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

## IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:	201326804
Issue No.:	<u>2021, 3021</u>
Case No.:	
Hearing Date:	February 27, 2013
County:	Kent

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

# **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 February 27, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included

Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included

## ISSUE

Due to excess assets, did the Department properly  $\square$  deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:



Food Assistance Program (FAP)? Medical Assistance (MA)?

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)?

# FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the testimony at the hearing, finds as material fact:

- Claimant X applied for benefits I received benefits for: X Food 1 Assistance Program (FAP), Adult Medical Assistance (AMP), Medical Assistance (MA), State Disability Assistance (SDA).
- 2 Due to excess assets, on January 10, 2013, the Department  $\boxtimes$  denied Claimant's application. Closed Claimant's case.
- 3. On January 10, 2013, the Department sent  $\boxtimes$  Claimant  $\square$  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  $\square$  denial.  $\square$  closure.

- 4. On January 22, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\square$  denial of the application.  $\square$  closure of the case.
- 5.

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are found in the Bridges 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 Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp 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 of Human Services (DHS or Department), administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Reference Table Manual (RFT), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

The Claimant argued that the Department improperly counted his stocks towards his countable assets. The Claimant testified that he purchased the stocks with borrowed funds and that the stocks have a negative net value.

However, the Claimant was unable to provide verification that the stocks were purchased on margin, or differentiate this debt from other debt amassed from other purchases.

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 assets, the Department  $\bigotimes$  properly denied Claimant's application  $\square$  improperly denied Claimant's case  $\square$  improperly closed Claimant's case for:  $\square$  AMP  $\bigotimes$  FAP  $\bigotimes$  MA  $\square$  SDA.

## 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  $\bigotimes$  did act properly.  $\square$  did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's  $\square$  AMP  $\boxtimes$  FAP  $\boxtimes$  MA  $\square$  SDA decision is  $\boxtimes$  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: March 1, 2013

Date Mailed: March 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.

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

