

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201053764

Issue No: 3055

Case No: [REDACTED]

Load No: [REDACTED]

Hearing Date:

November 17, 2010

Marquette County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki L. Armstrong

**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 telephone hearing was held on November 17, 2010. Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in the respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), MAC R 400.3130(5), or MAC R 400.3187(5).

**ISSUE**

Whether the respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) 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 clear and convincing evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Respondent was a FAP recipient during the period of February 2008 through January 2010.
2. Respondent and her husband [REDACTED] were receiving earned income from a land contract during the period of February 2008 through January 2010.

3. 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 Intentional Program Violation (IPV); the OIG also requested that respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
4. Respondent signed Assistance Application (DHS-1171) on January 15, 2008 and February 4, 2008, acknowledging that she understood her failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information about her circumstances could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against her. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 3, pages 4-12; Item 7, pages 54-63).
5. Respondent indicated on this application that the only income was Respondent's father's (W.S.) RSDI social security benefits. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 3, page 7; Item 7, page 57).
6. The Office of Inspector General indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2010. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 2-6).
7. On July 16, 2009, Respondent's case workers were notified by email by another case worker of Children's Foster Home Licensing of a possible overissuance. The case worker reported that she had been working with respondent and her husband [REDACTED] on foster home licensing and they had informed her that they received approximately \$28,000.00 in earned income per year through a land contract on land they had sold. During a check on Bridges, the case worker found that [REDACTED] was in respondent's group and that they were receiving food stamps and the earned income from the land contract was not budgeted. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 2, page 3).
8. Memorandum of Land Contract shows that on September 24, 2007, [REDACTED] and Respondent, sold property in the County of Arenac to [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 28, pages 139-140).
9. E.S. provided documentation showing payments in the amount of \$14,194.42 were paid each year to Respondent and [REDACTED] on March 15<sup>th</sup> and September 15<sup>th</sup> beginning in 2008, with an initial down payment of \$40,000.00 in September 2007. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 29, page 143).
10. Checks from [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] in the amount of \$14,194.42 were received and cashed by [REDACTED] on March 12, 2008, September 4, 2008, March 11, 2009, and September 12, 2009. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 30, pages 147-150).

11. During the alleged fraud period in which Respondent was receiving FAP benefits, Respondent and her husband [REDACTED] were receiving earned income which was not reported to DHS. Respondent was issued \$7,261.00 in FAP benefits. (Department Exhibit 1, Item 33, pages 158-210).
12. The department is pursuing the fraud period of February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2010 for the FAP program. Respondent received \$7,261.00 in FAP benefits during the respective alleged fraud period. If Respondent had informed the department that she and her husband had earned income in the amount of approximately \$2,365.74 per month, Respondent would not have received excess benefits for the FAP program.
13. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report all employment and income to the department.
14. Respondent did not report to the department that she and her husband were receiving earned income in the amount of approximately \$2,365.74 a month. This resulted in an overissuance of \$7,261.00 for the FAP program. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 158-210).
15. As a result of the failure to report that Respondent and her husband were receiving earned income, respondent committed an IPV and received an overissuance of benefits.
16. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill the income reporting responsibilities.
17. Respondent had not committed any previous intentional program violations of the FAP program. (Department Hearing Request).

### **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 Program Administrative Manual (BAM), the Program 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 the respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits. The department's manuals provide the following relevant policy statements and instructions for department caseworkers:

When a customer client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700. A suspected intentional program violation means an overissuance where:

- 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.

The department suspects an intentional program violation when the client has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing, or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. There must be clear and convincing evidence that the client acted intentionally for this purpose. BAM 720.

The department's Office of Inspector General processes intentional program hearings for overissuances referred to them for investigation. The Office of Inspector General represents the department during the hearing process. The Office of Inspector General requests intentional program hearings for cases when

- benefit overissuances are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
- prosecution of welfare fraud is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
  - the total overissuance amount is \$1000 or more, or
  - the total overissuance amount is less than \$1000, and
    - the group has a previous intentional program violation, or
    - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
    - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance,
    - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an intentional program violation disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. Other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720.

Clients that commit an intentional program violation are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. Clients are disqualified for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV,

lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720. This is the respondent's first intentional program violation.

In this case, the department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally failed to report her earned income from the land contract. In addition, Respondent's signature on this document certifies that she was aware that fraudulent participation in FAP could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims. Because of Respondent's failure to report the earned income, she received an overissuance in the amount of \$7,261.00 and the department is entitled to recoup.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence, decides Respondent committed her first FAP Intentional Program Violation for the period of time from February 1, 2008 through January 31, 2010.

Therefore, it is ORDERED that:

- (1) Respondent shall be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for one year, but the rest of the household may participate. This disqualification period shall begin to run immediately as of the date of this order.
- (2) The department is entitled to recoup the overissuance of benefits Respondent ineligibly received. The respondent is ORDERED to reimburse the department for the \$7,261.00 FAP overissuance caused by her Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

/S/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Ismael Ahmed, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: December 1, 2010

Date Mailed: December 2, 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.

VLA [REDACTED]

cc: [REDACTED]