

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-49567  
Issue No.: 2014  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 26, 2013  
County: Macomb-12 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 June 26, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income and excess assets, 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 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 for:  received benefits for:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input 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 May 31, 2013, the Department  denied Claimant's application  closed Claimant's case  reduced Claimant's benefits due to excess assets.

3. On May 21, 2013, the Department sent  Claimant  Claimant's Authorized Representative (AR) notice of the  denial.  closure.  reduction.

4. On May 30, 2013, 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 MA program is established by 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.

In April of 2013, the Claimant submitted a bank statement reflecting an account balance of \$2,503.

Asset eligibility is a requirement for all LIF, G2U, G2C, AMP and SSI related MA categories. The asset limit for the Claimant's MA category is \$2,000. (BEM 400).

If an ongoing MA recipient or active deductible client has excess assets, the Department is to initiate closure but delete pending negative actions if it is verified that the excess assets were disposed of. This includes payments for medical expenses, living costs and other debts. (BEM 400).

My role as an administrative law judge is to determine whether or not the Department's actions were appropriate and correct at the time of the negative action.

In this case, the Claimant did exceed the asset limit at the time of the negative action. But at no point in time between May 21, 2013 and June 25, 2013 did the Claimant indicate the excess assets were for housing expenses and other bills. Therefore, I find the Department's actions to be appropriate given the information they had available to them at the time of the negative action. Had the Claimant promptly informed the Department of the changes in her account balance, there might have been a different outcome. The Claimant is encouraged to reapply for MA benefits if the Claimant hasn't already done so.

Accordingly, the Department's actions are affirmed.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law that the Department acted in accordance with policy in determining Claimant's MA eligibility.

The Department's actions are **AFFIRMED**.



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

Date Signed: June 27, 2013

Date Mailed: June 27, 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

2013-49567/CAA

CAA/las

cc:

