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

## IN THE MATTER OF:



 Reg. No.:
 2013-28906

 Issue Nos.:
 1080, 2000

 Case No.:
 Issue

 Hearing Date:
 March 11, 2013

 County:
 Wayne (57)

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 March 11, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her daughter, Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included , Family Independence Specialist.

# <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly  $\Box$  deny Claimant's application  $\boxtimes$  close Claimant's case for:

imes	
<hr/>	

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 received benefits for:



Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP).

Modical Assistance (MA)

Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

2013-28906/JL

2. On January 1, 2012, the Department

 $\Box$  denied Claimant's application  $\Box$  closed Claimant's case

due to a determination that she would reach her 48<sup>th</sup> month of FIP benefits on that date.

- On November 26, 2012, the Department sent
   ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the ☐ denial. ☐ closure.
- 4. On February 5, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the  $\Box$  denial of the application.  $\boxtimes$  closure of the case.

## 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 Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known 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 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 of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

Additionally, Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 234, "FIP Time Limits," is the applicable Department policy in this case. BEM 234 establishes a 48-month limit for a customer to receive FIP benefits. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 234 (2011), p. 2. Based on this policy, it is found and conldued that Claimant reached the 48-month limit on December 31, 2012, and was no longer entitled to FIP benefits as of that date.

In this case the Department closed Claimant's FIP benefits effective January 1, 2013. It is found and determined that the Department had no authority to issue FIP benefits to Claimant as of that date, and the Department acted correctly in closing Claimant's FIP benefits as of that date. The Department took the correct action in this case and the Department therefore is AFFIRMED.

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 the Department

2013-28906/JL

properly closed Claimant's case

properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application improperly closed Claimant's case

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

Also in this case, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the Department's action regarding Medicaid benefits. Shortly after the commencement of the hearing, Claimant testified she now understood and accepted the actions taken by the Department. Claimant also testified that she did not wish to proceed with a hearing regarding Medicaid. The Department agreed to the dismissal of Claimant's hearing request. Pursuant to Michigan Administrative Code Rule (MAC-R) 400.906(1), Claimant's hearing request is hereby DISMISSED.

## **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  $\boxtimes$  did act properly. did not act properly.

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

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, based on the above discussion, that the Medicaid issue is DISMISSED pursuant to MAC-R 400.906(1).

Jan One.

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

Date Signed: March 11, 2013

Date Mailed: March 11, 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.

## 2013-28906/JL

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

cc:		
		F