

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.: 2009-12857

Issue No.: 3055

Case No.: [REDACTED]

Load No.: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

September 16, 2009

Macomb County DHS (36)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Aaron McClintic

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Department's request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was conducted from Detroit, Michigan on September 16, 2009. The Respondent appeared at the hearing and testified. [REDACTED], OIG representative appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and whether the respondent received an overissuance of benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds a material fact:

1. The Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) filed a hearing request to establish an overissuance of benefits received by respondent as a result of respondent having

committed an IPV. The OIG also requested that respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.

2. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits during the period of 12/1/02 – 7/31/03.
3. Respondent did not report his son's employment income in a timely manner.
4. As a result, respondent received overissuances in the amount of \$2809.00 under the FAP/FS program.
5. Respondent credibly testified that his son did not inform him of his employment income.
6. The Department has not established that respondent committed an IPV.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Food Assistance Program, 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"), formally known as the Family Independence Agency, administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq* and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Departmental policies are found in the Program Administrative Manual ("PAM"), the Program Eligibility Manual ("PEM"), and the Program Reference Manual ("PRM").

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the over issuance (OI). PAM 700, p. 1. DHS must inform clients of their reporting responsibilities and prevent OIs by following PAM 105 requirements informing the client of the requirement to promptly notify DHS of all changes in circumstances within 10 days. PAM 700, PAM 105. Incorrect, late reported or omitted information causing an OI can result in cash repayment or benefit reduction.

An Intentional Program Violation (IPV) is suspected when there is clear and convincing evidence that the client has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility.

PAM 720, p. 1. 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).

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

In the present case, the Department has not established by clear and convincing evidence that respondent was aware of the income that his son was earning or that he intentionally violated the program in any way. His uncontradicted testimony was that his son told him that he was going to school and not working. Respondent argued at hearing that the case should be dismissed because the enforcement was not timely. The regulations do not put any time constraints on the Department's ability to enforce its policies and procedures.

Respondent is responsible for the overissuance and department policy requires that it be recouped.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that respondent has not committed an IPV with regard to the FAP program but did receive overissuances in FAP program benefits.

It is ORDERED that the Department recoup for overissuances in FAP benefits in the amount of \$2809.00.



---

Aaron McClintic  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 09/29/09

Date Mailed: 09/29/09

**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.

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.

AM/jlg

cc:

