

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: 2010-27365

Issue No: 3052

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

June 9, 2010

Saginaw 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 9, 2010. 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) Respondent was an ongoing recipient of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits.

(2) On January 13, 2008, Claimant began using her electronic benefit card in Oklahoma.

All subsequent transactions on the card were in Oklahoma.

(3) Respondent intentionally failed to report her change of residence. Once Respondent was no longer a Michigan resident, she was no longer eligible to receive Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits through the State of Michigan.

(4) On May 15, 2008, the Department of Human Services local office was informed of the out of state use, by the Office of Inspector General.

(5) On July 31, 2008, Respondent's Food Assistance Program (FAP) case closed.

(6) At this hearing the Office of Inspector General representative verbally modified the OI date and amount to exclude the month of January 2008.

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:

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. (PAM 720)

The evidence shows that Respondent intentionally failed to report her change of residence and received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits through the State of Michigan which she was not eligible to receive.

DECISION AND ORDER

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

Respondent, Vanessa Brown committed an intentional program violation by not reporting an out of state move, in order to obtain Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits through the State of Michigan that she was not eligible for.

Respondent's intentional program violation resulted in the over-issuance of \$ [REDACTED] in Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits between February 1, 2008 and July 31, 2008. The Michigan Department of Human Services is entitled to recoup the \$ [REDACTED]

/s/

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

Date Signed: June 21, 2010

Date Mailed: June 22, 2010

2010-27365/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/alc

cc:

