



Date Mailed: October 27, 2025

Docket No.: 25-033320

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Petitioner: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

**This is an important legal document. Please have
someone translate the document.**

هذه وثيقة قانونية مهمة. يرجى أن يكون هناك شخص ما يترجم المستند.

এটি একটি গুরুত্বপূর্ণ আইনি ডকুমেন্ট। দয়া করে কেউ
দ্বারা অনুবাদ করুন।

Este es un documento legal importante. Por favor,
que alguien traduzca el documento.

这是一份重要的法律文件。请让别人翻译文件。

Ky është një dokument ligjor i rëndësishëm. Ju
lутем, кини дикë та пëркtheni dokumentin.

Date Mailed: October 27, 2025
Docket No.: 25-033320
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

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; 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 October 20, 2025. Petitioner appeared and was unrepresented. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS or Department) was represented by Sunshine Simonson, Eligibility Specialist. Interpretation services were provided by Gehad Helmi and Asia Nagi.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Petitioner's Medical Assistance (MA) Program application for benefits for failure to verify his wife's savings account?

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 August [REDACTED] 2025, the Department received Petitioner's application for MA benefits.
2. On August [REDACTED] 2025, an asset detection was completed by the Department which showed that Petitioner's wife had a savings account ending in [REDACTED] with Chase Bank and that there was a joint account with Petitioner and his wife for a checking account ending in [REDACTED] with Chase Bank.
3. On August [REDACTED] 2025, the Department issued a Verification Checklist (VCL) to Petitioner requesting verification of bank accounts with bank statements for the Chase account ending in [REDACTED] as well as [REDACTED] in addition to a True account ending in [REDACTED] with proofs due by August 29, 2025.
4. On August [REDACTED] 2025, the Department issued another VCL to Petitioner requesting verification of Petitioner's savings account by September 2, 2025. It did not identify any account numbers.
5. On September [REDACTED] 2025, the Department issued a Health Care Coverage Determination Notice (HCCDN) to Petitioner informing him that Petitioner's and his

wife's MA benefits applications were denied for all programs except Plan First (PF) because Petitioner had not submitted verification of his savings account.

6. On September 8, 2025, the Department received Petitioner's request for hearing denying his application for MA benefits.
7. At the hearing, the Department admitted that the Department had improperly listed the Chase account ending in █ as belonging to Petitioner instead of his wife in Bridges but that verification of this account was the reason for the denial of the application.
8. On October █ 2025, Petitioner submitted the verification of the account ending in █

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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.

In this case, Petitioner disputes the Department's denial of his MA application which was denied because the Department had not received verification of Petitioner's wife's savings account. Assets are considered in determining SSI-related MA category eligibility. BEM 400, p. 1. In MA cases, verifications are due 10 calendar days after the request is made by the Department. BAM 130 (May 2024), p. 8. Case action notices are sent when the client indicates a refusal to provide a verification or when the time period provided has lapsed. BAM 130, pp. 8-9. When requesting verification of an item, the Department is required to tell the client what is required, how to obtain it, and the due date. BAM 130, p. 3. When the Department issued the August 19, 2025 VCL, the Department specifically identified the account it was seeking to verify but did not list the account ending in 9013. With the August █ 2025 VCL, the Department requested verification of Petitioner's savings account, not his wife's. Because the Department failed to properly request verification of Petitioner's wife's account ending in █ with Chase Bank, Petitioner was not properly informed of the request and could not comply. The Department erred in denying Petitioner's August █ 2025 application for MA benefits for failure to verify his wife's savings account.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department did not act in accordance with Department policy when it denied Petitioner's application for MA benefits.

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

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

1. Reinstate and reprocess Petitioner's August █ 2025 application;
2. If otherwise eligible, issue MA coverage for Petitioner and his wife for coverage not previously received; and,
3. Notify Petitioner in writing of its decision.



AMANDA MARLER
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE

APPEAL RIGHTS: Petitioner may appeal this Hearing Decision to the circuit court. Rules for appeals to the circuit court can be found in the Michigan Court Rules (MCR), including MCR 7.101 to MCR 7.123, available at the Michigan Courts website at courts.michigan.gov. The Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR) cannot provide legal advice, but assistance may be available through the State Bar of Michigan at <https://lrs.michbar.org> or Michigan Legal Help at <https://michiganlegalhelp.org>. A copy of the circuit court appeal should be sent to MOAHR. A circuit court appeal may result in a reversal of the Hearing Decision.

Either party who disagrees with this Hearing Decision may also send a written request for a rehearing and/or reconsideration to MOAHR within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision. The request should include Petitioner's name, the docket number from page 1 of this Hearing Decision, an explanation of the specific reasons for the request, and any documents supporting the request. The request should be sent to MOAHR

- by email to MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov, OR
- by fax at (517) 763-0155, OR
- by mail addressed to
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
Rehearing/Reconsideration Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing Michigan 48909-8139

Documents sent via email are not secure and can be faxed or mailed to avoid any potential risks. Requests MOAHR receives more than 30 days from the mailing date of this Hearing Decision may be considered untimely and dismissed.

Via Electronic Mail:

Respondent

WAYNE-GREENFIELD/JOY-DHHS
8655 GREENFIELD RD
DETROIT, MI 48228
MDHHS-WAYNE-17-
HEARINGS@MICHIGAN.GOV

Via First Class Mail:

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]