

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2011-25856  
Issue No: 3055\1052  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date:  
November 8, 2011  
Wayne 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 upon the Department of Human Services (department) request for a disqualification hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 8, 2011, at which Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the department and due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in Respondent's absence in accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual, Item 725.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) 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. Based on a Wage Match, the department discovered that Respondent was working at [REDACTED], and had not reported the income. On September 22, 2008, the department received a verification of employment showing Respondent was currently employed at [REDACTED] and had been since November 29, 1999. (Department Exhibits 27-31).
2. Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits and [REDACTED] in FIP benefits during the alleged fraud period of September 2005 through March 2006. If the income had been properly reported and budgeted by the department, Respondent would not have been eligible to receive FIP benefits and would only have been eligible to receive [REDACTED] in FAP

benefits, resulting in a FAP overissuance in the amount of [REDACTED].  
(Department Exhibits 32-60).

### 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. The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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. When a customer client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700.

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 of the FIP and FAP programs.

In this case, the department discovered Respondent was working at Oakwood Healthcare. The Verification of Employment from September 22, 2008 showed Respondent was still employed at Oakwood Healthcare and had been working there since November 29, 1999. Respondent failed to timely report this income.

This Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed a first intentional violation of the FIP and FAP program, resulting in a [REDACTED] FAP overissuance and a [REDACTED] FIP overissuance from September 2005 through March 2006. Consequently, the department's request for FIP and FAP program disqualification and full restitution must be granted.

### DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation of the FIP

and FAP programs by failing to report that she was working while receiving benefits for the period of time from September 2005 through March 2006.

Therefore, it is ordered that:

1. Respondent shall be personally disqualified from participation in the FIP and 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. Respondent is ORDERED to reimburse the department for the [REDACTED] FAP overissuance and [REDACTED] FIP overissuance caused by her intentional program violations.

It is SO ORDERED.

/s/

Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 11/10/11

Date Mailed: 11/10/11

**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/ds

[REDACTED]