

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 201151239  
Issue No: 3055, 6052  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: November 10, 2011  
Wayne County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christopher S. Saunders

**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 10, 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 the Child Development and Care (CDC) Program?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. 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.
2. Respondent completed an application for public assistance on July 12, 2005 (DHS 1171), acknowledging her responsibility to report any changes in her income, resources, or living arrangements to the department within ten days of the change. The Respondent also acknowledged her responsibility to report those changes to the department on her applications for CDC benefits (DHS 4583) dated October 15, 2003 and July 22, 2004. (Department Exhibits 19-34).

3. Upon investigation, the department discovered that the Respondent's employment with her listed employer, [REDACTED], had ended on August 18, 2005. (Department Exhibits 37-43).
4. The Respondent did not inform the department that her employment had ended and continued to receive CDC benefits even after her employment had ended. (Department Exhibits 44-45).
5. The Respondent did not inform the department that she was no longer a resident of the state of Michigan. Beginning September 7, 2006, all of the Respondent's FAP purchase with her EBT card occurred in Texas. (Department Exhibits 48-51).
6. As a result of the Respondent's failure to report that she was no longer employed, she received an overissuance of CDC benefits for the period of August 21, 2005 through August 19, 2006 in the amount of [REDACTED]. (Department Exhibits 44-45).
7. As a result of the Respondent's failure to report to the department that she was no longer a resident of the state of Michigan, she received an overissuance of FAP benefits for the period of October 1, 2006 through February 28, 2007 in the amount of [REDACTED]. (Department Exhibits 46-51).
7. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report true and accurate information to the department.
8. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill the income reporting responsibilities.
9. The Respondent has not committed any previous intentional program violations.

### **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).

The Child Development and Care program is established by Titles IVA, IVE, and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program

is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department of Human Services (DHS or Department) provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and MAC R 400.5001-5015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Reference Table Manual (RFT), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

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, Respondent failed to notify the department that she was no longer employed, and therefore did not have a further need for CDC services. As a result of her failure to inform the department of her lack of CDC need and her continued receipt of benefits, she committed an intentional program violation of the CDC program.

Additionally, because the Respondent failed to notify the department that she was no longer a resident of the state of Michigan and because she continued to use her benefits solely in the state of Texas, the Respondent committed an intentional program violation of the FAP program. Because this is the Respondent's first IPV of the FAP program, the one year disqualification period is appropriate.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation of the CDC program by failing to notify the department that she was no longer employed and did not have further need for CDC services. Furthermore, the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation of the FAP program by failing to notify the department that she was no longer a resident of the state of Michigan.

Therefore, it is HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Respondent shall reimburse the department for FAP benefits ineligibly received as a result of her intentional program violation in the amount of [REDACTED]0.
2. The Respondent is personally ineligible to participate in the FAP program for the period of one year. The disqualification period shall be applied immediately.

3. The Respondent shall reimburse the department for CDC benefits ineligibly received as a result of her intentional program violation in the amount of

[REDACTED]

/s/

Christopher S. Saunders  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 16, 2011

Date Mailed: November 17, 2011

**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.

CSS/cr

cc:

[REDACTED]