

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201313507  
Issue No.: 3021  
Case No.: 102969627  
Hearing Date: [REDACTED]  
County: Wayne DHS (31)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

**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 January 7, 2013 from Detroit, Michigan. Participants included the above-named claimant. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (DHS) included [REDACTED], Specialist.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether DHS properly denied Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits to Claimant due to excess assets.

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. In 10/2010, Claimant's spouse received approximately \$10,000 in lottery winnings.
2. On 10/1/12, Claimant applied for FAP benefits.
3. On 10/4/12, DHS denied Claimant's application for FAP benefits due to excess assets.
4. On 10/12/12, Claimant requested a hearing to dispute the FAP benefit denial.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Food Assistance Program (formerly known as the Food Stamp 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). DHS administers the FAP pursuant to Michigan Compiled Laws 400.10, *et seq.*, and Michigan Administrative Code R 400.3001-3015. DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Updates to DHS regulations are found in the Bridges Policy Bulletin (BPB).

Claimant requested a hearing to dispute a FAP benefit application denial. It was not disputed that the basis for the denial was excess assets.

Assets must be considered in determining eligibility for FAP benefits. BEM 400 at 1. The asset limit for FAP benefits is \$5,000 or less. *Id.* at 4.


It was not disputed that Claimant's spouse received approximately \$10,000 in lottery winnings in 10/2010. DHS processed Claimant's application dated 10/1/12 based on the assumption that Claimant and/or her spouse still had the winnings; the DHS assumption was baseless. DHS would have no reason to base a client's benefit eligibility on two-year old asset information. The denial of Claimant's application was improper.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS improperly denied Claimant's application for FAP benefits. It is ordered that DHS:

- (1) reinstate Claimant's FAP benefit application dated 10/1/12;
- (2) process Claimant's application subject to the finding that Claimant's assets from 2010 are irrelevant to the processing of the application; and
- (3) supplement Claimant for any FAP benefits not issued as a result of the DHS error.

The actions taken by DHS are REVERSED.

  
Christian Gardocki  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: January 14, 2013

Date Mailed: January 14, 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. (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

CG/hw

cc:

