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

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES		
IN THE MATTER OF:		
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201319154 3002, 6019 February 12, 2013 Oakland
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully		
HEARING DEC	CISION	
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 February 12, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included		
ISSUE		
Due to excess income, did the Department prop ☐ close Claimant's case ☐ reduce Claimant's		laimant's application
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? ent and Care (CDC)?
Due to excess income, did the Department properly ☐ deny the Claimant's application ☐ close Claimant's case ☐ 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 evidence on the whole record, finds as material	•	rial, and substantial
 Claimant ☐ applied for benefits f ☐ Family Independence Progra (AMP), ☐ Food Assistance Assistance (SDA), ☐ Medical A 	am (FIP),	Medical Assistance State Disability

and Care (CDC).

2.	On March 28, 2012, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☒ reduced Claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits due to excess income.
3.	On March 28, 2012, the Department \square denied Claimant's application \boxtimes closed Claimant's case \square reduced Claimant's Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits due to excess income.
4.	On May 12, 2012, the Department received the Claimant's hearing request, protesting the \square denial of the application. \boxtimes closure of the case. \boxtimes reduction of benefits.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the bility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
	ult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, <i>et seq</i> .
Responsibilit 42 USC 601, Agency) adn through Rule	ily Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal by and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ninisters FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 e 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ober 1, 1996.
program] is implemented Regulations	d Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ninisters FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 e 400.3015.
Security Act The Departm	ical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). nent (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.
for disabled as the Famil	e Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known by Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL eq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
and XX of the 1990, and the program and 99. The	d Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE he Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of e Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. It is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 e Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL d 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

The Department determined the Claimant's monthly countable gross income based on the paycheck stubs submitted by the Claimant as verification of her earned income. These paycheck stubs and records made available by the Claimant's employer include an estimate of tips received by the Claimant on her job as a waitress for the purposes of income tax withholding.

The Claimant argued that it was improper for the Department to include these tips in its determination of her countable income because they are not an accurate reflection of her actual income.

The Claimant does not dispute that she does receive income from tips. The Claimant failed to supply the Department with a more accurate accounting of her income from tips, and the Department used the best information available when it used the estimated tip income printed on her paycheck stubs.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department determined the Claimant's countable income in accordance with Department policy.

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 🛛 properly 🗌 improperly 🔯 reduced Claimant's Food
Assistance Program (FAP) benefits, and Sciosed Claimant's Child Development and
Care (CDC) case.

DECISION AND ORDER

<u> </u>
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 ⊠ did not act properly.
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square MA \square SDA \boxtimes CDC decisions \boxtimes AFFIRMED \square REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
/s/ Kevin Scully Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 21, 2013

Date Mailed: February 21, 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

KS/tb

CC:

