

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2011-20382  
Issue No.: 3052  
[REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: October 12, 2011  
DHS County: Genesee (05)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Michael J. Bennane

**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 Service's (Department) request for a disqualification hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 12, 2011. The Respondent did not appear. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] agent, Office of Inspector General (OIG).

**ISSUES**

- (1) Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?
- (2) Is the Department entitled to recoup \$3,146.00 in FAP benefits?
- (3) Should the Respondent be disqualified from FAP for two years?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

- (1) On February 14, 2011, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish Respondent allegedly intentionally withheld information and received an overissuance of FAP benefits; and the Department is requesting to recoup \$3,146.00.00 in FAP benefits for the period of April 1, 2007, through October 31, 2007.
- (2) On May 27, 2004, and July 16, 2007, the Respondent signed applications/re-determinations and acknowledged the obligation to report change in the

circumstances that might affect the Respondent's benefits. (Department exhibits pp. 7-22).

- (3) On both the May 27, 2004 and July 16, 2007 applications, the Respondent failed to report income earned as a substitute teacher beginning November 27, 2000 and continuing through September of 2007.
- (4) On October 9, 2007 the Department received information that showed that the Respondent was receiving FAP benefits while employed without notifying the Department of such employment. (Department exhibit p.23).
- (5) On September 13, 2007, the Department received employment verification showing that the Respondent was employed at [REDACTED] Schools. (Department exhibits 25-26).
- (6) The Respondent did not report a physical or mental condition that may limit the Respondent's understanding or ability to fulfill the employment and income reporting responsibilities.
- (7) The Department sent notice of this hearing to the Respondent at her last known address; [REDACTED], and the mail was not returned.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp 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 administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

In this case, the Department requested a disqualification hearing; to establish an overissuance of benefits; to recoup the overissuance, and the Department is seeking a disqualification of the Respondent barring the receipt of benefits. The Department's manuals provide the relevant policy statements and instructions for Department caseworkers. In part, the policies provide:

**BENEFIT OVERISSUANCES: BAM 700, p. 1**

**DEPARTMENT POLICY**

**All Programs**

When a customer group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the department must attempt to recoup the over issuance (OI).

The **Automated Recoupment System (ARS)** is the part of CIMS that tracks all FIP, SDA and FAP OIs and payments, issues automated collection notices and triggers automated benefit reductions for active programs.

An **over issuance (OI)** is the amount of benefits issued to the customer group in excess of what they were eligible to receive.

**Over issuance Type** identifies the cause of an over issuance.

**Recoupment** is a department action to identify and recover a benefit over issuance. PAM 700, p.1.

## **PREVENTION OF OVERISSUANCES**

### **All Programs**

The department must inform customers of their reporting responsibilities and act on the information reported within the standard of promptness.

During eligibility determination and while the case is active, customers are repeatedly reminded of reporting responsibilities, including:

- acknowledgments on the application form, **and**
- your explanation at application/re-determination interviews, **and**
- customer notices and program pamphlets.

The department must prevent OIs by following BAM 10.5 requirements and by informing the customer or authorized representative of the following:

- Applicants and recipients are required by law to give complete and accurate information about their circumstances.
- Applicants and recipients are required by law to promptly notify the department of any changes in circumstances within 10 days.

- Incorrect, late reported or omitted information causing an OI can result in cash repayment or benefit reduction.
- A timely hearing request can delete a proposed benefit reduction. If the department is upheld or the customer fails to appear at the hearing, the customer must repay the OI.

Record on the application the customer's comments and/or questions about the above responsibilities. BAM 700, p.2.

## **INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

### **SUSPECTED IPV**

#### **All Programs**

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- the customer intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination; **and**
- the customer was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities; **and**
- the customer has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill his reporting responsibilities.

Intentional Program Violation (IPV) is suspected when the customer 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 customer acted intentionally for this purpose. BAM 720, p.1

### **OVERISSUANCE AMOUNT**

#### **FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP Only**

The amount of the OI is the amount of benefits the group actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 6.

#### **IPV Hearings**

### **FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP Only**

OIG represents the department during the hearing process for IPV hearings.

OIG requests IPV hearings when no signed FIA-826 or FIA-830 is obtained, and correspondence to the customer is not returned as undeliverable, or a new address is located.

OIG requests IPV hearings for cases involving:

1. Prosecution of welfare fraud or . . . is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, **and**

The total OI amount of FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$1,000.00 or more or . . .

### **DISQUALIFICATION**

#### **FIP, SDA and FAP Only**

Disqualify an active **or** inactive recipient who:

- is found by a court or hearing decision to have committed IPV, **or**
- has signed an FIA-826 or FIA-830, **or**
- is convicted of concurrent receipt of assistance by a court, **or**

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.

#### **Standard Disqualification Periods BAM 720, pp. 12, 13 FIP, SDA and FAP**

The standard disqualification period is used in all instances except when a **court** orders a different period (see **Non-Standard Disqualification Periods** in this item).

Apply the following disqualification periods to recipients determined to have committed IPV:

- One year for the first IPV

- Two years for the second IPV
- Lifetime for the third IPV

The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

(c) Definition of **intentional program violation** . For purposes of determining through administrative disqualification hearings whether or not a person has committed an intentional program violation, intentional program violations shall consist of having intentionally: (1) Made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts, or (2 ) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program regulations, or any State statute related to the use, presentation, transfer, acquisition , receipt, or possession of food stamp coupons or ATP's. 7 CFR 273.16(c).

The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

(6) Criteria for determining intentional program violation. The hearing authority shall base the determination of intentional program violation on clear and convincing evidence which demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, intentional program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section. 7 CFR 273.16(c) (6).

In this case, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent knowingly withheld information from the Department. Evidence at the hearing shows that the Respondent was receiving employment income and failed to notify the Department when completing the applications.

### **All Programs**

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- the customer intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination; **and**
- the customer was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities; **and**
- the customer has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill his/her reporting responsibilities. BAM 720, p. 1.

The Department is entitled to recoup the amount issued in excess of what the Respondent was eligible to receive. The undersigned reviewed the FAP budgets presented and the overissuance amount of FAP benefits they show; and finds the Department's FAP budget computations to be correct. Respondent owes \$3,146.00 in FAP benefits. The Department is entitled to recoup this amount.

**DECISION AND ORDER**


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

1. The evidence does establish that the Respondent committed a second IPV of the FAP program. The Department's request for disqualification from the FAP program for two years is GRANTED.
2. The Department is entitled to recoup overissuance of FAP benefits for a total of \$3,146.00.

Michael  
Administrative  
for  
Department

Date Signed: October 19, 2011

Date Mailed: October 19, 2011

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Bennane  
Law Judge  
Maura Corrigan, Director  
of Human Services

**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.

MJB/cl

cc:

