

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-48207
Issue No.: 2026
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 31, 2013
County: Wayne (82-35)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan W. Owens

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 31, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determine Claimant was eligible for Medical Assistance (MA) with a spend-down?

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 received MA benefits.
2. On April 15, 2013, Claimant met with the Department regarding his spend-down.
3. On May 13, 2013, Claimant requested a hearing regarding his MA benefits.

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 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 400.10 i.

In the instant case, Claimant had an ongoing active MA spend-down case. Claimant met with the Department in April 2013 regarding his spend-down. The spend-down program was explained. Claimant filed a hearing request.

In order to qualify for Group 2 MA, a medically needy client must have income which is equal to or less than the protected basic maintenance level. Department policy sets forth the method for determining the protected basic maintenance level by considering: (1) the protected income level; (2) the amount diverted to dependents; (3) health insurance premiums; and (4) remedial services if determining eligibility for clients in adult-care homes. The protected income level is a set amount for non-medical needs such as shelter, food and incidental expenses. In all other cases other than those involving long-term care, the appropriate protected income level must be taken from PRT 240. BEM Item 545, and 42 CFR 435.811 through 435.814. If the individual's income exceeds the protected income level, the excess amount must be used to pay medical expenses before Group 2 MA coverage can begin. This process is known as "spend-down." Policy requires the Department to count and budget all income received that is not specifically excluded. There are three main types of income: countable earned, countable unearned and excluded.


Additionally, Claimant's total undisputed income is \$1,025. After subtracting the standard \$20 disregard and the protected income limit of \$375, Claimant would be left with a \$580 spend-down amount. The Department properly completed a budget reflecting all countable sources of income and determined correctly that Claimant would only qualify for MA under a spend-down case.

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 determined Claimant's MA benefits.

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.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.



Jonathan W. Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 7, 2013

Date Mailed: August 7, 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

JWO/pf

cc:

