

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-10290  
Issue No.: 3015; 2009; 4032  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 1, 2013  
County: Macomb County DHS #20

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Carmen G. Fahie

**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 Wednesday, May 1, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED] MCW.

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department properly  deny the Claimant's application  close Claimant's case  reduce Claimant's 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 checked="" 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 for:  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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA).
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA).	<input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC).
2. On October 29, 2012, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess income.
3. On October 29, 2012, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)

notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.

4. On November 1, 2012, Claimant or Claimant's AHR filed a hearing request, protesting the  denial of the application.  closure of the case.  reduction of 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 Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315, and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*

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 1997 AACS R 400.3101-3131. 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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015.

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 Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1998-2000 AACS R 400.3151-400.3180.

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 1997 AACS R 400.5001-5015.

Additionally, the claimant's FAP benefits have not changed according to the department caseworker, but this information could not be verified because it is not part of the hearing packet. According to the department caseworker, the claimant requested verbally to have her SDA and MA application withdrawn on October 29, 2012, but a

case note was not submitted providing the written verification of the phone call. However, the claimant requested a hearing on November 1, 2012 once she received the Notice of Case Action dated October 29, 2012 for FAP, MA, and SDA. The claimant disagreed with the department's case action.

The claimant subsequently got approved for Social Security SSI benefits. However, the proof of her SSI income was not provided through an SOLQ for the hearing packet. The SDA budget was also not provided to show that she was over income for SDA.

There is a language barrier and an interpreter should be used in assisting this claimant. As a result, the claimant's verbal request to not be considered for SDA and MA will be not be accepted because of the language barrier. The department has not met its burden that it followed policy in determining the claimant's eligibility for FAP or in denying the claimant's application for SDA and MA. There were no manual items, laws, or regulations cited by the department caseworker.

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 income, the Department  properly  improperly

- denied Claimant's application
- reduced Claimant's benefits
- 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, 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 for the reasons stated on the record.

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

1. Initiate a redetermination of the Claimant's eligibility for FAP, MA and SDA based on her application dated September 21, 2012.
2. Provide the Claimant with written notification of the Department's revised eligibility determination.

3. Issue the Claimant any retroactive benefits she/he may be eligible to receive, if any.

/s/  
Carmen G. Fahie  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 14, 2013

Date Mailed: May 15, 2013

**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.

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the mailing 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

CGF/hj

cc:

