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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No:2013-9966Issue No:2010Case No:Image: Case No:Hearing Date:April 10, 2013Alpena-Alcona County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: William A. Sundquist

HEARING DECISION

ISSUE

Was divestment correctly established?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. Claimant applied for MA-P (and retr o for July) on August 30, 2012, was denied on October 11, 2012 based on excess assets for July and divestment of a motor vehicle on August 22, 2012 in the amount of \$ with a penalty period of 13 days beginning August 14, 2012.
- 2. Claimant's representative did not disagree with the retro-July ineligibility.
- 3. On August 22, 2012 t he representative transferred the above v ehicle to the Claimant's daughter for no payment.
- 4. On September 12, 2012 the v ehicle was appraised by a c ar dealer for
- 5. On September 27, 2012 the represent ative submitted a vehic le appraisal to the DHS.
- 6. After the above transfer, the daughter spent \$ in vehicle repairs.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is estab lished by Title XIX of the Social Sec urity Act and is implemented by T itle 42 of the C ode of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Facts above are undisputed.

Facts above are undisputed.

Divestment means a transfer of a resource by a client for less than fair market value. BEM 405, Pg. 1.

The Claim ant established a third party (c ar dealer ship) verification value of the transferred car for \$ The Claimant's r epresentative argues t hat the \$1000 should not have been count ed by the DHS because the transferee had to spend \$1200 to repair the car. This is an equitable argument and this ALJ has no equitable powers.

What the Claimant's representative should have done was to have contacted the DHS before the car transfer for DHS policy information on how to financially follow the DHS policy requirements.

Therefore, the Claimant has not sustained her burden of proof to establish t he divestment decision was incorrect.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon t he above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that divestment was correctly established.

Accordingly, MA-P approval wit h a th irteen day divestment period is **UPHELD** and s o ORDERED.

<u>/s/</u>

William A. Sundquist Administrative Law Judge For Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 26, 2013

Date Mailed: April 29, 2013

NOTICE: Administrative Hearings may or der a re hearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at t he request of a party wit hin 30 days of the ma iling date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hear ings will not orde r 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.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing 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.

WAS/hj

CC:			