

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Calhoun 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 October 20, 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 Redetermination, the department discovered that Respondent had been working at the [REDACTED] but had not reported the income. On July 21, 2010, the department received verification of employment from the [REDACTED] showing she was employed and had been started working on January 11, 2010. (Department Exhibits 14-16).
2. Respondent received an overissuance of [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during the fraud period of May 2010 through June 2010. If the income had been properly reported and budgeted by the department, Respondent would not have been eligible to receive FAP benefits. (Department Exhibits 39-44).

### 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 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.

In this case, the department discovered Respondent was working at the Kellogg Center after she completed her Redetermination. The verification of employment from the Work Number showed Respondent had been working there since January 11, 2010 and Respondent had 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 FAP program, resulting in a [REDACTED] overissuance from May 2010 through June 2010. Consequently, the department's request for 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 FAP program by failing to report that she was working while receiving benefits for the period of time from May 2010 through June 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. Respondent is ORDERED to reimburse the department for the [REDACTED] FAP overissuance caused by her intentional program violation.

It is SO ORDERED.

/s/

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

Date Signed: 10/24/11

Date Mailed: 10/24/11

**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]