

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████
██
██

Reg. No.: 2013-42039
Issue Nos.: 2022, 3021, 5024
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: August 21, 2013
County: Oakland (03)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

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 hearing was held on August 21, 2013, at Walled Lake, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her daughter, ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████, Assistance Payments Supervisor.

ISSUE

Due to excess assets, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application close Claimant's case for:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Emergency Relief (SER)? | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | |

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the testimony at the hearing, finds as material fact:

1. Claimant applied for benefits received benefits for:

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Emergency Relief (SER). | <input type="checkbox"/> Adult Medical Assistance (AMP). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP) | |

2. Due to excess assets, on March 20, 2013 and May 1, 2013, the Department

denied Claimant's application. closed Claimant's case.

3. On March 20, 2013 and April 3, 2013, the Department sent
 Claimant Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)
notice of the denial. closure.
4. On April 11, 2013, Claimant filed a hearing request, protesting the
 denial of the application. closure of the case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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

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

The State Emergency Relief (SER) program is established by 2004 PA 344. The SER program is administered pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and by, 1999 AC, Rule 400.7001 through Rule 400.7049. Department policies are found in the State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

Additionally, The Department publishes asset limitations for each of the benefit programs, and the asset limitations are set forth in the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 400, "Assets," and Emergency Relief Manual (ERM) 205, "Assets." Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 400 (2013); Emergency Relief Manual (ERM) 205 (2013).

The Claimant's asset in this case is a home with a State Equalized Value of \$1[REDACTED]. Dept. Exh. 1, p. 25. The asset limits for the four programs in question are:

FAP:	\$5,000.
MA:	\$2,000.
MA Cost Share:	\$7,080.
SER:	\$50. BEM 400; ERM 205.

Having carefully considered all of the evidence in this case in its entirety, it is found and determined that the Department acted correctly in this case. The Department is required to use the State Equalized Value (SEV) or other documented evidence of the value of the Claimant's assets. *Id.* It is found and concluded that the Department did use the proper evidence and this resulted in a denial of SER and closure of MA and FAP. The Department is affirmed.

The Claimant argued at the hearing that the property is encumbered with judgment liens which Claimant is unable to pay, and further, she made efforts to sell the property and was unable to do so. The house was not continuously listed for sale however. Claimant's arguments do not change the fact that the SEV is \$ [REDACTED] regardless of its fair market value. There is no other appraisal or valuation to show that the value of the house is any more or less, therefore the Department is required to use the SEV. *Id.*

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, due to excess assets, the Department

properly denied Claimant's application improperly denied Claimant's application
 properly closed Claimant's case improperly closed Claimant's case

for: SER FIP FAP MA SDA.

DECISION AND ORDER

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 SER FIP FAP MA SDA decision is
 AFFIRMED REVERSED for the reasons stated on the record.



Jan Leventer
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 27, 2013

Date Mailed: August 27, 2013

NOTICE OF APPEAL: 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

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

JL/tm

cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]