

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2007-14804  
Issue No: 4060

[REDACTED]

Kent County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to 7 CFR 273.18, 45 CFR 233.20(a)(13), MCL 400.9, MCL 400.37, MCL 400.43(a), MAC R 400.941 and MCL 24.201, *et seq.*, upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (department) to establish an overissuance of benefits to Respondent. After due notice was mailed to Respondent, a hearing was held July 26, 2011, at which Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the department and due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in Respondent's absence in accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual, Item 725.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent received an overissuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Respondent applied for and received FAP benefits. (Hearing Summary).
2. Respondent signed Assistance Application (DHS-1171) on April 28, 2006, acknowledging that she understood her failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information about her circumstances could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against her. (Department Exhibits 2-9).

3. On May 11, 2006, the department mailed Respondent an Eligibility Notice showing her FAP benefits were based on her earned income of [REDACTED] a month and instructing her to notify the department within 10 days if her monthly income exceeded [REDACTED] (Department Exhibit 10).
4. On October 12, 2006, the department received a Quarterly Wage Match, showing Respondent had earnings from Grand Rapids Home for Veterans from July 2006 through September, 2006. Respondent did not report this income to the department. (Department Exhibit 11).
5. Verification of income from the Grand Rapids Home for Veterans was received on December 4, 2006, showing Respondent was employed from June 26, 2006 until she was terminated on November 4, 2006. (Department Exhibits 13-15).
6. Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during the alleged fraud period of November 2006. If her income had been properly reported and budgeted by the department, Respondent would not have been eligible to receive FAP benefits. (Department Exhibits 16-19).
7. Respondent failed to report her income to the department, resulting in a FAP overissuance for the month of November 2006, in the amount of [REDACTED] (Department Exhibits 16-19).
8. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report all employment and income to the department.
9. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill the income reporting responsibilities.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

Departmental policy, states that when the client group receives more benefits than the group is entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). Repayment of an OI is the responsibility of anyone who was an eligible, disqualified, or other adult in the program group at the time the OI occurred. Bridges will collect from all adults who were a member of the case. OIs on active programs are repaid by lump

sum cash payments, monthly cash payments (when court ordered), and administrative recoupment (benefit reduction). OI balances on inactive cases must be repaid by lump sum or monthly cash payments unless collection is suspended. BAM 725.

In this case, the department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all income and employment to the department. Department policy requires clients to report any change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within ten days. BAM 105. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities.

Respondent completed an application for assistance on April 28, 2006, indicating that she was working at Corporate Security Solutions. The department mailed Respondent an Eligibility Notice on May 11, 2006, indicating her FAP was based on her current employment and if her monthly income exceeded [REDACTED] a month, she was to notify the department. Respondent began working at Grand Rapids Home for Veterans on June 26, 2006. Respondent failed to report her employment income resulting in an overissuance of FAP benefits. Changes for earned income are required to be reported within 10 days of the start date of employment.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the evidence presented by the department shows that Respondent failed to report her employment income in a timely manner. Therefore, Respondent is responsible for repayment of the overissuance.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits for the time period of November 2006 that the department is entitled to recoup.

The department is therefore entitled to recoup FAP overissuance of \$222.00 from Respondent.

It is SO ORDERED.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 7/29/11

Date Mailed: 7/29/11

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 60 days of mailing of the above Decision the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she resides or has his or her principal place of business in this state, or in the circuit court for Ingham County. Administrative Hearings, on its own motion, or on request of a party within 60 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, may order a rehearing.

VLA/ds

■ [REDACTED]