

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: 2009-36896
Issue No: 3055, 2013
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
March 17, 2010
Wexford County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ivona Rairigh

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 March 17, 2010. Respondent personally appeared and testified. Also appearing on claimant's behalf was her [REDACTED]

ISSUE

1. Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) on the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and whether respondent received an overissuance of benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?
2. Whether respondent committed an IPV on Medical Assistance (MA) program 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. On August 24, 2009, the department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) filed a hearing request to establish an overissuance of FAP and MA benefits received by respondent as a result of respondent having committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV); the OIG also requested that respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits.
2. Respondent signed Assistance Application (1171) on October 28, 2003, acknowledging that she understood her failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate wage/employment information and her circumstances could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against her (Department's Exhibit 1).
3. Respondent was mailed an Eligibility Notice on October 29, 2003 approving her FAP benefit application. The Notice stated "Please report all changes in income or living situation within 10 days, as required by state policy". (Department's Exhibit 2).
4. Respondent then started working at [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] but failed to report this employment to the department. Respondent's employment was discovered by Wage Match computer report generated on December 7, 2004. (Department's Exhibit 4).
5. Respondent's employment and wages were further verified through subpoenaed records from respondent's employer prepared on August 26, 2005. (Department's Exhibit 5).
6. Respondent failed to report her employment income in a timely manner, resulting in a FAP overissuance for the time period of January 1, 2004 thru September 30, 2004 in the amount of \$1,851, and in MA overissuance for the time period of February 1, 2004 thru September 1, 2004 in the amount of \$747.22.

5. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of her responsibility to report all household income to the department.

6. Respondent was physically and mentally capable of performing her reporting responsibilities.

7. Respondent has not committed any previous intentional FAP program violations.

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 Program Reference Manual (PRM).

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 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 FAP benefits. The department's manuals provide the following relevant policy statements and instructions for department caseworkers:

BENEFIT OVERISSUANCES

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). BAM, Item 700, p. 1.

Definitions

The **Automated Recoupment System (ARS)** is the part of CIMS that tracks all FIP, SDA 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 department 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 the 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. In CIMS the “establishment date” has been renamed “notice sent date.”

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 700, p. 1.

PREVENTION OF OVERISSUANCES

All Programs

DHS must inform clients of their reporting responsibilities and act on the information reported within the Standard of Promptness (SOP).

During eligibility determination and while the case is active, clients are repeatedly reminded of reporting responsibilities, including:

- . Acknowledgments on the application form, **and**
- . Explanation at application/redetermination interviews, **and**
- . Client notices and program pamphlets.

DHS must prevent OIs by following BAM 105 requirements and by informing the client or authorized representative of the following:

- . Applicants and recipients are required by law to give complete and accurate information about their circumstances.
- . Applicants and recipients are required by law to promptly notify DHS of all changes in circumstances within 10 days. FAP Simplified Reporting (SR) groups are required to report only when the group's actual gross monthly income exceeds the SR income limit for their group size.
- . Incorrect, late reported or omitted information causing an OI can result in cash repayment or benefit reduction.
- . A timely hearing request can delete a proposed benefit reduction.

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. BAM, 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. BAM, 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. BAM 720, p. 2.

OVERISSUANCE AMOUNT

FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP Only

The amount of the OI is the amount of benefits the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 6.

IPV Hearings

FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP Only

OIG represents DHS during the hearing process for IPV hearings.

OIG requests IPV hearings for cases when no signed DHS-826 or DHS-830 is obtained, and correspondence to the client is not returned as undeliverable, or a new address is located.

OIG requests IPV hearing for cases involving:

1. FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
2. Prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, **and**

The total OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$1,000 or more, **or**

- . The total OI amount is less than \$1,000, **and**
 - .. The group has a previous IPV, **or**
 - .. The alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, **or**
 - .. The alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), **or**
 - .. The alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

Excluding FAP, OIG will send the OI to the RS to process as a client error when the DHS-826 or DHS-830 is returned as undeliverable and no new address is obtained. BEM, Item 720, p. 10.

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. BAM 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

FIP and FAP Only

- . Ten years for concurrent receipt of benefits (see BEM 203). BAM 720, p. 13.
- .

In this case, the department has established that respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all income and employment to the department. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. Respondent stated at her initial interview on October 29, 2003, according to caseworker's notes, that she has not worked anywhere for the last two years because she currently has a seizure disorder and is battling cancer. Respondent also listed a [REDACTED] on her October, 2003 application as a roommate for whom she was not requesting assistance. Respondent then started working on November 3, 2003. Respondent testified that she did report her employment to the department when she reported her change of address, but could not remember when this occurred or when she moved. Respondent further testified that she left a message for her caseworker but never talked to her caseworker directly about changes in her circumstances.

OIG representative at the hearing was asked to check departmental records for any mention of respondent's report of address change or employment. Additional information was faxed to the Administrative Law Judge on March 17, 2010 indicating that no letter was found from the respondent reporting her address change prior to an application dated November 2, 2004. Copy of this application was enclosed on which respondent claimed only herself and her daughter in the household. Respondent stated on page 1 of this application that her household had recently lost its only source of income, specifically on September 17, 2004. Respondent's caseworker wrote in the Notes section of this application that respondent's boyfriend [REDACTED] [REDACTED] listed on previous application as roommate for which no assistance was being requested) shared the rent and expenses, but passed away on September 17, 2004. Respondent had worked from November 3, 2003 to September 12, 2004 and received her last employment check on September 16, 2004, but failed to report this stopped income on the application of November 2, 2004 and during her interview with the caseworker on this date. Respondent clearly had the opportunity to report her own stopped income, but only reported her boyfriend's death as stopped household income, and told the caseworker she herself had not worked since November, 2003 for [REDACTED].

Hearing testimony also indicated that the respondent was not prosecuted for the IPV. OIG representative explained that prosecutor's decision not to prosecute for IPV was based on the respondent providing voluminous medical records and not because it was concluded she was not guilty of the IPV.

This Administrative Law Judge concludes that the department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that respondent committed a first intentional violation of the FAP program, resulting in a \$1,851 overissuance for the time period of January 1, 2004 thru September 30,

2004. Consequently, the department's request for FAP program disqualification and full restitution must be granted.] Furthermore, respondent also committed a first intentional violation of the MA program, resulting in an overissuance of \$747.22 for the time period of February 1, 2004 thru September 1, 2004, and full restitution also must be granted for this overissuance.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence, decides respondent committed a first intentional FAP and MA program violation.

Therefore it is ORDERED that:

1. Respondent shall be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for one year, but the rest of the household may participate. This disqualification period shall begin to run immediately as of the date of this Order.
2. Respondent is responsible for full restitution of the \$1,851.00 FAP overissuance and \$747.22 MA overissuance caused by her Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

/s/ _____
Ivona Rairigh
Administrative Law Judge
for Ismael Ahmed, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 29, 2010

Date Mailed: April 29, 2010

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.

IR/tg

cc:

