

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-20616  
Issue No.: 3008  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 31, 2013  
County: Macomb-20 County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Corey A. Arendt

**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 31, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED]. Interpreting the hearing was [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

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

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

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

I find as material fact, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, including the testimony at the hearing:

1. Claimant  applied for benefits  received benefits for:

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

2. At several points in time in 2012, the Claimant's daughters received lottery proceeds.

3. At some point in time, the Claimant's notified the Department about the lottery proceeds.
4. On approximately October 19, 2012, the Department closed the Claimant's FAP case due to the Claimant's having excess assets for the FAP program.
5. On January 4, 2013, the Claimant requested a hearing to protest the October 19, 2012 FAP closure.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. MAC R 400.903(1).

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. BAM 600. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness. BAM 600.

The 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 administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Assets must be considered in determining eligibility for FIP, SD A, RAPC, LIF, G2U, G2C, SSI-related MA categories, AMP and FAP. (BEM 400).

**Assets** means cash, any other personal property and real property. **Real property** is land and objects affixed to the land such as buildings, trees and fences. Condominiums are real property. **Personal property** is any item subject to ownership that is **not** real property (examples: currency, savings accounts and vehicles). (BEM 400).

Determine asset eligibility prospectively using the asset group's assets from the benefit month. Asset eligibility exists when the group's countable assets are less than, or equal to, the applicable asset limit at least one day during the month being tested. The FAP asset limit is \$5,000. (BEM 400).

In the present case, the Department failed to provide any testimony or documentation to show what the asset amounts were, how they were counted, calculated etc. Consequently, I was unable to determine whether or not the Claimant indeed had excess assets to be eligible for the FAP program. Therefore, I have no choice but to reverse the Department's actions in this matter.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law find that the Department did not act in accordance with the applicable laws and policies in closing the Claimant's FAP case.

Accordingly, the Department's FAP decision is **REVERSED**.

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 as to the Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits beginning October 19, 2012 and issue retroactive benefits if otherwise qualified and eligible.

/s/  
Corey A. Arendt  
Administrative Law Judge  
For Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 1, 2013

Date Mailed: February 1, 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 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.

2013-20616/CAA

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

CAA/las

cc:

