



FH
[REDACTED]

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals

In the Matter of

[REDACTED]

DECISION

BCS/144398

PRELIMINARY RECITALS

Pursuant to a petition filed October 10, 2012, under Wis. Stat. § 49.45(5)(a), to review a decision by the Rock County Dept. of Social Services in regard to Medical Assistance (MA), a hearing was held on December 17, 2012, at Janesville, Wisconsin. A hearing set for November 20, 2012 was rescheduled at the petitioner's request. The record was held open 28 days for the parties to file written arguments.

The issue for determination is whether the father of petitioner's child lives with her. Note that individuals' initials are used for confidentiality purposes.

There appeared at that time and place the following persons:

PARTIES IN INTEREST:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

Petitioner's Representative:

Atty. Hal Menendez
Legal Action of Wisconsin, Inc.
31 South Mills Street
Madison, WI 53715

Respondent:

Department of Health Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

By: Atty. Jerome A. Long, Sherry Quirk
Rock County Dept. of Social Services
P.O. Box 1649
Janesville, WI 53546

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Brian C. Schneider
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner (CARES # [REDACTED]) is a resident of Rock County.
2. In 2012 petitioner received BadgerCare Plus (BC+) for herself and her sons K.C. and M.E.J. M.E.J. was born in February, 2012, and his father is M.E.S.

3. In the summer, 2012, the agency received a referral from the county child support agency that M.E.S. was living with petitioner. An investigation commenced, and following the investigation the agency determined that M.E.S. lived with petitioner and the children. The agency obtained M.E.S.'s income information, and by a notice dated August 10, 2012, it informed petitioner that she and M.E.S. would have to pay a BC+ premium beginning September 1. BC+ eventually closed for the adults because they did not pay the premium.
4. Petitioner moved to her current residence on July 1, 2012. Prior to that she lived with her mother.
5. Although M.E.S. is at petitioner's residence daily, his official residence is with his mother. M.E.S. was ordered to pay child support despite the allegation he lived with petitioner.

DISCUSSION

To be eligible for BC+, a person must be under age 19, a custodial parent, or the spouse of a custodial parent. Wis. Admin. Code, §DHS 103.03(1)(f)1. A "fiscal test group" is "all members of the medical assistance group and all persons who are financially responsible for members of the medical assistance group who live in the same household as the person for whom they are legally responsible and who are not SSI or AFDC recipients." Admin. Code, §DHS 101.03(65). The BC+ Handbook, Appendix 2.2 also defines a household as the primary person plus others living in the household whose needs must be included.

The best evidence before me is that M.E.S. is present at petitioner's residence daily. In addition, petitioner admitted that he stayed there temporarily after she had surgery in July.

At the hearing M.E.S.'s mother testified that his regular residence is with her in [REDACTED]. She disputed the statement in the investigator's report alleging that he regularly sleeps at petitioner's residence. Petitioner and her mother also testified that although he is at petitioner's residence regularly he stays with his mother. I note that the Rock County child support agency obtained a child support order against M.E.S. despite the question of his residence. That supports petitioner's testimony that she told the court that they intended to live together, not that they were living together. In addition, M.E.S.'s employer shows the [REDACTED] address for him.

Based upon the evidence, I find that when the county took the action to change petitioner's BC+ eligibility, M.E.S. was not living with her. Even if he did stay with her temporarily in July, he and petitioner changed the arrangement after the investigation. They probably did so specifically for benefit purposes; not only does petitioner receive FoodShare, BC+, and child care, her rental subsidy does not allow for M.E.S. to live there.

The question then is whether a person who is acknowledged to be present daily, but who does not sleep in a residence or keep his belongings there, is living in the residence. I have to conclude that the answer is no. It is really a close call, and petitioner should be aware that this finding does not mean that the agency will stop looking into her residential situation, but I am satisfied that petitioner and M.E.S. have separate residences based upon the evidence before me.

Under old AFDC rules, a father could be included in a household even if he did not technically live there, as long as his child was not deprived by his absence. BC+ rules do not have a similar standard. To be included in a BC+ household, a person must live in the household. Petitioner and M.E.S. may have established a separation of convenience, but at this point they have done so successfully.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The county erroneously added the father of petitioner's son to her BC+ case because the evidence does not support a conclusion that they are living together.

THEREFORE, it is

ORDERED

That the matter be remanded to the county with instructions to remove M.E.S. from petitioner's case and re-determine BC+ eligibility retroactive to September 1, 2012, and to issue appropriate BC+ eligibility for the ensuing time period, including removing any penalties for non-payment of premiums if none were owed. The county shall do so within 10 days of this decision.

REQUEST FOR A REHEARING

This is a final administrative decision. If you think this decision is based on a serious mistake in the facts or the law, you may request a rehearing. You may also ask for a rehearing if you have found new evidence which would change the decision. Your request must explain what mistake the Administrative Law Judge made and why it is important or you must describe your new evidence and tell why you did not have it at your first hearing. If you do not explain these things, your request will have to be denied.

To ask for a rehearing, send a written request to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875. Send a copy of your request to the other people named in this decision as "PARTIES IN INTEREST." Your request for a rehearing must be received no later than 20 days after the date of the decision. Late requests cannot be granted.

The process for asking for a rehearing is in Wis. Stat. § 227.49. A copy of the statutes can be found at your local library or courthouse.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be served and filed with the appropriate court no more than 30 days after the date of this hearing decision (or 30 days after a denial of rehearing, if you ask for one).

For purposes of appeal to circuit court, the Respondent in this matter is the Department of Health Services. After filing the appeal with the appropriate court, it must be served on the Secretary of that Department, either personally or by certified mail. The address of the Department is: 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. A copy should also be sent to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, 5005 University Avenue, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53705-5400.

The appeal must also be served on the other "PARTIES IN INTEREST" named in this decision. The process for appeals to the Circuit Court is in Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53.

Given under my hand at the City of Madison,
Wisconsin, this 17th day of January, 2013

\sBrian C. Schneider
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals



State of Wisconsin \DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

David H. Schwarz
Suite 201
5005 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096
FAX: (608) 264-9885
email: DHAmail@wisconsin.gov
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on January 17, 2013.

Rock County Department of Social Services
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability
ham@legalaction.org