

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████  
██████████████████

Reg. No.: 2013-43297  
Issue Nos.: 1021, 2009  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: June 26, 2013  
County: Wayne (19)

**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 June 26, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included the Claimant and her daughter, ██████████ ██████████. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included ██████████, Assistance Payments Worker, and ██████████ ID # ██████████, ██████████ interpreter.

**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 type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)?                | <input 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  received benefits for:

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

2. On April 12, 2013, the Department  
 denied Claimant's application       closed Claimant's case

due to a determination that she was not eligible for FIP benefits because she was not a dependent child, she was not a caretaker or relative of a child, she was not aged or disabled, she was not a refugee, and she was not qualified by virtue of a qualifying relationship to other household members. In addition, Claimant was approved for the Adult Medical Program (AMP).

3. On April 12, 2013, the Department sent  
 Claimant       Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR)  
notice of the       denial.       closure.

4. On April 24, 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 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.

Additionally, Claimant testified at the hearing that her application was submitted online by her daughter, Samrina Nawaz. The application was for cash and medical benefits. Ms. Nawaz did not request disability benefits for her mother in the online application. Dept. Exh. 1, p. 7.

With regard to cash benefits, there are two programs for which Claimant could be eligible, the FIP program and the State Disability Assistance (SDA) program. Both of these programs provide cash benefits to customers. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 210 (2013), 214 (2010).

BEM 210, "FIP Group Composition," states that there must be a dependent child in the family household group, in order for the customer to be eligible. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 210 (2013), p. 1. As Claimant does not have a dependent child in the family group, the Department is correct that Claimant is not eligible for FIP cash benefits. The Department is affirmed in its denial of FIP benefits to Claimant.

The second possible program is the cash assistance program for disabled customers, State Disability Assistance (SDA). However, Claimant has not been found to be a disabled person, so the Department is correct in finding that she is not eligible to receive cash assistance for disabled persons. The Department is therefore affirmed in its denial of SDA cash benefits to Claimant. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 214 (2010).

At the hearing the Claimant indicated that she now understood that she needed to apply for MA disability benefits in order to receive cash assistance as a disabled person. She indicated that she was satisfied with the Department's action and would undertake to reapply and request MA disability and SDA benefits.

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.



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

Date Signed: June 28, 2013

Date Mailed: July 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. (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: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]