

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-11146
Issue No.: 1028
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 28, 2013
County: Jackson County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

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 Thursday, March 28, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant, her daughter, [REDACTED] and authorized representative [REDACTED], from L&S Associates, Inc. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], FIM and [REDACTED] ES.

ISSUE

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | |

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:

1. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | |

2. Due to excess assets, on July 30, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case.

3. On July 30, 2012, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On October 25, 2012, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

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 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, R 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1997 AACSR 400.3001-3015.

Additionally, the claimant applied for MA on July 19, 2012. The department caseworker determined that the claimant had excess assets because her household owned 3 cars. Department Exhibit 9-15. The most expensive car, 2007 Chrysler 300, was exempt as based in policy. However, the claimant still owned 2 additional cars of a 1994 Ford F150 Pickup worth \$██████ and a 1997 Jeep Cherokee worth \$██████ for a total asset worth of \$██████ which was over the MA asset limit for a group size of 2 of \$██████ Department Exhibit 7. As a result, the department correctly denied the claimant's application due to excess assets.

During the hearing, the authorized representative presented an argument that the claimant should have been eligible for Group 2 MA because she is taking care of her great niece who is a minor. However, the claimant's great niece is already on her mother's case for MA and is therefore not eligible to be on the claimant's based on department's policy first in time, first in right. The claimant does not have guardianship of her grand niece, but rather has a kinship care relationship with the mother in caring for her grand niece. The mother is present and involved in her daughter's life. In addition, the family has not decided to make the claimant the caretaker relative for the grand niece, but has maintained that the child's mother is. As a result, the claimant is not eligible for Group 2 caretaker relative MA benefits.

The department has met its burden that the claimant has excess assets for MA and is not eligible for Group 2 MA caretaker relative status because the claimant's great niece is on her mother's case.

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

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

for: AMP FIP MA SDA FAP.

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. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP MA SDA FAP decision is
 AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

/s/ _____
Carmen G. Fahie
Administrative Law Judge
For Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 5, 2013

Date Mailed: April 5, 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 **MAY** 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

CGF/hj

cc:

