



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: August 6, 2020  
MOAHR Docket No.: 20-004153  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Lain**

**HEARING DECISION**

Following Petitioner'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; 42 CFR 438.400 to 438.424; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10; and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on July 23, 2020, from Lansing, Michigan.

Attorney Caroline Dellenbusch (P33185) represented Petitioner [REDACTED] and Petitioner [REDACTED] at the hearing. The hearing of [REDACTED] #20-004141 and [REDACTED] #20-004153 were consolidated and held as one hearing with the consent of the parties. The Department of Health and Human Services (Department or Respondent) was represented by Assistant Attorney General Geraldine Brown (P67601).

All Exhibits were admitted without objection.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department properly determine that Petitioner has a divestment penalty?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On December 31, 2019 an LTC MA application for Petitioner [REDACTED] was received with 3-month retro requested.
2. On March 18, 2019, Petitioner [REDACTED] applied for Medical Assistance (MA) as a nursing home resident. (Note Petitioner [REDACTED] had Medicaid prior to the state book March 8, 2019, is the most recent application on file.)

3. On May 6, 2019, Petitioner [REDACTED] was approved for full Medicaid.
4. Respondent was not made aware of the sale of the [REDACTED] Property that was sold on April 12, 2019.
5. On January 31, 2020, the Department received a redetermination form for Petitioner [REDACTED] which included verification of the sale of the property the Petitioners owned, the appraisal of said property, and a promissory note that occupied the transaction.
6. On February 27, 2020, after review of the property sale, the land appraisal and the promissory note, it was determined that two separate divestments had occurred.
7. The first divestment was due to the land being appraised for \$205,000 but the property was sold for \$ [REDACTED], a difference of \$ [REDACTED] from the appraised amount.
8. Mr. Baker is a quarter of an owner of the property so 1/4 of \$ [REDACTED] is \$ [REDACTED]. In addition, a promissory note was written for \$ [REDACTED].
9. Policy as was written in April of 2019, indicates that the promissory must be actuarially sound, be in equal monthly payments, and not canceled upon the death of the note holder.
10. Because the promissory note does not call for a payment schedule it is not actuarially sound nor are the payments in equal payments therefore the note is not considered purchased for fair market value.
11. Mr. Baker is 1/4 owner of the note so 1/4th of the \$ [REDACTED] divestment is \$ [REDACTED].
12. The total divestment for Mr. Baker is \$ [REDACTED] (\$ [REDACTED] + \$ [REDACTED]). The penalty is \$ [REDACTED] divided by \$ [REDACTED] (average cost of NH on baseline date) = 4 months and 6 days.
13. The divestment will run from April 1, 2020 to July 31, 2020.
14. On February 27, 2020, a Healthcare Coverage Determination Notice was sent to Petitioner [REDACTED].
15. Darla Baker: On February 12, 2020 a Verification Checklist was sent for information around the sale of land in 2019.
16. On February 27, 2020, after review of the property sale, the land appraisal and the promissory note, it was determined that two separate divestments had occurred.

17. The first divestment was due to the land being appraised for \$205,000 but the property was sold for \$ [REDACTED], a difference of \$ [REDACTED] from the appraised amount. Mrs. Baker is a quarter of an owner of the property so 1/4 of \$54,000 is \$13,500.
18. In addition, a promissory note was written for \$ [REDACTED]. Policy as was written in December of 2019, indicates that the promissory must be actuarially sound, be in equal monthly payments, and not canceled upon the death of the note holder.
19. Because the promissory note does not call for a payment schedule it is not actuarially sound nor are the payments in equal payments therefore the note is not considered purchased for fair market value.
20. Mrs. Baker is 1/4 owner of the note, so 1/4th of the \$ [REDACTED] divestment is \$ [REDACTED]. The total divestment for Mrs. [REDACTED] is \$ [REDACTED] (\$ [REDACTED] + \$ [REDACTED]). The penalty is \$ [REDACTED] divided by \$ [REDACTED] (average cost of NH on baseline date) = 4 months and 6 days.
21. The divestment will run from September 1, through December 31, 2019
22. On February 25, 2020, a DHS-1606, notice of eligibility sent.
23. On March 31, 2020, the Department received a Hearing request to contest the negative action.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901-400.951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his or her claim for assistance has been denied. MAC R 400.903(1). Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. BAM 600.

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever they believe the decision is incorrect. The department provides an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine its appropriateness in accordance to policy. This item includes procedures to meet the minimum requirements for a fair hearing. BAM 600, page 1

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 Department

of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

Participating states must provide at least seven categories of medical services to persons determined to be eligible Medicaid recipients. 42 USC §1396a(a)(10)(A), 1396d(a)(1)-(5), (17), (21). One of the seven mandated services is *nursing facility services*. 42 USC §1396d(a)(4)(A).

For medical assistance eligibility, the Department has defined an asset as “any kind of property or property interest, whether real, personal, or mixed, whether liquid or illiquid, and whether or not presently vested with possessory rights.” NDAC 75-02-02.1-01(3). Under both federal and state law, an asset must be “actually available” to an applicant to be considered a countable asset for determining medical assistance eligibility. *Hecker*, 527 N.W.2d at 237 (*On Petition for Rehearing*); *Hinschberger v. Griggs County Social Serv.*, 499 N.W.2d 876, 882 (N.D.1993); 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(17)(B); 1 J. Krauskopf, R. Brown, K. Tokarz, and A. Bogutz, *Elderlaw: Advocacy for the Aging* § 11.25 (2d ed. 1993). Yet, “actually available” resources “are different from those *in hand*.” *Schweiker v. Gray Panthers*, 453 U.S. 34, 48, 101 S.Ct. 2633, 2642, 69 L.Ed.2d 460 (1981) (emphasis in original). NDAC 75-02-02.1-25(2) explains: Only such assets as are actually available will be considered. Assets are actually available when at the disposal of an applicant, recipient, or responsible relative; when the applicant, recipient, or responsible relative has a legal interest in a liquidated sum and has the legal ability to make the sum available for support, maintenance, or medical care; or when the applicant, recipient, or responsible relative has the lawful power to make the asset available, or to cause the asset to be made available. Assets will be reasonably evaluated.... See also 45 C.F.R. § 233.20(a)(3)(ii)(D).

As noted in *Hecker*, if an applicant has a legal ability to obtain an asset, it is considered an “actually available” resource. The actual-availability principle primarily serves “to prevent the States from conjuring fictional sources of income and resources by imputing financial support from persons who have no obligation to furnish it or by overvaluing assets in a manner that attributes non-existent resources to recipients.” *Heckler v. Turner*, 470 U.S. 184, 200, 105 S.Ct. 1138, 1147, 84 L.Ed.2d 138 (1985).

The focus is on an applicant's actual and practical ability to make an asset available as a matter of fact, not legal fiction. See *Schrader v. Idaho Dept. of Health and Welfare*, 768 F.2d 1107, 1112 (9th Cir.1985). See also *Lewis v. Martin*, 397 U.S. 552, 90 S.Ct. 1282, 25 L.Ed.2d 561 (1970) (invalidating California state regulation that presumed contribution of non-AFDC resources by a non-legally responsible and non-adoptive stepfather or common law husband of an AFDC recipient's mother).

Determining whether an asset is “actually available” for purposes of medical assistance eligibility is largely a fact-specific inquiry depending on the circumstances of each case. See, e.g., *Intermountain Health Care v. Bd. of Cty. Com'rs*, 107 Idaho 248, 688 P.2d 260, 264 (Ct.App.1984); *Radano v. Blum*, 89 A.D.2d 858, 453 N.Y.S.2d 38, 39 (1982); *Haynes v. Dept. of Human Resources*, 121 N.C.App. 513, 470 S.E.2d 56, 58 (1996).

Interpretation of the “actually available” requirement must be “reasonable and humane in accordance with its manifest intent and purpose....” *Moffett v. Blum*, 74 A.D.2d 625, 424 N.Y.S.2d 923, 925 (1980). That an applicant must sue to collect an asset the applicant has a legal entitlement to usually does not mean the asset is actually unavailable. See, e.g., *Wagner v. Sheridan County S.S. Bd.*, 518 N.W.2d 724, 728 (N.D.1994); *Frerks v. Shalala*, 52 F.3d 412, 414 (2d Cir.1995); *Probate of Marcus*, 199 Conn. 524, 509 A.2d 1, 5 (1986); *Herman v. Ramsey Cty. Community Human Serv.*, 373 N.W.2d 345, 348 (Minn.Ct.App.1985). See also *Ziegler v. Dept. of Health & Rehab. Serv.*, 601 So.2d 1280, 1284 (Fla.Ct.App.1992) At issue here is the methodology utilized in determining the availability of an individual's “resources” for purposes of evaluating his or her eligibility. SSI recipients, and thus SSI-related “medically needy” recipients, may not retain resources having a value in excess of \$2,000. 42 U.S.C. § 1382(a)(1)(B).

The regulations governing the determination of eligibility provide that resources mean cash or other liquid assets or any real or personal property that an individual (or spouse, if any) owns and could convert to cash to be used for his support and maintenance. If the individual has the right, authority or power to liquidate the property, or his share of the property, it is considered a resource. If a property right cannot be liquidated, the property will not be considered a resource of the individual (or spouse).20 C.F.R. § 416.1201(a).

After the Medicaid program was enacted, a field of legal counseling arose involving asset protection for future disability. The practice of “Medicaid Estate Planning,” whereby “individuals shelter or divest their assets to qualify for Medicaid without first depleting their life savings,” is a legal practice that involves utilization of the complex rules of Medicaid eligibility, arguably comparable to the way one uses the Internal Revenue Code to his or her advantage in preparing taxes. See generally *Kristin A. Reich, Note, Long-Term Care Financing Crisis-Recent Federal and State Efforts to Deter Asset Transfers as a Means to Gain Medicaid Eligibility*, 74 N.D. L.Rev. 383 (1998). Serious concern then arose over the widespread divestiture of assets by mostly wealthy individuals so that those persons could become eligible for Medicaid benefits. *Id.*; see also *Rainey v. Guardianship of Mackey*, 773 So.2d 118 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000). As a result, Congress enacted several laws to discourage the transfer of assets for Medicaid qualification purposes. See generally *Laura Herpers Zeman, Estate Planning: Ethical Considerations of Using Medicaid to Plan for Long-Term Medical Care for the Elderly*, 13 *Quinnipiac Prob. L.J.* 187 (1988). Recent attempts by Congress imposed periods of ineligibility for certain Medicaid benefits where the applicant divested himself or herself of assets for less than fair market value. 42 U.S.C. § 1396p(c)(1)(A); 42 U.S.C. § 1396p(c)(1)(B)(i); *Fla. Admin. Code R. 65A-1.712(3)*. More specifically, if a transfer of assets for less than fair market value is found within 36 months of an individual's application for Medicaid, the state must withhold payment for various long-term care services, i.e., payment for nursing home room and board, for a period of time referred to as the penalty period. *Fla. Admin. Code R. 65A-1.712(3)*. Medicaid does not, however, prohibit eligibility altogether. It merely penalizes the asset transfer for a certain period of time. See generally *Omar N. Ahmad, Medicaid Eligibility Rules for the Elderly Long-Term Care Applicant*, 20 *J.*

*Legal Med. 251 (1999). [Thompson v. Dep't of Children & Families, 835 So.2d 357, 359-360 (Fla App, 2003).]*

In *Gillmore* the Illinois Supreme Court recognized this same history, noting that over the years (and particularly in 1993), Congress enacted certain measures to prevent persons who were not actually “needy” from making themselves eligible for Medicaid: In 1993, Congress sought to combat the rapidly increasing costs of Medicaid by enacting statutory provisions to ensure that persons who could pay for their own care did not receive assistance. Congress mandated that, in determining Medicaid eligibility, a state must “look-back” into a three- or five-year period, depending on the asset, before a person applied for assistance to determine if the person made any transfers solely to become eligible for Medicaid. See 42 U.S.C. § 1396p(c)(1)(B) (2000). If the person disposed of assets for less than fair market value during the look-back period, the person is ineligible for medical assistance for a statutory penalty period based on the value of the assets transferred. See 42 U.S.C. § 1396p(c)(1)(A) (2000). [*Gillmore*, 218 Ill 2d at 306 (emphasis added).]

See, also, *ES v. Div. of Med. Assistance and Health Servs.*, 412 NJ Super 340, 344; 990 A.2d 701 (2010) (Noting that the purpose of this close scrutiny while “looking back” is “to determine if [the asset transfers] were made for the sole purpose of Medicaid qualification.”).

This statutory “look-back” period, noted in *Gillmore* and *Thompson* and contained within 42 USC 1396p(c)(1), requires a state to “look-back” a number of years (in this case five) from the date of an asset transfer to determine if the applicant made the transfer solely to become eligible for Medicaid, which can be established if the transfer was made for less than fair market value. See 42 USC 1396p(c)(1); DHS Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) 405, pp 1, 4; see also *Gillmore*, 218 Ill 2d at 306.

“Less than fair market value means the compensation received in return for a resource was worth less than the fair market value of the resource.” BEM 405, p 5.

A transfer for less than fair market value during the “look-back” period is referred to as a “divestment,” and unless falling under one of several exclusions, subjects the applicant to a penalty period during which payment of long-term care benefits is suspended. See, generally BEM 405, pp 1, 5-9. “Congress's imposition of a penalty for the disposal of assets or income for less than fair market value during the look-back period is intended to maximize the resources for Medicaid for those truly in need.” *ES*, 412 NJ Super at 344. See also *Mackey v Department of Human Services, Michigan Court of Appeals, Docket No. 288966, decided September 7, 2010.*

Pertinent department policy dictates:

Assets must be considered in determining eligibility or SSI related categories. Assets mean cash, any other personal property and real property. (BEM, Item 400 Page 1). Countable assets cannot exceed the applicable asset limit. Not all assets are counted. Some assets are counted for one program but not for another program. (BEM Item 400, Page 1).

The department is to consider both of the following to determine whether and how much of an asset is countable: An asset is countable if it meets the availability test and is not excluded. The department is to consider the assets of each person in the asset group. (BEM, Item 400, Page 1).

Asset eligibility exists when the asset groups countable assets are less than or equal to the applicable asset limit at least one day during the month being tested. (BEM, Item 400, Page 4). An application does not authorize MA for future months if the person has excess assets on the processing date.

The SSI related MA asset limit for SSI related MA categories that are not Medicare savings program or QDWI is \$2000.00 for an asset group for one person and \$3000.00 for an asset group of 2 people. BEM, Item 400 Page 5.

An asset must be available to be counted. Available means that someone in the asset group has the legal right to use or dispose of the asset. BEM, Item 400, Page 6. The department is to assume an asset is available unless the evidence shows that it is not available.

BEM, Item 405, states:

Divestment results in a penalty period in MA, **not** ineligibility. Divestment is a type of transfer of a resource and not an amount of resources transferred.

Divestment means a transfer of a resource (see RESOURCE DEFINED below and in glossary) by a client or his spouse that are all of the following:

- Is within a specified time; see LOOK-BACK PERIOD in this item.
- Is a transfer for LESS THAN FAIR MARKET VALUE;
- Is not listed below under TRANSFERS THAT ARE NOT DIVESTMENT

See Annuity Not Actuarially Sound and Joint Owners and Transfers below and BEM 401 about special transactions considered transfers for less than fair market value.

During the penalty period, MA will **not** pay the client's cost for:

- LTC services.
- Home and community-based services.
- Home Help.
- Home Health. BEM, Item 405, page 1

**Resource means all the client's and his spouse's assets and income.** It includes all assets and all income, even countable and/or excluded assets, the individual or spouse receive. It also includes all assets and income that the individual (or their spouse) were entitled to but did **not** receive because of action by one of the following:

- **The client or spouse.**
- A person (including a court or administrative body) with legal authority to act in place of or on behalf of the client or the client's spouse.
- Any person (including a court or administrative body) acting at the direction or upon the request of the client or his spouse. BEM, Item 405, page 2

Transferring a resource means giving up all or partial ownership in (or rights to) a resource. Not all transfers are divestment. Examples of transfers include:

- Selling an asset for fair market value (not divestment).
- Giving an asset away (divestment).
- Refusing an inheritance (divestment).
- Payments from a **MEDICAID TRUST** that are **not** to, or for the benefit of, the person or his spouse; see BEM 401 (divestment).
- Putting assets or income in a trust; see BEM 401.
- Giving up the **right** to receive income such as having pension payments made to someone else (divestment).
- Giving away a lump sum or accumulated benefit (divestment).
- Buying an annuity that is **not** actuarially sound (divestment).
- Giving away a vehicle (divestment).
- Putting assets or income into a Limited Liability Company (LLC). BEM, item 405, page 2

Department policy states that it is **not** divestment to transfer a homestead to the client's:

- Spouse; see Transfers Involving Spouse above.
- Blind or disabled child; see Transfers Involving Child above.
- Child under age 21.
- Child age 21 or over who:
  - Lived in the homestead for at least two years immediately before the client's admission to LTC or BEM 106 waiver approval, **and**
  - Provided care that would otherwise have required LTC or BEM 106 waiver services, as documented by a physician's (M.D. or D.O.) statement. BEM Item 405, page 8.

Policy also states that the uncompensated value of a divested resource is:

- The resource's cash or equity value.
- Minus any compensation received.
- The uncompensated value of a promissory note, loan, or mortgage is the outstanding balance due on the "Baseline Date". BEM, Item 405, page 12.

When divestment occurs the department must invoke a penalty period. The transferred amount is used to calculate the penalty period. The Department may only recalculate the penalty period under certain circumstances. Pertinent policy dictates that the first step in determining the period of time that transfers can be looked at for divestment is determining the baseline date. Once the baseline date is established, you determine the look-back period. The look back period is 60 months prior to the baseline date for all transfers made after February 8, 2006. BEM, Item 405, page 2-4.

The department is allowed to recalculate the penalty period if either of the following occurs while the penalty is in effect:

- All the transferred resources are returned.
- Full compensation is paid for the resources.

Use the same per diem rate originally used to calculate the penalty period.

Once a divestment penalty is in effect, return of, or payment for, resources **cannot** eliminate any portion of the penalty period already past. However, the caseworker must recalculate the penalty period. The divestment penalty ends on the later of the following:

- The end date of the new penalty period.
- The date the client notified you that the resources were returned or paid for.  
BEM, Item 405, pages 12-13

Petitioner's Representative cites BEM 400, pages 41-42 as authority for Petitioner's position.

BEM 400 states:

A note is a written promise to pay a certain sum of money to another person at a specified time. The note may call for installment payments over a period of time (installment note) or a single payment on a specified date. The most common type of note involves the sale of real property and is called a land contract or a mortgage. A homeowner might also sell their home via a sale leaseback agreement. The person who sold the property is holder of the note. The note is the holder's asset.

Example: John sells land to Irma on a land contract. John is the land contract holder. The land contract is John's asset. The land is Irma's asset.

All money used to purchase a promissory note, loan, or mortgage must be treated as a transfer of assets unless all of the following are true:

- The repayment schedule is actuarially sound; and
- The payments are made in equal monthly amounts during the term of the agreement with no deferral of payments and no balloon payments; and
- The note, loan, or mortgage must prohibit the cancellation of the balance upon the death of the lender; see BEM 405 Uncompensated Value to determine the value.

Note: The payments from a note that meets these requirements are countable unearned income.

Note: The estate recovery program needs to know about a promissory note in order for the state to recover Medicaid expenses. Please send a copy of the promissory note to the Estate Recovery unit at: [MDHHS-EstateRecovery@michigan.gov](mailto:MDHHS-EstateRecovery@michigan.gov).

The value of a promissory note, land contract or mortgage is the amount it can be sold for in the holder's geographic area on short notice (usually at a commercial discount rate) minus any lien on the property the holder must repay. If the note meets the requirements listed above, then the note itself may not be a countable asset. The payments are countable unearned income.

Jointly owned assets are assets that have more than one owner. For joint cash and retirement plans the Department must count the ***entire*** amount unless the person claims and verifies a different ownership. Then, each owner's share is the amount they own. BEM 400, page 11

The department's position is that the divestment penalty may only be cancelled if "all the transferred (given away) resources are returned and retained by the individual" or "fair market value" is paid for the resources. The penalty period may only be recalculated if "all of the transferred resources are returned", or "full compensation is paid for the resource." BEM, Item 405, page 12.

Once a divestment penalty is in effect, return of, or payment for, resources cannot eliminate any portion of the penalty period already past. However, recalculate the penalty period. The divestment penalty ends on the later of the following:

- The end date of the new penalty period.
  - The date the client notified you that the resources were returned or paid for.
- BEM 405, page 16

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the department policy is explicit. It states that all the transferred resources must be returned, or fair market value must be paid for the resources, or full compensation paid for the resources, before the necessity for either cancellation or recalculation of the divestment period can be triggered.

In this case, the promissory note was not actuarially sound, was not equal monthly payments and was not to be canceled at the time of death of the note holder. Because the promissory note does not call for a payment schedule, it is not actuarially sound nor are the payments in equal payments. Therefore, the note is not considered purchased for fair market value.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the divestment penalty must stand and was properly imposed. Petitioner divested assets that must be counted for Petitioner's eligibility status under Medical Assistance policy. Assets that are transferred between spouses are not divestment. However, divestment occurs when one or the other spouse transfers assets to a third party. The Department calculations remain in effect and were proper.


Petitioner's representative's statements on the record are not sufficient to rebut the Department's determination that divestment occurred. The Divestment penalty was properly imposed in both the case of Robert Baker and the case of Darla Baker. The Department has established by the necessary competent, substantial and material evidence on the record that it was acting accordance with department policy when, during redetermination, it calculated and instituted the divestment penalty under the circumstances.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department of Human Services has established by a preponderance of evidence that there has been asset divestment, and properly determined that a divestment penalty period under the circumstances should be from April 1, 2020 - July 31, 2020 for Robert Baker, and September 1, 2019 - December 31, 2019, for Darla Baker.

Accordingly, the Department's decision is **AFFIRMED for both Petitioners.**

LL/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Landis Lain**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Robert Gordon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

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

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

**DHHS**

Kent County via electronic mail

BSC3 via electronic mail

D. Smith via electronic mail

EQADHShearings via electronic mail

**Counsel for Respondent**

Geraldine A. Brown, AAG via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

**Counsel for Petitioner**

Caroline Dellenbusch  
2944 Fuller Ave. NE, STE 100  
Grand Rapids, MI 49505