

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No: 20113255
Issue No: 3055
Case No: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: June 6, 2011
Calhoun County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: **Kandra Robbins**

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 an intentional program violation and disqualification hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on June 6, 2011. Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), MAC R 400.3130(5), or MAC R 400.3187(5).

ISSUE

1. Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) on the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and whether respondent received an overissuance of benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?
2. Whether respondent committed an IPV on the Family Independence Program (FIP) 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. Department's Office of Inspector General (OIG) filed a hearing request to establish an overissuance of FAP benefits received by respondent as a result of respondent having committed an IPV; the OIG also requested that respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
2. Respondent signed Assistance Application (1171) on December 11, 2008 and a Redetermination on April 1, 2009 acknowledging that she understood her

failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against her (Department Exhibit 1, pages 13-32).

3. Respondent reported that she intended to stay in Michigan on the application. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 13-32).
4. Respondent did not report Unemployment Compensation received beginning in December 2008. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 11-18).
5. Respondent received Unemployment Compensation from December 27, 2008 through July 18, 2009. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 37-40).
6. The respondent began making EBT FAP purchases outside of the State of Michigan beginning in May 2009. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 50-54).
7. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is August 1, 2009, through September 30, 2009, for dual benefits and March 1, 2009 through April 30, 2009 for unreported income. (Hearing Summary).
8. During the alleged fraud period, the respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan and [REDACTED] in FIP benefits (Department Exhibit 1 page 36-41).
9. The respondent was issued food stamp benefits in Illinois from August 2009 through September 2009. (Department Exhibit 1, pages 58-59).
10. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of her responsibility to report any changes in residency and income to the department.
11. Respondent was physically and mentally capable of performing her reporting responsibilities.
12. Respondent has committed one previous intentional FAP program violations.
13. Respondent has not committed any previous intentional FIP 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.

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.

In this case, the department has requested a hearing to establish an overissuance of benefits as a result of an Intentional program violation of the Food Assistance Program and Family Independence Program and the department has asked that respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits. The department's manuals provide the following relevant policy statements and instructions for department caseworkers:

BAM 700 BENEFIT OVERISSUANCES

DEPARTMENT POLICY

All Programs

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). BAM, Item 700, p. 1.

Definitions

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.

A **claim** is the resulting debt created by an overissuance of benefits.

The **Discovery Date** is determined by the Recoupment Specialist (RS) for a client or department error. This is the date the OI is known to exist and there is evidence available to determine the OI type. For an Intentional Program Violation (IPV), the Office of Inspector General (OIG) determines the discovery date. This is the date the referral was sent to the prosecutor or the date the OIG requested an administrative disqualification hearing.

The **Establishment Date** for an OI is the date the DHS-4358A-D, Repay Agreement, is sent to the client and for an IPV, the date the DHS-4357 is sent notifying the client when the disqualification and recoupment will start. In CIMS the "establishment date" has been renamed "notice sent date."

An **overissuance (OI)** is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what they were eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold).

Overissuance Type identifies the cause of an overissuance. **Recoupment** is a DHS action to identify and recover a benefit OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

PREVENTION OF OVERISSUANCES

All Programs

DHS must inform clients of their reporting responsibilities and act on the information reported within the Standard of Promptness (SOP).

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

- . Acknowledgments on the application form, **and**
- . Explanation at application/redetermination interviews, **and**
- . Client notices and program pamphlets.
- .

DHS must prevent OIs by following PAM 105 requirements and by informing the client 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 DHS of all changes in circumstances within 10 days. FAP Simplified Reporting (SR) groups are required to report only when the group's actual gross monthly income exceeds the SR income limit for their group size.
- . 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.

INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

DEFINITIONS

All Programs

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

- . 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.

.
Intentional Program Violation (IPV) is suspected when there is clear and convincing evidence that the client or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM, Item 720, p. 1. The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

- (c) Definition of Intentional Program Violation. Intentional Program Violation 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 for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system (access device). 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).

IPV

FIP, SDA AND FAP

IPV exists when the client/AR is determined to have committed an Intentional Program Violation by:

- . A court decision.
- . An administrative hearing decision.
- . The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification or DHS-83, Disqualification Consent Agreement, or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms. BAM, Item 720, p. 1.

FAP Only

IPV exists when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. BAM 720, p. 2.

OVERISSUANCE AMOUNT

FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP Only

The amount of the OI is the amount of benefits the group or provider 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 DHS during the hearing process for IPV hearings.

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

OIG requests IPV hearing for cases involving:

1. FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
2. Prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, **and**

The total OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$1,000 or more, **or**

The total OI amount is less than \$1,000, **and**

- .. The group has a previous IPV, **or**
- .. The alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, **or**
- .. The alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), **or**
- .. The alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

Excluding FAP, OIG will send the OI to the RS to process as a client error when the DHS-826 or DHS-830 is returned as undeliverable and no new address is obtained. BEM, Item 720, p. 10.

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 a DHS-826 or DHS-830, **or**
- . is convicted of concurrent receipt of assistance by a court, **or**
- . for FAP, is found by SOAHR or a court to have trafficked FAP 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, pp. 12-13.

Standard Disqualification Periods

FIP, SDA and FAP Only

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

FIP and FAP Only

- . Ten years for concurrent receipt of benefits (see PEM 203). BAM 720, p. 13.

In this case, the department has established that respondent was aware of the responsibility to report any changes in circumstances that might affect eligibility for services. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities.

The respondent was required to report all household income to determine eligibility. However, the respondent failed to report unemployment compensation. Based on clear and convincing evidence, it is found that respondent intentionally failed to inform the department that a member of the household was receiving income.

Respondent received FAP and FIP benefits in March and April 2009. The respondent was receiving unearned income in the form of unemployment compensation during this time period. Beginning in March 2009, the respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits. The respondent was only entitled to receive [REDACTED] FAP benefits because of the household income level. The respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP OI. The respondent received [REDACTED] in FIP Benefits. The respondent was not entitled to receive any FIP benefits as a result of the household income during this time period. The respondent received [REDACTED] in FIP OI. The respondent received a total overissuance from the State of Michigan from March 2009 through April 2009 in the amount of [REDACTED].

The benefits issued during this period were in error as the respondent was receiving income. The respondent would not have been eligible to receive benefits if he had reported this income.

The respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during August and September 2009 from the State of Michigan. In August 2009, she also began receiving food stamp benefits from the State of Illinois. She received [REDACTED] in food assistance from the State of Illinois during this same time period.

In this case, the respondent was receiving food assistance from the State of Michigan and the State of Illinois in August and September 2009. Policy prohibits any individual from receiving food benefits in two states at the same time. Based on clear and convincing evidence, it is found that respondent intentionally failed to inform the department that she was receiving program benefits from the State of Michigan from the State of Illinois.

Department policy indicates that the overissuance amount is the amount of benefits the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM, item 720, p. 6. The respondent was issued the following benefits during August and September 2009 [REDACTED] from the State of Michigan and [REDACTED]0 from the State of Illinois.

All of the benefits issued during this period were in error as the claimant was receiving benefits in another state and would not have been eligible to receive benefits if she had reported.

This Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that respondent committed a second intentional violation of the FAP program, resulting in a [REDACTED] overissuance. Consequently, the department's request for FAP disqualification and full restitution must be granted.

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 program, resulting in a [REDACTED] overissuance. Consequently, the department's request for FIP disqualification and full restitution must be granted.

Based on clear and convincing evidence, it is found that the respondent intentionally committed the program violation as she applied to receive benefits from the State of Illinois while she was already receiving benefits from the State of Michigan. Furthermore, she did not report unearned income during this time period.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the clear and convincing evidence, decides respondent committed a second intentional FAP program violation and first intentional FIP program violation. The Respondent committed this violation in order to receive multiple FAP benefits from two different states simultaneously.

Therefore it is ORDERED that:

1. Respondent shall be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years. This disqualification period shall begin to run immediately as of the date of this Order.
2. Respondent shall be personally disqualified from participation in the FIP program for 1 year. This disqualification period shall begin to run immediately as of the date of this Order.
3. Respondent is responsible for full restitution of the [REDACTED] FAP overissuance and [REDACTED] in FIP overissuance caused by her IPV.

/s/

Kandra Robbins
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: June 9, 2011

Date Mailed: June 10, 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.

KR/ar

cc:

