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

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-29866 Issue No.: 1017 Case No.: Hearing Date: March 25, 2013 County: Wayne (17)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susan C. Burke

## 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 25, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and , Claimant's Authorized Hearing Representative. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included

### ISSUE

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

Family	Indepe	endence	Program	(FI
		_		

P)? 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).

Medical Assistance (MA).

Adult Medical Assistance (AMP).

🔀 State Disability Assistance (SDA).

Child Development and Care (CDC).

- On January 28, 2013, the Department
   Idenied Claimant's application
   Claimant's benefits.
- On January 28, 2013, the Department sent
   □ Claimant □ Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) □ closure. □ calculation.
- 4. Claimant's group size was seven.
- 5. Claimant received RSDI income in excess of \$905.00
- 6. On January 31, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of the application. □ closure of the case. □ calculation.

### 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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

RFT 210 sets the FIP payment standard for a group size of seven at \$905.00. RFT 225 sets a lower standard for SDA (\$315.00). Claimant's income of RSDI is at least \$1,600.00, and therefore the Department was correct in denying Claimant's application for cash assistance, as Claimant's income exceeded the above standards.

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

 $\boxtimes$  properly denied Claimant's application

improperly denied Claimant's application

properly closed Claimant's case

properly calculated Claimant's benefits

improperly closed Claimant's case

improperly calculated Claimant's benefits

for:  $\square$  AMP  $\boxtimes$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\boxtimes$  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  $\boxtimes$  FIP  $\square$  FAP  $\square$  MA  $\boxtimes$  SDA  $\square$  CDC decision is  $\boxtimes$  AFFIRMED  $\square$  REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Jusa C. Buche

Susan C. Burke Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 26, 2013

Date Mailed: March 26, 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 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

#### SCB/tm

