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

IN THE MA	ATTER OF:
-----------	-----------

		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201341390 2001 July 25, 2013 SSPC -West		
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 25, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist					
ISSUE					
Did the Department properly $igtimes$ deny Claimant's application $igsqcup$ close Claimant's case for:					
Food	Independence Program (FIP)? Assistance Program (FAP)? al Assistance (MA)?		sistance (AMP)? ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?		
FINDINGS OF FACT					
The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:					
1. Claima	. Claimant ⊠ applied for benefits □ received benefits for:				
☐ Foo	mily Independence Program (FIP). od Assistance Program (FAP). dical Assistance (MA).	State Disability A	sistance (AMP). Assistance (SDA). ent and Care (CDC).		
Depart ⊠ den	is no DHS-1605, Notice of Case ment's hearing summary on ied Claimant's application clossincome for AMP and not being categ	April 10, 2013, sed Claimant's case	the Department due to her having		

3.	There is no DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action in evidence, however, per the Department's hearing summary on April 10, 2013, the Department sent \boxtimes Claimant \square Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the \boxtimes denial. \square closure.
4.	On April 16, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the \boxtimes denial of the application. \square closure of the case.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
	epartment policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the idges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
Re 42 Ag thr	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal esponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence jency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3101 rough Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program fective 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 Jency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, R 400.3001 rough Rule 400.3015.
Se Th Ag	The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social ecurity Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence gency) 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	The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human ervices (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.
an 19 Th an	The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE d XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 90, 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 d 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 0.14(1) and 1999 AC. R 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

In this case, it is not contested that the Claima					
	Claimant testified that she has				
many expenses and needs medical benefits. Bridg	· ·				
(2012) p. 4 provides that the only allowable deductions from income are \$ deduction from a program group members gross earnings and then a 20% deduction					
from the remaining earnings and a deduction for court-ordered support paid by group members. There are no other allowable deductions in an AMP budget. BEM 640 p. 3					
provides that income eligibility for AMP exists when	•				
does not exceed the program group's AMP income lir					
RFT 236. RFT 236 provides that for an individual					
Claimant testified that she had no earned income deduction or court-ordered support					
deduction. As the Claimant exceeds the income limit for AMP, this Administrative Law					
Judge concludes that the Department was acting in accordance with its policy when					
denying the Claimant's application for AMP due to excess income. It is also not contested that the Claimant is not aged, disabled, blind, or pregnant nor is she the care					
taker of minor children. As such, per BEM 105 pp. 1, 2, the Claimant is not categorically					
eligible for MA.	,				
Based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons					
stated on the record, the Administrative Law Judge properly denied Claimant's application improp	•				
	operly closed Claimant's case for:				
□ AMP □ FIP □ FAP □ MA □ SDA □ CDC.	openy cloud Claimant Code for.				
DECISION AND ORDE	<u>=R</u>				
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 FAP MA SDA CDC decision					
is 🛮 AFFIRMED 🗌 REVERSED.					
	/s/				
	Susanne E. Harris				
	Administrative Law Judge				
	For Maura Corrigan, Director				
Data Cinna di 7/00/40	Department of Human Services				
Date Signed: 7/29/13					

Date Mailed: 7/30/13

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)

201341390/SEH

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/tb

