

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-56974  
Issue No.: 3021  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 13, 2013  
County: 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 August 13, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included Eligibility Specialist [REDACTED] and Office of Inspector General (OIG) [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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)? | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)? |
| <input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP). | <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA). |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).  |

2. On August 1, 2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case due to excess assets.

3. On June 26, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.       closure.
4. On July 5, 2013, Claimant 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.

The Department in this case alleged that the Claimant had the following properties valued at the following amounts: [REDACTED];

[REDACTED]; and [REDACTED]. The Claimant is associated with the [REDACTED] address valued at \$ [REDACTED]. The Department also alleged that the Claimant has three vehicles: [REDACTED] and a [REDACTED]. The evidence indicates that the Claimant deposited \$ [REDACTED] into his checking account in May of 2013.

Regarding the [REDACTED], the Claimant testified that there is no home but rather a vacant lot. The Claimant stated that the [REDACTED] it, tore it down and it went to a [REDACTED] approximately five years ago and he receives no tax assessment from that property anymore. The Claimant is not paying taxes on that property. The Claimant testified that the [REDACTED] is his [REDACTED] and he does own that home and the [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] 15 years ago. The Claimant asserted that the [REDACTED] belongs to his [REDACTED]. Regarding the [REDACTED] the Claimant stated he drives the [REDACTED] he sold the [REDACTED] four months ago and the [REDACTED] is not running. He was able to deposit the \$ [REDACTED] into his checking account as he did sell some of his [REDACTED] in May.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 400 (2013) p. 4, sets the asset limit for FAP at \$ [REDACTED]. The Department's exhibits, particularly the Claimant's bank statement and documents showing the ownership and value of the [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] properties are persuasive to this Administrative Law Judge. The Claimant's testimony that he no longer owns these properties is refuted by the recent documentary evidence and is therefore found to be less than credible. Based on the evidence in the record, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Claimant had assets in excess of \$ [REDACTED] at the time the Department took action to close his case. It is therefore concluded that when the Department took action to close the Claimant's case, it was acting in accordance with its policy.

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.

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

Date Signed: 8/20/13

Date Mailed: 8/21/13

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

SEH/tb

cc:

