

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2008-25265
Issue No: 4060

[REDACTED]

Washtenaw 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 June 14, 2011, at which Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the department and due notice having been provided to the 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 was receiving FAP benefits at all times pertinent to this hearing.
2. Respondent signed Assistance Application (DHS-1171) on September 15, 2004, acknowledging that he understood his failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information about his circumstances could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against him. (Department Exhibits 4-7).

3. On November 16, 2004, the department mailed Respondent an Eligibility Notice informing him that he was a Simplified Reporter and that if his household's income exceeded [REDACTED] he had 10 days to report the change to the department. (Department Exhibit 10).
4. On July 14, 2005, the department ran a Quarterly Wage Match which showed Respondent had gross earnings of [REDACTED] for the time period of January through March 2005, which averaged [REDACTED] a month and wages of [REDACTED] for the time period of April through June 2005, which averaged [REDACTED] a month. Respondent had not reported the change in income. (Department Exhibit 3).
5. On November 18, 2004 and August 30, 2005, the department received a Verification of Employment from the [REDACTED] showing Respondent had been employed since June 23, 2002, earning [REDACTED] an hour. (Department Exhibits 11-14).
6. Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during the alleged fraud period of December 2004 through August, 2005. If the income had been properly reported and budgeted by the department, Respondent would not have been eligible to receive FAP benefits. (Department Exhibits 15-35).
7. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report all employment and income to the department.
8. 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 September 15, 2004. Based on the application, Respondent was placed on Simplified Reporting which meant he was only to report changes in income if his monthly income exceeded \$1,698.00. Respondent began working at the University of Michigan Hospital on June 23, 2002. Changes for earned income are required to be reported within 10 days of income exceeding \$1,698.00 in his case, under Simplified Reporting. Respondent failed to timely report his increase in earned income.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the evidence presented by the department shows that Respondent failed to report his increase in 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 December 2004 through August, 2005, that the department is entitled to recoup.

The department is therefore entitled to recoup FAP overissuance of [REDACTED] from Respondent.

It is SO ORDERED.

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

Date Signed: 6/15/11

Date Mailed: 6/15/11

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]