#### STATE OF MICHIGAN MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH

P.O. Box 30763, Lansing, MI 48909 (877) 833-0870; Fax: (517) 373-4147

Docket No. 14-014119 HHS

### IN THE MATTER OF:



Appellant.

# DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 42 CFR 431.200 *et seq.*, and upon the Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on Appeals Review Officer of the Department of Community Health represented the Department of Community Health. Adult Services Workers (ASW) from County DHS, and County DHS, and testified for the Department.

### **ISSUE**

Did the Department act properly when it terminated Appellant's Home Help Services (HHS)?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. Appellant is a year-old (DOB: Medicaid beneficiary who was receiving HHS. (Exhibit A, pp. 11, 19 and testimony).
- 2. On ASW ASW made a home call at the Appellant's residence at the Appellant and her provider/husband. The ASW advised the Appellant that a spouse cannot be a paid caregiver for a spouse even if they are legally separated. (Exhibit A, pp. 4, 8, 15 and testimony).
- 3. On second at the ASW received a call from second who rents from at advised that advised that lives with Appellant at the address. (Exhibit A, p. 15 and testimony).

### Docket No. 14-014119 HHS Decision and Order

- 4. On \_\_\_\_\_, the ASW noted \_\_\_\_\_\_ address on file is which according to Bridges is the residence and \_\_\_\_\_\_. DHS worker \_\_\_\_\_\_ for and \_\_\_\_\_\_. DHS worker \_\_\_\_\_\_ for did not live with them in the \_\_\_\_\_\_ home. (Exhibit A, p. 15 and testimony).
- 5. On \_\_\_\_\_, ASW \_\_\_\_\_ made contact with across the street from the \_\_\_\_\_\_ residence and stated he lived across the street with \_\_\_\_\_. He changed his story later and said he lived at \_\_\_\_\_. (Exhibit A, p. 16 and testimony).
- 6. On **Section**, the ASW sent Appellant an Advance Negative Action Notice that her HHS was being terminated effective **Section**. The notice stated that the Appellant's husband has been paid to be her provider, but it had been determined that the husband lives in the home and according to the policy in the Adult Services Manual, ASM 120 & 135 a spouse as a responsible relative cannot be paid as a caregiver under the HHS program. (Exhibit A, pp. 7-10, 19-20).
- 7. On (MAHS) received a Request for Hearing in this matter. (Exhibit A, p. 4).
- 8. On advised that the ASW received a call from a second who does live in the home with the Appellant and has been living in the home but may be using another address. (Exhibit A, p. 16 and testimony).

## CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance Program is established pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). It is administered in accordance with state statute, the Social Welfare Act, the Administrative Code, and the State Plan under Title XIX of the Social Security Act Medical Assistance Program.

Home Help Services (HHS) are provided to enable functionally limited individuals to live independently and receive care in the least restrictive, preferred settings. These activities must be certified by a physician and may be provided by individuals or by private or public agencies.

Here, Appellant's HHS was terminated on the basis that Appellant's husband was the Appellant's paid caregiver. He is a responsible relative and it had not been shown that she was unable and/or unavailable to care for him. Adult Services Manual 120 (12-1-2013) (hereinafter "ASM 120") addressed responsible relatives at the time of the action in this case:

#### Responsible Relatives

<u>A responsible relative is defined as an individual's spouse</u> or a parent of an unmarried child under age 18.

Activities of daily living (ADL) may be approved when the responsible relative is **unavailable** or **unable** to provide these services.

**Note: Unavailable** means absence from the home for an extended period due to employment, school or other legitimate reasons. The responsible relative must provide a work or school schedule to verify they are unavailable to provide care. **Unable** means the responsible person has disabilities of their own which prevent them from providing care. These disabilities must be documented/verified by a medical professional on the DHS-54A, Medical Needs form.

Do **not** approve shopping, laundry, or light housecleaning, when a responsible relative of the client resides in the home, **unless** they are unavailable or unable to provide these services. Document findings in the general narrative in ASCAP.

**Example:** Mrs. Smith is in need of home help services. Her spouse is employed and is out of the home Monday thru Friday from 7a.m. to 7p.m. The specialist would not approve hours for shopping, laundry or house cleaning as Mr. Smith is responsible for these tasks.

**Example:** Mrs. Jones is in need of home help services. Her spouse's employment takes him out of town Monday thru Saturday. The specialist may approve hours for shopping, laundry or house cleaning. [ASM 120, p. 6 of 7].

Adult Services Manual 135 (12-1-2013) (hereinafter "ASM 135") addresses provider selection and states in part:

#### PROVIDER SELECTION

The client has the right to choose the home help provider(s). As the employer of the provider, the client has the right to hire and fire pro-viders to meet individual personal care service needs. Home help services is a benefit to the client and earnings for the provider.

The determination of provider criteria is the responsibility of the adult services specialist.

Home help services **cannot** be paid to:



• A spouse caring for a spouse or a parent caring for an unmarried child under 18 (responsible relative).

**Note:** Couples who are separated must provide verification that they are no longer residing in the same home (unavailable). Verification may include their driver's license, rent receipt or utility bill reflecting their separate mailing address. <u>A spouse who is legally separated from a spouse **cannot** be paid to provide home help. [ASM 135, p. 1 of 9, emphasis added].</u>

Here, the ASW properly determined that the Appellant's spouse could not be the Appellant's paid caregiver and further that it had not been shown that he was either unavailable or unable to provide for her care prior to **sector to the sector sector** when her HHS was terminated. Rather, it was established that the Appellant's husband was being paid to provide care for the Appellant and that he was actually living in the home with her despite claims that they were separated and living apart.

On ASW made a home call at the Appellant's residence at provider/husband. The ASW advised the Appellant at that time that a spouse cannot be a paid caregiver for their spouse even if they are legally separated.

On	, the AS	W received a call from	who had rented from
a	t	advised her th	hat lives with Appellant
at the	address.	said he belie	eves is now living with
the Appellar	<u>it, because he see</u>	s him night and day co	oming in and out of the house on
	and going to the	beer store	said he also sees
	n the mornings wa	tching TV in the Appel	llant's front room from across the
street when	he takes his childre	en to the bus stop.	

The AS <u>W n</u> oted on	that the address o	n file at DHS for	
is , which accord	ing to Bridges is the resid	ence of and	I
	was advised by	the DHS worker for	
and that she confirmed address.	with them that	did not live with them at the	ł

The ASW was later informe	d on	that ASW	
made contact with	across the street from the	resid	ence and he
told her he lived in the hous	se with	told	that
later changed his	story and said he lived at	whe	re
lives. stated	she met when s	he was called to the	Appellant's
residence on	. She stated she be	elieves the Appellar	nt's husband
lives in the home with the	Appellant, because when	she arrived at the	
address on	told her it	was his home.	
said she advised him she wa	as there to see the Appella	ant, and then	let her
into the residence and entered	ed along with her.		

## Docket No. 14-014119 HHS Decision and Order

Finally, the ASW received a call from a group on with the Appellant and advised that does live in the home on with the Appellant and has been living in the home, but may be using another address. Advised that she was going to be the Appellant's caregiver after but she couldn't live in the home because lived there, and he was a drunk and abuses the Appellant.

Appellant testified during the hearing that everything are said was a lie. She said she has her daughter and son-in-law living with her. Appellant also said is her intended caregiver. She said her husband does not live with her, and she presented a letter from an insurance company addressed to her husband at prescription form from a doctor dated are some and and and a shoulder surgery and are ruptured discs in his back and can no longer take care of her. Appellant also acknowledged that her husband's pick-up is parked in her yard, but it only there in case her caregiver needs to take her somewhere.

testified he stays in the house at . He said he had been staying there to look after the Appellant ever since got hurt. He said had surgery in tor

Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the Department erred in terminating her HHS. Here, given the above evidence and the information available to the Department at the time it made its decision, Appellant has failed to meet her burden of proof and the Department's decision must be affirmed. The Appellant's husband cannot be her paid caregiver. Furthermore, the Appellant was not entitled to receive HHS as her husband, a responsible relative, had been living with her, and there had been no showing that he was either unavailable or unable to provide for her care prior to the termination of her HHS on

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that the Department properly terminated Appellant's HHS.

#### IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED THAT:

The Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

Willia D Bon

William D. Bond Administrative Law Judge for Nick Lyon, Director Michigan Department of Community Health

Date Mailed:

## Docket No. 14-014119 HHS Decision and Order

#### WDB/db

CC:



#### \*\*\* NOTICE \*\*\*

The Michigan Administrative Hearing System may order a rehearing on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. The Michigan Administrative Hearing System will not order a rehearing on the Department's motion where the final decision or rehearing cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. The Appellant 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 of the rehearing decision.