

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-33126
Issue No.: 2021
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: August 22, 2013
County: Benzie

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 August 22, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant's [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included General Services Program Manager, [REDACTED].

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development 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. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

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

2. On December 11, 2012, the Department denied Claimant's application closed Claimant's case due to excess assets.

3. On December 11, 2012, the Department sent Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the denial. closure.

4. On January 23, 2013, the Claimant's daughter/POA filed a hearing request, protesting the denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 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 1999 AC, R 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

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

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

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.

██████████ argued that the Administrative Law Judge should exercise equity powers to reverse the Department and determine the Claimant's eligibility on her first MA application which the Department denied via a DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action issued on August 27, 2013. ██████████ testified that he did not represent the Claimant at that time. He argued that the Claimant was being assisted by a Department worker who failed to inform the Claimant that she should have filed for retroactive MA. As such, the Claimant relied to her detriment on the Department worker's advice and failed to file for retroactive MA. The Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600, p. 4, provides in relevant part as follows:

The client or authorized hearing representative has 90 calendar days from the date of the written notice of case action to request a hearing. The request must be received anywhere in DHS within the 90 days.

As ██████████ is essentially, verbally requesting that the Department's actions described in the August 27, 2012, DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action be reviewed, his request constitutes a hearing request for that issue. It is not in writing and not requested within 90 days of the issuance of the DHS-1605, Notice of Case Action. Furthermore, the Administrative Law Judge has no equity powers. As such, ██████████ hearing request is dismissed.

The entire issue in this case is whether or not the Claimant's ██████████ or proceeds of a home have been placed in a ██████████ ██████████ stated that the ██████████ has not been placed in a ██████████ and that he was in possession of the ██████████. The Department testified that there has been a policy clarification on this particular issue. There is no deed and no trust nor is there any policy clarification in evidence.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 402 (2012) p. 7, sets the protected ██████████ for MA at \$ ██████████ effective January 1, 2012. Outside of the value of the home, the Claimant's assets are less than the amount provided for a protected ██████████. Because there is no policy clarification or evidence of whether or not the Claimant's house or proceeds of the house have been placed in a trust, the evidence is found to be insufficient to establish that the Claimant's assets have been properly counted for the purpose of determining whether or not the Claimant has excess assets to be 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 concludes that 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 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 did act properly. did not act properly.

Accordingly, the Department's AMP FIP FAP MA SDA CDC decision is AFFIRMED **REVERSED**.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO DO THE FOLLOWING WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Initiate action to re-determine the Claimant's eligibility for MA back to the October 10, 2012 MA application, and
2. Initiate action to issue the Claimant any supplement she may thereafter be due.

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

Date Signed: 8/23/13

Date Mailed: 8/23/13

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)

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

2013-33126/SEH
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P. O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

SEH/tb

cc:

