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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-18773 Issue No.: 3002 Case No.: Hearing Date: County: Wayne (57)

**JANUARY 28, 2013** 

## 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 28, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her granddaughter, Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

Family Independence Manager.

#### ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly and deny the Claimant's application Close Claimant's case reduce Claimant's benefits for:

imes	

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: X received 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).

2013-18773/JL

- 2. On January 1, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's application
  Closed Claimant's case reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
- On December 8, 2012, the Department sent
  ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
  ☐ of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure. ☐ reduction.
- 4. On December 17, 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, Bridges Eligibility Manual (BAM) Items 500, "Income Overview," and 554, "FAP Income Budgeting," require the Department to use the customer's income as the basis for calculating the amount of FAP benefits the customer is entitled to receive. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 500 (2012), 554 (2012). These policies, BEM 500 and BEM 554, are applicable to Claimant's case.

In this case, Claimant's income increased on January 1, 2013. Because Claimant had a change of income, the Department is required to recalculate her FAP benefits. This recalculation must be based on her current, and not her past, income. Claimant's higher income caused her to be entitled only to a lower FAP benefit. *Id.* 

Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess income, the Department

denied Claimant's application

reduced Claimant's benefits

closed Claimant's case

for:  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department  $\square$  did act properly  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\square$  FIP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\square$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\boxtimes$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Jan

Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 29, 2013

Date Mailed: January 30, 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

JL/tm

