

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 200923861  
Issue No: 3020  
[REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 15, 2011  
Genesee County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kandra K. Robbins

**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 Respondent's request for hearing. After due notice, a telephone conference hearing was held on August 15, 2011. The Respondent was present and testified.

**ISSUE**

Did the Department act properly trying to recover a Food Assistance Program (FAP) overissuance that respondent received due to a client error?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

This Administrative Law Judge, based upon the evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Respondent completed an Application for Assistance and began receiving FAP benefits in January 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 1-7).
2. The Respondent's husband began working at [REDACTED] on January 24, 2007. This was not reported to the Department until March 21, 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 9-11).
3. The change income resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits for the month of March 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 12-14).
4. The Respondent's husband began different employment with [REDACTED] on April 28, 2007. This was not reported until May 21, 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 25-26).
5. The change of income resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits for the month of June 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 15-16).

6. Department sent a DHS 4358 Notice of Overissuance to the Respondent on April 7, 2009. (Department Exhibit 1, pgs 28-31).
7. On April 19, 2009, the Department received a Request for Hearing from the Respondent.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The regulations governing the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in the Michigan Administrative Code, MAC R 400.901 - .951. An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. MAC R 400.903(1) An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because of a denial. MAC R 400.903(2)

Clients have the right to contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. BAM 600. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness. BAM 600.

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), Reference Table Manual (RFT), State Emergency Relief Manual (ERM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM). Department policy states:

#### **BAM 700 DEPARTMENT POLICY**

##### **All Programs**

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). This item explains OI types and standards of promptness (SOP). Note: A client or CDC provider may voluntarily repay any program benefits even when there is no overissuance. Refer these situations to the local office fiscal unit.

Definitions The Benefit Recovery System (BRS) is the part of Bridges that tracks all FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP OIs and

payments, issues automated collection notices and triggers automated benefit reductions for active programs.

A claim is the resulting debt created by an overissuance of benefits. The discovery date is determined by the recoupment specialist (RS) for a client or agency error. This is the date the OI is known to exist and there is evidence available to determine the OI type. For an intentional program violation (IPV) the Office of Inspector General (OIG) determines the discovery date. This is the date the referral was sent to the prosecutor or the date that OIG requested an administrative disqualification hearing.

The establishment date for an OI is:

The date the DHS-4358A-D, Repay Agreement, is sent to the client and for an IPV the date the DHS-4357 is sent notifying the client when the disqualification and recoupment will start. An overissuance (OI) is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what they were eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). Overissuance type identifies the cause of an overissuance. Recoupment is a DHS action to identify and recover a benefit OI.

### **BAM 705 Definition All Programs**

An agency error OI is caused by incorrect actions (including delayed or no action) by the Department of Human Services (DHS) or the Department of Information and Technology staff or department processes. Some examples are:

- Available information was not used or was used incorrectly.
- Policy was misapplied.
- Action by local or central office staff was delayed.
- Computer errors occurred.
- Information was not shared between department divisions (services staff, Work First! agencies, etc.).
- Data exchange reports were not acted upon timely (Wage Match, New Hires, BENDEX, etc.).

If unable to identify the type of OI, record it as an agency error.

## **BAM 705 AGENCY ERROR EXCEPTIONS FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP**

Agency error OIs are not pursued if the estimated OI amount is less than \$125 per program.

### **OVERISSUANCE PERIOD**

#### **All Programs**

#### **OI Begin Date FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP**

The OI period begins the first month (or first pay period for CDC) when benefit issuance exceeds the amount allowed by policy, or 12 months before the date the OI was referred to the RS, whichever is later. To determine the first month of the OI period for changes reported timely and not acted on, Bridges allows time for:

- The full standard of promptness (SOP) for change processing, per [BAM 220](#), and
- The full negative action suspense period. See [BAM 220](#), EFFECTIVE DATE OF CHANGE.

#### **OI End Date**

The OI period ends the month (or pay period for CDC) before the benefit is corrected.

#### **OVERISSUANCE AMOUNT FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP**

The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the group actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive.

The Respondent was receiving FAP benefits in 2007. The Respondent's husband was not employed at the time of the application. He became employed at [REDACTED] on January 24, 2007. This income was not properly budgeted for March 2007. As a result, the Respondent received a FAP overissuance in the amount of [REDACTED] for March 2007. The Respondent's husband obtained a new job with [REDACTED] on April 28, 2007. The income from this job was not reported until May 21, 2007. As a result of the delay in reporting, the proper income was not used for calculating the FAP budget. This resulted in an overissuance for June 2007 in the amount of [REDACTED]

In this case, the Agency used the incorrect income in determining Respondent's FAP budget as the result of an error in reporting timely. Department policy requires the

recoupment of the overissuance if it is more than [REDACTED]. In this case, the Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for the month of March 2007 but was only entitled to [REDACTED] in benefit for March 2007. This resulted in an overissuance for March 2007 in the amount of [REDACTED]. The Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for June 2007. However, for June, they were not entitled to any FAP benefit. This resulted in a total FAP overissuance of [REDACTED]. Because the overissuance amount is over [REDACTED] the Department must take action to recover the overissuance that Respondent received.

The Respondent made an overissuance payment of [REDACTED] on October 8, 2009. The Notice of Balance Due for the [REDACTED] balance states that it is for claim number [REDACTED]. The overissuance in this matter is for claim [REDACTED]. Based on Bridges Claim Search marked as Department Exhibit 1, pg 32, it is found that [REDACTED] is for the time period of March 1, 2007 through June 30, 2007. Department Exhibit 1, pg 33 indicated that claim number [REDACTED] if for the time period of April 1, 2007 through July 31, 2007.

At the time of the hearing, the Department worker was unable to explain the two claim numbers. It is clear that claim number [REDACTED] if for time period of April 1, 2007 through July 31, 2007. Further, Respondent has paid this claim.

There has been no explanation for the fact that the 2 claims cover much of the same time period. In fact, the overissuance in this matter is for an overissuance that occurred in June 2007. This overissuance would be for the same time period as the claim that has been paid. Neither the Department nor the Respondent have any explanation as to what claim [REDACTED] is for other than a FAP overissuance that occurred from April to July 2007. The Notice (Respondent Exhibit 2) indicates that the overissuance was for an error in calculating Respondent's husband's income from [REDACTED]. As this was the same error testified to in this matter, it appears that the claims at least for June 2007 are the same.

Because of the conflicting information regarding the two claims and time periods, the Department has not established that the June 2007 overissuance was not included in the amount already paid by the Respondent.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

This Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings and conclusion of law, decides that the Department established that Respondent received a [REDACTED] FAP overissuance for March 2007.

The Department acted properly in trying to recover a FAP overissuance that the Respondent received due to client error.

200923861/kkr

Respondent is responsible for full restitution of the [REDACTED] FAP overissuance caused by client error.

It is so ORDERED.

/s/

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kandra K. Robbins  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 22, 2011

Date Mailed: August 22, 2011

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 60 days from the mailing date of the above hearing 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.

KKR/db

cc:

[REDACTED]