

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: 2009-9086

Issue No: 2024; 3055

Case No:

[REDACTED]

Load No:

Hearing Date:

March 4, 2009

Kent 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, 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 4, 2009. Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), MAC R 400.3130(5), or MAC R 400.3187(5).

ISSUES

Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and the 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. Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) filed a hearing request to establish an overissuance of FAP 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 program benefits.

2. Respondent signed Assistance Applications (DHS-1171) on June 25, 1999; March 3, 2003; March 9, 2004; and March 25, 2005, acknowledging that he understood his failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against him (Department Exhibit #1, pages 10 – 16; Exhibit #3, pages 25 – 32; Exhibit #4, pages 33 – 40; and Exhibit #5, pages 41 - 48).

3. On each of these applications, the respondent indicated that his two children, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], resided with him (Department Exhibit #1, page 11; Exhibit 3, page 26; Exhibit #4, page 34; Exhibit #5, page 42).

4. The respondent's children, [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], actually resided with their mother in Arkansas. Both children were enrolled in schools in Arkansas for the years of 2001 through 2005 (Department Exhibit #2, pages 17 – 24).

5. The department is pursuing the fraud period from April 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005, when the respondent received FAP and MA benefits for himself and his children.

6. During the fraud period, the respondent received \$7463.00 in FAP benefits. If the group size had properly been budgeted using a group size of one, instead of three, the respondent would have been entitled to \$1594.00 in FAP benefits. This totals an overissuance of \$5869.00 (Department Exhibit #6, pages 49 – 104).

7. Respondent was also receiving MA benefits for himself and his children during the fraud period. The department indicates that the fraud period they are pursuing for the MA

program is June 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005. During this period, DHS paid \$1061.62 for [REDACTED] and \$1072.64 for [REDACTED], resulting in a total overissuance for MA of \$2134.26 (Department Exhibit #6, pages 105 – 120).

8. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of his responsibility to report accurate information and any changes in household composition to the department.

9. Respondent was physically and mentally capable of performing his reporting responsibilities.

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

11. A Notice of Disqualification Hearing was mailed to respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the U.S. Post Office as undeliverable. Respondent's last known address is: [REDACTED].

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).

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 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:

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). PAM, 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. PAM 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 PAM 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. 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.

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. PAM 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 PEM 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. PEM, 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. 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

FIP and FAP Only

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

In this case, the department has established that respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all circumstances that could affect eligibility or benefit amount to the department. This would include group composition and the correct information regarding where his children lived and attended school. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. The respondent continually indicated on applications that his children were living with him. However, school records from Arkansas show this was false, as the children were both enrolled in Arkansas schools, residing with their mother. As the children's legal residence was with their mother, the respondent should not have included the children on his FAP or MA case.

The respondent was issued \$7463 in FAP benefits during the fraud period of April, 2003 through June, 2005. If the group size had properly been budgeted at one, the respondent would have only been eligible to receive \$1594.00 in FAP benefits. Thus, the respondent received an overissuance of \$5869.00.

The department presents an MA overissuance of \$3811.00. However, the department corrected the hearing summary and Investigative Report to show an alleged fraud period of

June 1, **2003** through June 30, 2005. The department's computation of the OI amount is based on a fraud period of June 1, **2001** through June 30, 2005, and is, therefore, in error. Totaling the amounts paid for the two children for MA coverage from June 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005 shows a total paid for [REDACTED] of \$1061.62 and for [REDACTED] of \$1072.64. This brings the total amount of MA coverage for the two children for the period of June 1, 2003 through June 30, 2005 to \$2134.26.

This Administrative Law Judge therefore 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 \$5869.00 overissuance from April, 2003 through June, 2005. Further, the respondent has also committed a first intentional violation of the MA program, resulting in a \$2134.26 overissuance from June 2003 through June, 2005. Consequently, the department's request for FAP program disqualification and full restitution for both programs must be granted.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence, decides respondent committed a first intentional FAP 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 \$5869.00 FAP overissuance caused by his Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

(3) Respondent is not disqualified from participation in the MA program as department policy does not allow it, but the respondent is responsible for full restitution of the \$2134.26 MA overissuance caused by his Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

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

Date Signed: June 25, 2009

Date Mailed: June 29, 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.

SLK 

cc:

