

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: 2009-35512  
Issue No: 3019  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Load No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
October 14, 2009  
Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne L. Keegstra

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon claimant's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 14, 2009. The claimant personally appeared and provided testimony.

ISSUE

Did the department properly deny the claimant's Food Assistance Program (FAP) application in August, 2009 due to an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) disqualification?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. The claimant applied for FAP benefits on August 18, 2009.
2. The claimant's application was denied because she had committed an IPV and signed an IPV Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) and a Disqualification Consent Agreement (DHS-830) on March 5, 2009. (Department Exhibit 13 – 15).
3. The claimant submitted a hearing request on August 26, 2009.

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

Department policy states:

### **INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

#### **DEFINITIONS**

##### **All Programs**

##### **Suspected IPV**

**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.

Intentional Program Violation (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. PAM, Item 720, p. 1. The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

- (c) Definition of Intentional Program Violation. Intentional Program Violation shall consist of having intentionally:

- (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or
- (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system (access device). 7 CFR 273.16(c).

The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

(6) Criteria for determining intentional program violation. The hearing authority shall base the determination of intentional program violation on clear and convincing evidence which demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, intentional program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section. 7 CFR 273.16(c)(6).

### **IPV**

### **FIP, SDA AND FAP**

**IPV** exists when the client/AR is determined to have committed an Intentional Program Violation by:

- . A court decision.
- . An administrative hearing decision.
- . The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification or DHS-83, Disqualification Consent Agreement, or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms. PAM, Item 720, p. 1.

### **FAP Only**

**IPV** exists when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. PAM 720, p. 2.

### **DISQUALIFICATION**

### **FIP, SDA and FAP Only**

Disqualify an active **or** inactive recipient who:

- . is found by a court or hearing decision to have committed IPV, **or**
- . has signed a DHS-826 or DHS-830, **or**
- . is convicted of concurrent receipt of assistance by a court, **or**
- . for FAP, is found by SOAHR or a court to have trafficked FAP benefits.

A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. Other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. PAM 720, pp. 12-13.

### **Standard Disqualification Periods**

#### **FIP, SDA and FAP Only**

The standard disqualification period is used in all instances except when a **court** orders a different period (see **Non-Standard Disqualification Periods**, in this item).

Apply the following disqualification periods to recipients determined to have committed IPV:

- . One year for the first IPV
- . Two years for the second IPV
- . Lifetime for the third IPV

In this case, the claimant is disputing the department's determination to deny her FAP benefits. The claimant applied for FAP benefits on August 18, 2009. However, at this time the claimant was not eligible to receive FAP benefits as she was in a disqualification period for an IPV.

The claimant began to be investigated by the Office of Inspector General (OIG) in February, 2009 for a possible IPV for failure to report her son's employment income. The claimant met with OIG agent R. Dalman on March 5, 2009. At this time, the claimant signed the IPV Repayment Agreement and the Disqualification Consent Agreement. The claimant testified in this hearing that she did, in fact, sign both of these forms and that the signatures were authentic.

The claimant argues that she was told she would have to pay the money back, but wasn't told that she would be disqualified for the FAP program for one year. However, the claimant admitted that she had read and signed the documents, one of which is clearly captioned "Disqualification Consent Agreement." This form indicates that the claimant is going to be disqualified from the FAP program for one year. The entire form spells out the disqualification period and how it will impact any FAP benefits. Therefore, the claimant's argument that she wasn't aware she would be sanctioned from the program holds no weight.

The claimant's one-year disqualification period runs from April 1, 2009 through March 31, 2010. Therefore, the department properly denied the claimant's application for FAP benefits as she was currently under her disqualification period and not eligible to receive FAP benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly denied the claimant's FAP application in August, 2009, as the claimant was under a disqualification for the FAP program at that time.

Accordingly, the department's actions are UPHeld. SO ORDERED.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Suzanne L. Keegstra  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 16, 2009

Date Mailed: November 16, 2009

**NOTICE:** Administrative Hearings may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. Administrative Hearings will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 60 days of the filing of the original request.

2009-35512/SLK

The Claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the rehearing decision.

SLK

cc:

