

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: 2009-37081
Issue No: 3055
Case No: [REDACTED]
Load No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date:
December 16, 2009
Isabella 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 December 16, 2009. Respondent did not appear. In accordance with Program Administrative Manual (PAM) 720 the hearing proceeds without Respondent.

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 May 8, 2006, Respondent signed an application for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Respondent marked the application that she moved to Michigan from South Dakota on 3/23/06, was looking for work, and intended to stay in Michigan. The

application also indicated that Respondent was staying with her sister and did not have any identification because her purse was recently stolen. Respondent's signature acknowledged her responsibility to report changes that would affect her eligibility for benefits.

Respondent was approved and began receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.

(2) On June 6, 2006 through January 7, 2007 Respondent used her Food Assistance Program (FAP) electronic benefit card in South Dakota and Nebraska.

(3) Respondent was not eligible for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits through the State of Michigan after July, 2006 because she was not a resident of Michigan.

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).

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 evidence shows that Respondent intentionally failed to report her return to South Dakota in order to continue receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that she was not eligible for.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

Respondent committed an intentional program violation by intentionally failing to report her return to South Dakota in order to continue receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that he was not eligible for.

Respondent’s intentional program resulted in an over-issuance of \$1,976 of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits between August 1, 2006 and February 28, 2007. The Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$1,976.

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

Date Signed: February 18, 2010

Date Mailed: February 18, 2010

2009-37081/GFH

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:

[REDACTED]