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

DEI ARTIMENT OF THO	MAN SERVISES	
IN THE MATTER OF:		
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013 36962 1017 June 26, 2013 Wayne (17)
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Feri	ris	
HEARING DEC	CISION	
This matter is before the undersigned Administrant MCL 400.37 following Claimant's requestelephone hearing was held on June 16, 2013, behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Part Human Services (Department) included	st for a hearing. from Detroit, Michi	After due notice, a gan. Participants on
ISSUE		
Due to excess income, did the Department properly $\boxtimes$ deny the Claimant's application $\square$ close Claimant's case $\square$ reduce Claimant's benefits for:		
<ul><li>☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)?</li><li>☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)?</li><li>☐ Medical Assistance (MA)?</li></ul>	<ul><li>☐ Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)?</li><li>☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)?</li><li>☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?</li></ul>	
FINDINGS OF	FACT	
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the evidence on the whole record, finds as material		rial, and substantial
1. Claimant	received benefits fo	or:
	Adult Medical As	ssistance (AMP).

State Disability Assistance (SDA). Child Development and Care (CDC).

Food Assistance Program (FAP). Medical Assistance (MA).

2.	On April 1, 2013, the Department		
3.	On March 12, 2013, the Department sent  Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  notice of the denial. closure. reduction.		
4.	On March 22, 2013, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting		
	the $\boxtimes$ denial of the application. $\square$ closure of the case. $\square$ reduction of benefits.		
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
	partment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the dges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).		
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal sponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.		
Clabe be \$1, the and pay	ditionally, in this case the pay stubs used by the Department to calculate the aimant's income were reviewed and confirmed by the Claimant. Exhibit 3. The partment determined that the Claimant's income exceeded the payment standard to eligible for FIP benefits. RFT 210. In this case the Claimant's earned income of 720 was based on an averaging of the Claimant's 3 pay stubs and the Department on deducted the earned income deduction and the earned income percentage, \$200 d \$304 respectively, resulting in countable income of \$1,216 which exceeds the yment standard of \$597. Exhibit 2 Therefore the Department properly denied the aimant's FIP application. BEM 515, BEM 518 and BEM 520 (11/1/12)		
sta	sed upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons ted on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that, due to excess ome, the Department $\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \ $		
	<ul> <li>☑ denied Claimant's application</li> <li>☐ reduced Claimant's benefits</li> <li>☐ closed Claimant's case</li> </ul>		
for	: ☐ AMP ☑ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ MA ☐ SDA ☐ CDC.		

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, finds that the Department \( \subseteq \text{did act properly} \) \( \subseteq \text{did not act properly}.
Accordingly, the Department's $\square$ AMP $\boxtimes$ FIP $\square$ FAP $\square$ MA $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC decision is $\boxtimes$ AFFIRMED $\square$ REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.

Lynn M. Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 16, 2013

Date Mailed: July 16, 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.

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
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

LMF/cl

## 2013-36962/LMF

