

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Respondent

Reg. No: 2009-13554

Issue No: 1052; 3055

Case No:

[REDACTED]

Load No:

Hearing Date:

April 29, 2009

Genesee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Gary F. Heisler

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37, 7 CFR 273.16, MAC R 400.3130, and MAC R 400.3178 upon the Department of Human Services (department) request for a disqualification hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on April 29, 2009. Respondent appeared and testified.

ISSUES

Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and whether respondent received an overissuance of 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 has received public assistance through the Department of Human Services and its predecessor agencies for approximately 15 years.

(2) On June 28, 2006, Respondent submitted an application for Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Respondent signed the application acknowledging her responsibility to report changes in income within 10 days.

(3) On January 14, 2007, Respondent began employment through [REDACTED]

(4) On July 10, 2007, the Department received verification of Respondent's employment.

(5) On July 13, 2007, Respondent submitted an application for Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) and reported working through [REDACTED].

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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 Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

In this case, the department has requested a disqualification hearing to establish an overissuance of benefits as a result of an IPV and the department has asked that respondent be

disqualified from receiving benefits. The department's manuals provide the following relevant policy statements and instructions for department caseworkers:

## **PAM 720 INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

### **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

#### **All Programs**

Recoupment policies and procedures vary by program and overissuance (OI) type. This item explains Intentional Program Violation (IPV) processing and establishment. [PAM 700](#) explains OI discovery, OI types and standards of promptness. [PAM 705](#) explains agency error and [PAM 715](#) explains client error.

### **DEFINITIONS**

#### **All Programs**

**Suspected IPV** means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- The client **intentionally** failed to report information **or intentionally** gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination, **and**
- The client was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities, **and**
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill their reporting responsibilities.

IPV is suspected when there is clear and convincing evidence that the client or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility.

#### **FAP Only**

IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits.

#### **IPV**

**FIP, SDA and FAP**

The client/authorized representative (AR) is determined to have committed an IPV by:

- A court decision.
- An administrative hearing decision.
- The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing or DHS-830, Disqualification Consent Agreement or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms.

Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that “produce[s] in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established, evidence so clear, direct, and weighty and convincing as to enable [the fact finder] to come to a clear conviction, without hesitancy, of the truth of the precise facts in issue.” *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995), quoting *In re Jobes*, 108 NJ 394, 407-408; 529 A2d 434 (1987).

During the hearing Respondent testified that she called and left a message for her case worker that she was working. When specifically asked Respondent stated the amount of her benefits did not change, she has received benefits long enough to know the income would reduce her benefits, and she did not take any further steps to report her income or ensure her case worker had the information.

Even if Respondent initially left a message with the Department, her knowledge and lack of further action constitute an intentional failure to provide necessary information to the Department.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence, decides the following:

(1) Respondent committed an intentional program violation by intentionally failing to report earned income to the Department in order to receive more benefits that she was eligible for.

(2) Respondent received an over-issuance of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits between March 1, 2007 and May 31, 2007 in the amount of \$1,203. The Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$1,203 over-issuance.

(3) Respondent received an over-issuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits between March 1, 2007 and June 30, 2007 in the amount of \$987. The Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$987 over-issuance.

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary F. Heisler  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 15, 2009

Date Mailed: June 17, 2009

NOTICE: The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of the above Decision and Order, the respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives.

GFH 

cc:

