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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No.: 2014-10247

Issue No(s).: 2010

Case No.:

Hearing Date: January 22, 2014

County: Wayne (55)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Zainab Baydoun

## **HEARING DECISION**

Following Claimant's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 22, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and his daughter, who also served as translator. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 22, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 22, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant and his daughter, and the participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Administrative Law Judge Participant of the Department of Huma

# <u>ISSUE</u>

Did the Department properly close Claimant's wife's Medical Assistance (MA) case based on excess income?

## **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's wife was an ongoing recipient of MA benefits under the Adult Medical Program (AMP).
- 2. On October 22, 2013, the Department sent Claimant a Notice of Case Action informing him that effective December 1, 2013, his wife's MA benefits under the AMP would be terminated on the basis that her income exceeded the limit for the program. (Exhibit 1).
- 3. On October 26, 2013, Claimant submitted a hearing request disputing the Department's actions.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.

The Adult Medical Program (AMP) is established by 42 USC 1315 and is administered by the Department pursuant to MCL 400.10.

In this case, Claimant's wife was an ongoing recipient of MA benefits under the AMP. The Department testified that because Claimant was approved for RSDI benefits, Claimant's wife was no longer eligible for MA under the AMP because the group's countable income was now in excess of the AMP income limit.

Income eligibility for AMP coverage exists when the AMP group's net income does not exceed the group's AMP income limit. BEM 640 (July 2013), p 3. The AMP income limit applicable in this case, which includes Claimant and his spouse is BEM 214 (July 2013), p. 2; RFT 236 (December 2013), p 1.

At the hearing, the Department did not provide an AMP income budget, showing the calculation of Claimant's income, but testified that in calculating Claimant's wife's AMP budget, it considered Claimant's unearned income from RSDI in the amount of Claimant confirmed that he receives in monthly RSDI benefits and the Department presented an SOLQ in support of its testimony. (Exhibit 2). Because there was no evidence that Claimant's group had any court-ordered child support that were paid, Claimant's wife was not eligible for any income deductions. BEM 640, p 4.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that because Claimant's net income from RSDI exceeded the AMP income limit of \_\_\_\_\_, the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it closed Claimant's wife's AMP case based on excess income.

## **DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.

Zamab Raydoun

Zainab Baydoun

Administrative Law Judge

for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 11, 2014

Date Mailed: February 11, 2014

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** 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 or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

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).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;
- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client:
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P.O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

ZB/tm

cc: