


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-006450  
Issue No.: 3001  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 5, 2014  
County: Oakland-District 4 (North Saginaw)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Darryl T. Johnson

**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 August 5, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of Claimant included Claimant. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Family Independence Specialist [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Due to excess income, did the Department properly close Claimant's case for Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

**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 received FAP benefits.
2. On June 16, 2014, the Department closed Claimant's case due to excess income, effective July 1, 2014.
3. On June 16, 2014, the Department sent Claimant its decision.
4. On July 1, 2014, the Department received Claimant's hearing request, protesting 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), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.


BEM 503 (7/1/14) describes unearned income for budgeting purposes. Claimant receives Guardianship Assistance Program (GAP) income for four children who are in his care. He and his wife are the legal guardians of four children. They receive money from the GAP to help with the needs of each child. For three of the children, they receive [REDACTED] each, or a total of [REDACTED]. For the fourth child, they receive [REDACTED]. Total GAP income is [REDACTED]. In BEM 503 at page 19, GAP is specifically counted as unearned income. Claimant's wife earns [REDACTED] per month. The Department counted in Claimant's budget [REDACTED] in earned income, and [REDACTED] in unearned income. If each of the GAP payments is rounded down to the nearest dollar, the total of the four amounts is [REDACTED] which is supported by the evidence.

When the Department calculates a FAP budget it takes into account, among many other factors, the earned and unearned income the Claimant receives, and costs of housing-related expenses. The Claimant did not dispute the amounts used by the Department in his budget. There is no evidence that the Department erred in its calculation of Claimant's FAP benefits after taking into account his monthly unearned income and expenses. While Claimant might be receiving a lesser amount of FAP than previously awarded, any number of factors could have caused the previous amount to be greater. The issue is not whether the award should have remained the same. The issue is whether the current amount is supported by the evidence and current policy.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department acted in accordance with Department policy when it decreased Claimant's Food Assistance Program benefits.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

  
Darryl T. Johnson  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **8/6/2014**

Date Mailed: **8/6/2014**

DTJ / jaf

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date.

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Hearing Decision from the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, or MAHS may order a rehearing or reconsideration on its own motion.

MAHS may grant a party's Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration 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 party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration 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 this Hearing Decision is mailed.

A written request may be faxed or mailed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, 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

cc:

