

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-37396  
Issue Nos.: 1018, 3015  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 25, 2013  
County: Oakland (04)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Jan Leventer

**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 April 25, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED], Eligibility Specialist.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly  deny Claimant's application  close Claimant's case for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 March 4, 2013, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application     closed Claimant's case  
due to his income, which is above the maximum limit for receipt of FIP and FAP  
benefits.
3. On March 4, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant     Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the     denial.     closure.
4. On March 20, 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, Rule 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, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

Additionally, Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 500, "Income Overview," states that the Department is required to consider the customer's gross income when determining the customer's eligibility for FIP and FAP benefits. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 500 (2013). In this case the Department did use the Claimant's gross income amounts in determining his eligibility for FIP and FAP benefits.

Although a decision upholding the Department's calculations was announced at the hearing, further research indicates that the decision was premature and erroneous and must be reconsidered. Further legal research and examination of the documents in evidence reveals that the Department used an incorrect income limit of \$931 in denying Claimant's FAP application. Dept. Exh. 1, p. 19.

Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 213, "Categorical Eligibility," states that unless a customer has committed an Intentional Program Violation, a drug-related felony, or a violation of the employment-related participation requirements, the customer is entitled to the benefit of a higher, 200% income limit. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 213 (2011). The 200% income limit for a single customer is \$1,862. Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT) 250 (2012).

This income limit, \$1,862, is not the income limit the Department used in this case to determine Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits. Instead, the Department used the 100% income limit, which is \$931. *Id.* Accordingly, it is found and determined that the Department miscalculated Claimant's eligibility for FAP benefits and shall be reversed.

Second, with regard to FIP benefits, at the hearing the Department failed to present testimony and evidence to explain the calculations resulting in its denial of FIP benefits to Claimant. Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105, "Rights and Responsibilities," requires the Department to determine eligibility, provide benefits and protect client rights. Without a rational explanation of the denial of FIP benefits in this case it is impossible to determine whether Claimant's rights were protected. Accordingly, the Department's denial of FIP benefits to Claimant shall be reversed. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (2013), p. 1.

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, 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 SHALL INITIATE WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER, THE FOLLOWING:

1. Reinstate Claimant's FIP and FAP application.
2. Redetermine eligibility using the appropriate income limits for FIP and FAP benefits.
3. Issue a new Notice of Case Action announcing the Department's actions to Claimant regarding his eligibility for FIP and FAP benefits.

4. Provide retroactive and ongoing FIP and FAP benefits to Claimant at the benefit levels to which he is entitled.
5. All steps shall be taken in accordance with Department policy and procedure.



**Jan Leventer**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 29, 2013

Date Mailed: April 29, 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 affect the substantial rights of the claimant:
  - 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

JL/tm

cc:

