

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: 2009-12773

Issue No: 1052; 3055

Case No:

Load No:

Hearing Date:

June 10, 2009

Oakland 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 June 10, 2009. Respondent did not appear.

ISSUE

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) On February 21, 2001, Respondent submitted an application for Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. The application listed three sons, [REDACTED], as part of the benefit group. Respondent signed

the application acknowledging her responsibility to report changes that would affect her benefit eligibility within 10 days.

(2) On June 19, 2001, [REDACTED] was placed in a juvenile residential home for six months, by court order, for breaking and entering.

(3) On November 21, 2001, Respondent submitted an application for Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. The application listed three sons, [REDACTED], as part of the benefit group. Respondent signed the application acknowledging her responsibility to report changes that would affect her benefit eligibility within 10 days.

(4) On December 20, 2001, [REDACTED] time in the juvenile home was extended another six months.

(5) On March 1, 2002, Respondent submitted an application for Family Independence Program (FIP) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. The application listed three sons, [REDACTED], as part of the benefit group. Respondent signed the application acknowledging her responsibility to report changes that would affect her benefit eligibility within 10 days.

(6) On March 5, 2002, [REDACTED] was removed from the home by Child Protective Services (CPS) and placed with his grandmother.

(7) On April 29, 2002, the Department was made aware of the changes to group composition.

#### 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).

The facts show that Respondent submitted two fraudulent applications which listed group members who she knew were not living in her home. The purpose of the fraud was to receive benefits she was not eligible for.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

(1) Respondent committed an intentional program violation for the purpose of receiving benefits she was not eligible for.

(2) Respondent was over-issued Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits between December 1, 2001 and February 2002 in the amount of \$260. The Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$260 over-issuance.

(3) Respondent was over-issued Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits between August 1, 2001 and April 30, 2002 in the amount of \$858. The Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$858 over-issuance.

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

Date Signed: June 25, 2009

Date Mailed: June 26, 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:

