## STATE OF MICHIGAN MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN	ITL		МΛ	TI	TER.	$\mathbf{a}$	
117		1E I	VI / 1	\			Г.

	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-18440 3002 January 30, 2013 Oakland (02)			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer					
HEARING DECISION					
This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 30, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and his son, on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Assistance Payments Supervisor.					
<u>ISSUE</u>					
Due to excess income, did the Department properly $\square$ deny the Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case $\boxtimes$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:					
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐	Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Child Development and Care (CDC)?				
FINDINGS OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:					
1. Claimant ☐ applied for benefits for: ☐ re	ceived benefits fo	r:			
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP). ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP). ☐ Medical Assistance (MA). ☐	_	esistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).			

2.	On January 1, 2013, the Department			
3.	On December 8, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. closure. reduction.			
4.	On December 18, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application.   Closure of the case.   reduction of benefits.			
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).				
The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.				
Additionally, the Department's Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 500 (2012), "Income Overview," requires the Department to base benefit amounts on all earned and unearned income of the client minus deductions for proper expenses. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 500 (2012). Thus, when a client's income increases, the Department is required to recalculate the client's FAP allotment. This policy is applicable in this case.				
In this case Claimant's Social Security benefit increased from \$1,156 to \$1,175. It is found and determined that the Department took correct notice of this increase and recalculated Claimant's FAP allotment. It is further found and determined that the FAP benefit of \$16 is also required by the Department's Reference Table (RFT) 260 (2012), which states that a client with a countable net income of \$649 is entitled to \$16 FAP per month. Department of Human Services Reference Tables (RFT) 260 (2012), p. 6.				
sta	sed upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons ated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess some, the Department $\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \ $			
	<ul> <li>☐ denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li> <li>☐ closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>			
for	: ☐ AMP ☐ FIP ☒ FAP ☐ MA ☐ SDA ☐ CDC.			

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upo of Law, and for the reasons stated on the ☑ did act properly ☐ did not act pro	•
Accordingly, the Department's ☐ AMP ☐ is ☑ AFFIRMED ☐ REVERSED for the r	FIP  FAP  MA SDA CDC decision easons stated on the record.
	Jan Goenly
	Jan Leventer
	Administrative Law Judge
	for Maura Corrigan, Director
	Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 1, 2013
Date Mailed: February 1, 2013

**NOTICE**: Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. (60 days for FAP cases)

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

Claimant may request a rehearing or reconsideration for the following reasons:

- A rehearing <u>MAY</u> be granted if there is newly discovered evidence that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision.
- A reconsideration **MAY** be granted for any of the following reasons:
  - misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision,
  - typographical errors, mathematical error, or other obvious errors in the hearing decision that effect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - the failure of the ALJ to address other relevant issues in the hearing decision.

Request must be submitted through the local DHS office or directly to MAHS by mail at Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing Michigan 48909 07322

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CC:

