

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.: 2009-32714  
Issue No.: 3052  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Load No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
January 13, 2010  
Wayne County DHS (59)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jeanne M. VanderHeide

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 January 13, 2010. The Respondent did not appear. [REDACTED] representative, appeared on behalf of the Department.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and whether the Respondent received an over-issuance 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 over-issuance 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 8/2005 through 1/31/07.
3. Respondent signed a recertification application on 6/5/06 (Exhibit 1, p. 15). Respondent's son was working and earning income on this date.
4. Respondent's son turned 18 years of age on [REDACTED].
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all employment and income to the Department and had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. Respondent did not report her son's income to the Department after he turned 18 years of age.
7. As a result of the failure to report all members in the group, the Department argues that Respondent committed an IPV and received an over-issuance of benefits in the amount of \$1,340.00 under the FS/FAP program.
8. The Department has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
9. A notice of disqualification hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

#### 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"), formerly 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 established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all employment and income for persons living in the household and had no apparent limitations to fulfilling this requirement. The Department did not prove by clear and

convincing evidence, however, that the oversight on Respondent's son's income after he turned 18 was intentional. As a result, the Respondent did not commit an IPV. Respondent was over-issued FS/FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,340.00.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that Respondent did not commit an IPV with regard to the FAP program.

It is ORDERED that the Department recoup for over-issuances in FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,340.00.



Jeanne M. VanderHeide  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 2, 2010

Date Mailed: February 3, 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.

JV/pf

cc:

