



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
SUZANNE SONNEBORN
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

MARLON I. BROWN, DPA
ACTING DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: December 20, 2023
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-006816
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

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 hearing was held via telephone conference on December 14, 2023. Petitioner participated and was unrepresented. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by Princess Ogundipe, supervisor.

ISSUE

The issue is whether MDHHS properly terminated Petitioner's Medical Assistance (MA) eligibility.

FINDINGS OF FACT

The administrative law judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. As of September 2023, Petitioner was an ongoing recipient of MA under the category of Healthy Michigan Plan (HMP).
2. As of September 2023, Petitioner was unmarried, not pregnant, not a caretaker to children, between the ages of 19 and 64 years, and not disabled. Also, Petitioner was a tax filer with one dependent.
3. On September 25, 2023, Petitioner reported to MDHHS the following gross weekly wages covering August 20 through September 15, 2023: \$ [REDACTED] \$ [REDACTED] and \$ [REDACTED]

4. As of October 5, 2023, MDHHS sent Petitioner notice of MA benefit termination beginning November 2023.
5. On October 11, 2023, Petitioner requested a hearing to dispute the termination of MA benefits.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The 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. MDHHS administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k. MA policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Petitioner requested a hearing to dispute a termination of MA benefits. Exhibit A, pp. 3-4. A Health Care Coverage Determination Notice dated October 5, 2023 stated that Petitioner was ineligible for various MA categories beginning November 2023.¹ Exhibit A, pp. 14-18. Determining whether MDHHS properly terminated Petitioner's MA eligibility requires a consideration of MA categories.

The MA program includes several sub-programs or categories. BEM 105 (January 2021) p. 1. To receive MA under a Supplemental Security Income (SSI)-related category, the person must be aged (65 or older), blind, disabled, entitled to Medicare or formerly blind or disabled. *Id.* MA eligibility for children under 19, parents or caretakers of children, pregnant or recently pregnant women, former foster children, MOMS, MICHild and Healthy Michigan Plan is based on Modified Adjusted Gross Income (MAGI) methodology. *Id.*

Persons may qualify under more than one MA category. *Id.*, p. 2. Federal law gives them the right to the most beneficial category. *Id.* The most beneficial category is the one that results in eligibility, the least amount of excess income or the lowest cost share. *Id.*

It was not disputed that Petitioner was aged 19-64 years, not pregnant, not disabled, and not a caretaker to minor children as of the MA termination month. Under the circumstances, Petitioner's only potential MA category is the MAGI-related category of HMP. MDHHS stated that Petitioner was ineligible for HMP due to excess income.²

¹ The notice also determined that Petitioner's son was ineligible to receive MA benefits. Petitioner did not dispute the termination of her son's MA benefits, only her own.

² The notice dated October 5, 2023, stated that Petitioner was ineligible for HMP due to not applying for the program. MDHHS explained the stated reason for closure was inexplicably incorrect, but that closure was still ultimately proper due to excess income.

MAGI-based income means income calculated using the same financial methodologies used to determine modified adjusted gross income as defined in section 36B(d)(2)(B) of the Code.³ 42 CFR 435.603(e). For individuals who have been determined financially-eligible for [Medicaid](#) using the [MAGI](#)-based methods set forth in this section, a State may elect in its State plan to base financial [eligibility](#) either on current monthly household income and [family size](#) or income based on projected annual household income and family size for the remainder of the current calendar year. 42 CFR 435.603(h). MDHHS elected to determine HMP eligibility based on current monthly income.⁴

MAGI can be defined as a household's adjusted gross income with any tax-exempt interest income and certain deductions added back.⁵ Common deductions and disregards which should be factored in determining a person's adjusted gross income include alimony payments, unreimbursed business expenses, Health Savings Account (e.g., 401k) payments, and student loan interest.⁶

In determining Petitioner's HMP eligibility, MDHHS stated it factored a group of two persons. A group of two persons is consistent with Petitioner's testimony that she was a tax filer with one dependent child.⁷

Petitioner's only income derived from employment. Petitioner submitted 30 days of wage documents to MDHHS on September 25, 2023, verifying her gross income going back 30 days from September 15, 2023. Exhibit A, pp. 6-13. The documents verified gross payments of \$██████, \$██████, \$██████, and \$██████ which totaled \$██████ (dropping cents). MDHHS also calculated Petitioner's gross monthly income for HMP to be \$3,078. Exhibit A, p. 19.

HMP income limits are based on 133% of the federal poverty level (FPL). RFT 246 (April 2014) p. 1. MDHHS applies a 5% income disregard when the disregard is the difference between a client's eligibility and ineligibility. BEM 500 (July 2017) p. 5. The disregard functionally renders the HMP income limit to be 138% of the FPL. The 2023 federal poverty level is \$19,720 for a 2-person group.⁸ For Petitioner to be eligible for HMP, Petitioner's income would have to not exceed \$27,213.60 (\$2,267.80 per month). Petitioner's monthly income of \$3,078 exceeds the HMP income limit.

Petitioner testified she can obtain health care through her employer, but it would be expensive and financially challenging. Due to her costly medical needs, Petitioner estimated the costs of employer-provided insurance to be \$400 per month in

³ Income exceptions are made for lump-sums which are counted as income only in the month received; scholarships, awards, or fellowship grants used for education purposes and not for living expenses; and various exceptions for American Indians and Alaska natives. No known exceptions are applicable to the present case.

⁴ https://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdhhs/SPA_17-0100_Approved_638230_7.pdf

⁵ <https://www.investopedia.com/terms/a/agi.asp>

⁶ *Id.*

⁷ See BEM 211 for MDHHS policy to determine group size.

⁸ <https://aspe.hhs.gov/poverty-guidelines>

copayments and \$25 per week in premiums. Petitioner's testimony concerning her insurance needs and costs was sincere but not ultimately irrelevant to determining MA eligibility.

The evidence established that Petitioner had excess income for HMP. Because Petitioner was ineligible for any other MA categories, MDHHS properly terminated Petitioner's MA eligibility beginning November 2023.

DECISION AND ORDER

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS properly terminated Petitioner's MA eligibility beginning November 2023. The actions taken by MDHHS are **AFFIRMED**.

CG/nr



Christian Gardocki
Administrative Law Judge

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

Via-Electronic Mail :

DHHS

Yaita Turner
Oakland County Pontiac-Woodward
51111 Woodward Ave 5th Floor
Pontiac, MI 48342
**MDHHS-Oakland-District-IV-
Hearings@michigan.gov**

Interested Parties

Oakland 4 County DHHS
BSC4
D. Smith
EQAD
MOAHR

Via-First Class Mail :

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
MI [REDACTED]