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:	201345118 2015 July 3, 2013 Jackson						
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris								
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 July 3, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included his Authorized Representative (AR) Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Assistance Payments Supervisor,								
<u>ISSUE</u>								
Did the Department properly ⊠ deny Claimant's eligibility ☐ close Claimant's case for:								
Family Independence Program (FIP)? Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? Food Assistance Program (FAP)? State Disability Assistance (SDA)? Medical Assistance (MA) for August of 2012?								
FINDINGS OF FACT								
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:								
Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits ☐ received benefits for:								
☐ Family Independence Program (FIP).☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP).☒ Medical Assistance (MA).		esistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).						

2.	On February 7, 2013, the Department denied Claimant's eligibility for August of 2012 closed Claimant's case due to the Claimant not having a child in his home during that month.
3.	On February 7, 2013, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. Closure.
4.	On May 1, 2013, Claimant's AR filed a hearing request, protesting the ⊠ denial of eligibility for August of 2012. ☐ closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment 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, R 400.3101 ough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program ective October 1, 1996.
pro im Re Ag	The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) ogram] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is plemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal egulations (CFR). The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 ough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social curity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). e Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence ency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MCL 0.105.
	The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is ministered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq.
for Se pro	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human rvices (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 2000 AACS, R 400.3151 through Rule 0.3180.

repeatedly and left messages that he wished to withdraw from representing the Claimant because agrees with the Department's position that the Claimant in the tot eligible for MA for August of 2012. It setified that the Claimant did return one of the telephone calls to to withdraw from representation. It was aware of the date and time for hearing. The Administrative Law Judge did also telephone the Claimant, who was not present at the local office, and left a message for the Claimant to telephone the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) if he wished to have a hearing. As of the date of the signing of this decision, no telephone call from the Claimant has been received at MAHS. Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 135 (2011) p. 1 provides criterion for eligibility for a Care Taker Relative and one of those criterion is that there is a in the home. In this case it is not disputed that there was no child in the Claimant's home in August of 2012. The Claimant's AR did not have permission to withdraw from representing the Claimant and the AR agrees that the Department is acting in accordance with its policy. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that it is not contested that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy and that the denial of MA eligibility as a Care Taker Relative is therefore proper. 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 Department Claimant's eligibility for August 2012 improperly denied Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case improperly	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.					
Care Taker Relative and one of those criterion is that there is a in the home. In this case it is not disputed that there was no child in the Claimant's home in August of 2012. The Claimant's AR did not have permission to withdraw from representing the Claimant and the AR agrees that the Department is acting in accordance with its policy. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that it is not contested that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy and that the denial of MA eligibility as a Care Taker Relative is therefore proper. 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 properly denied Claimant's eligibility for August 2012 improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC. DECISION AND ORDER The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department	not eligible for MA for August of 2012. testified that the Claimant did return					
stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department properly denied Claimant's eligibility for August 2012 improperly denied Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC. DECISION AND ORDER The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department	Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 135 (2011) p. 1 provides criterion for eligibility for a Care Taker Relative and one of those criterion is that there is a in the home. In this case it is not disputed that there was no child in the Claimant's home in August of 2012. The Claimant's AR did not have permission to withdraw from representing the Claimant and the AR agrees that the Department is acting in accordance with its policy. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that it is not contested that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy and that the denial of MA eligibility as a Care Taker Relative is therefore proper.					
Claimant's application properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC. DECISION AND ORDER The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department	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					
<u>DECISION AND ORDER</u> The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department	 ☑ properly denied Claimant's eligibility for August 2012 ☐ improperly denied Claimant's application ☐ properly closed Claimant's case ☐ improperly closed Claimant's case 					
The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department	for: AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC.					
of Law finds that the Department	DECISION AND ORDER					
Z and doct property.	The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law finds that the Department ☐ did act properly. ☐ did not act properly.					

Accordingly, the Department's		FIP	☐ FAP	\boxtimes MA	SDA	CDC decision
is 🛛 AFFIRMED 🗌 REVERSE	D.					

/s/

Susanne E. Harris Administrative Law Judge For Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: <u>7/9/13</u>

Date Mailed: <u>7/9/13</u>

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 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

SEH/aca

CC:



