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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



2013 19376
3002,3008
January 30, 201
Wayne (49)

3

## ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

## HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on J anuary 30, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participant s on behalf of Claimant included t he Claimant and a witness, who also appeared. . Participants on be half of the Department of Hu man Services (Department) included ES.

### ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's applic ation Close Claimant's case 🛛 reduce Claimant's benefits for:

ĺ	Х
i	

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 t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact;

1. Cla imant
--------------

 $\square$  applied for benefits for:  $\square$  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).

2013-19376/LMF

- 2. On 1/1/13, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
- On 12/8/12, the Department sent
  ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) ☐ denial. ☐ closure. ☐ reduction.
- 4. On 8/9/10 the Claimant was found in noncooperation wi th the Offic e of Child Support. Claimant did not provide the name of the father of her child in question prior to the hearing.
- 5. Due to noncooperation with the Office of Child Suppor t, the Claimant was removed from her FAP group reducing the group size by one member . No representative from the Office of Child Support attended the hearing.
- 6. On 12/13/12, 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 Br idges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*.

☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq*. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq*., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) [for merly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amend ed, 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.

The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The State Disabilit y Assistance (SDA) progr am, which provides financial ass istance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the F amily Independence Agency) admini sters the SDA program pursuant to M CL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Soc ial Security Act, the Ch ild Care and Developm ent Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Feder al Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. T he Department provides servic es to adult s and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

Additionally, The Claimant's Food Assistance (FAP) decreased when t wo group members' RSDI increased from \$698 to \$710 monthly. The amount of the increase and the total monthly income was confirmed by the Claimant's witness who is a FAP group member and who als o confirmed that he and his son each receive \$710 per month for RSDI and a monthly guarterly supplement of \$14 each, for total unearned income of \$1448. The FAP calculation did not include an amount for Claimant's rent as part of the excess shelter deduc tion because verification of rent was not r eceived until 12/26/12 after the benefits were calculated and the Notice of Case action dated 12/8/12 was sent. The Claimant acknowledged that the rent was not verified until 12/26/12. The F AP group size was 4 members and the Department correctly did not include t he Claimant due to noncooperation with the Office of Child Support. The Department also correctly included a shelter allowance in the amount of \$575. The mont hly be nefit amount of \$281 as calculated by the Department was correct and the F AP benefits were properly reduced. Exhibit 1.

As regards the Claim ant's nonc operation and exclusion from the FAP g roup, it is determined that the in stant hearing was the first time the Claimant was able to provide the name of the father and othe r relevant information. The Claimant is ur ged to report the information to the Office of Child Suppor t immediately so a det ermination by that office can be made regarding cooperation.

Based upon the abov e Findings of Fact and Conclus ions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, the Administrative La income, the Department income incom

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.

Lynn M. Ferris` Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 5, 2013

Date Mailed: February 5, 2013

**NOTICE:** Michigan Administrative Hearing S ystem (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a par ty within 30 days of the mailing date of this Dec ision and Order . MAHS will not or der a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's mo tion where the final decis ion 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 ti mely 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

Re consideration/Rehearing Request P. O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

## 2013-19376/LMF

LMF/cl

