


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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 14-012879
Issue No.: 2001
Case No.:
Hearing Date: January 15, 2015
County: DHS SSPC-WEST

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

HEARING DECISION

Following the 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 four-way telephone hearing was held on January 15, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Claimant included her Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR), , Appeals Analyst of Advomas. The Claimant did not answer her phone when the Administrative Law Judge telephoned her for the hearing. The Claimant was found to have failed to appear for her hearing. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included Hearing Facilitator, .

ISSUE

Due to excess income, did the Department properly deny the Claimant's application for Medical Assistance (MA)?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The Claimant's AHR applied for MA benefits.
2. On June 24, 2014, the Department denied Claimant's application due to excess income.
3. On June 24, 2014, the Department sent the Claimant's AHR its decision.
4. On September 26, 2014, the Claimant's AHR filed a 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 Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

Additionally, in this case, the Claimant failed to appear for the hearing. The Claimant's AHR indicates that the AHR has tried to telephone the Claimant several times and only received a voicemail message. The Claimant's AHR testified that the Claimant was not cooperating with her and that she had no additional information regarding the Claimant's income. Indeed, the Claimant's AHR testified that the Claimant did not make her aware of any adult home health income. That is why the AHR attempted to telephone the Claimant several times so she could have the Claimant confirm or deny this income.

The record in this case establishes that the Claimant has earned income from Resident Advancement, Inc. as well as adult home help income from the Department. A review of the record indicates that the Department did properly count the Claimant's income and that the Claimant is still over the income limit to be eligible for MA benefits. There was no one at the hearing, with personal knowledge, who could contest the amounts the Department used as income. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the Department was acting in accordance with departmental policy when taking action to deny the Claimant's application for MA benefits due to excess income.

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 took action to deny the Claimant's application for MA due to excess income.

DECISION AND ORDER

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



Susanne E. Harris
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **1/16/2015**

Date Mailed: **1/16/2015**

SEH/hj

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 48909-8139

CC:

