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

IN THE MATTER OF:					
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-49567 2014 June 26, 2013 Macomb-12 County DHS			
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Areno	dt				
HEARING DECIS	SION				
This matter is before the undersigned Administration and MCL 400.37 following Claim ant's request for telephone hearing was held on J une 26, 2013 from behalf of Claimant included and Department of Human Services (Department) included	or a hearing. Afte m Lansing, Mi chig . Pa rtic	r due notice, a			
<u>ISSUE</u>					
Due to exc ess income and exc ess a ssets, did the Claimant's application \square close Claimant's case					
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ ☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? ☐ ☐ Medical Assistance (MA)? ☐	Adult Medical Ass State Disability A Child Developme	,			
FINDINGS OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the cevidence on the whole record, finds as material fac	• '	al, and substantial			
1. Cla imant ☐ applied for benefits for: ☐ received benefits for:					
Family Independence Program (FIP). Food Assistance Program (FAP). Medical Assistance (MA).		sistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).			
 On May 31, 2013, the Department ☐ denied Claimant's application ☐ closed Claimant's case ☐ reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess assets. 					
3. On May 21, 2013, the Department sent ☐ Claimant ☐ Claimant's Authorized Rep	resentative (AR)				

4.	On May 30, 2013, Claimant of	r Claimant's AHR filed a h	earing request, protesting the
	denial of the application.	$oxed{\boxtimes}$ 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 MA program is established by T itle XIX of the Socia I Security Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of t he Code of F ederal Regulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Fa mily Independence Agenc y) admin isters the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 400.105.

In April of 2013, the Claimant submitted a bank statement reflecting an account balance of \$2,503.

Asset eligibility is a requirement for all LIF, G2U, G2C, AMP and SSI related MA categories. The asset limit for the Claimant's MA category is \$2,000. (BEM 400).

If an ongoing MA recipient or active deduc tible client has excess assets, the Department is to initiate clos ure but delete pending ne gative actions if it is verified that the excess assets were disposed of. The is includes payments for medical expenses, living costs and other debts. (BEM 400).

My role as an administrative law judge is to determine whether or not the Department's actions were appropriate and correct at the time of the negative action.

In this case, the Claimant did exceed the asset limit at the time of the negative action. But at no point in time between May 21, 2013 and June 25, 2013 did the Claimant indicate the excess a ssets were for housing expenses and other bills. Therefore, I find the Department's actions to be appropriate given the information they had available to them at the time of the negative action. Had the Claimant promptly informed the Department of the changes in her account balance, there might have been a different outcome. The Claimant is encouraged to reapply for MA benefits if the Claimant' hasn't already done so.

Accordingly, the Department's actions are affirmed.

DECISION AND ORDER

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law that the Department acted in accordance with policy in determining Claimant's MA eligibility.

The Department's actions are **AFFIRMED**.

Corey A. Arendt Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 27, 2013

Date Mailed: June 27, 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant,
- 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

Recons ideration/Rehearing Request

P. O. Box 30639

Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

2013-49567/CAA

CAA/las

