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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2013-3959

Issue No.: 2013

Case No.:

Hearing Date: November 13, 2012

County: Oakland (02)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Admini strative 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 November 13, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claiman t included and representative. Partic ipants on behalf of the Depar tment of Human Services

(Department) included

ISSUE

Did the Department properly calculate the claimant's income?

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. After the department closed the claimant's MA on June 1, 2012, it reached an agreement with the claimant and reinstated the claimant's MA case back to June 15, 2012
- 2. At the hearing the claim ant's representative challe nged the figures the department used for the claimant's income, testifying that the claimant's income fluctuated throughout the year.
- 3. The claimant requested a hearing on this issue on September 28, 2012.

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).

Fluctuating income is addressed in departmental policy.

Use income from the past 60 or 90 days for fluctuating or irregular income, if:

The past 30 days is not a good indicator of future income, and

The fluctuations of income during the past 60 or 90 days appear to accurately reflect the income that is expected to be received in the benefit month. (BEM 505, p.5).

In the instant case, the department argued t hat 30 days of income documentation was called for regardless of the clai mant's testimony that the cl aimant's income fluctuated widely. Department policy demands that the department accept documentation of income for the "past 60 or 90 days" if "the past 30 days is not a good indicator of future income." (BEM 505, p.5, June 15, 2012).

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
☐ did act properly when . ☐ did not act properly when it used the past 30
days of income to calculate the claimant's monthly income, after it was notified that the
figures being used were not accurate from month to month.
Accordingly, the Department's \square AMP \square FIP \square FAP \boxtimes MA \square SDA \square CDC decision
is AFFIRMED 🖾 REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.
oxtimes THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF
THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Accept documentation of claimant's in come back to her reinstatement on June 15, 2012, and utilize do cumentation that accurate ly reflects the claimant's fluctuating income.

Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 3, 2013

Date Mailed: January 3, 2013

NOTICE: Michigan Administrative Hearing Syst em (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

MJB/cl

