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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:

201224236 3055

March 22, 2012 Kalamazoo County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

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 hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 22, 2012 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Code R 400.3130(5), or Mich Admin Code R 400.3187(5).

ISSUES

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of



Family Independence Program (FIP) State Disability Assistance (SDA)


Food Assistance Program (FAP)

Child Development and Care (CDC)

Medical Assistance

benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

- Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
- 3. Should Respondent be disgualified from receiving



FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- 1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on December 20, 2011 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
- 2. The OIG 🖂 has 🗌 has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
- 3. Respondent was a recipient of FIP K FAP SDA CDC MA benefits during the period of November 1, 2010 through October 31, 2011.
- 4. Respondent was a recipient of FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits during the period of September 1, 2010 through October 31, 2011.
- 5. Respondent 🖂 was 🗌 was not aware of the responsibility to report all changes within 10 days.
- 6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
- 7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is November 1, 2010 through October 31, 2011 for FAP and September 1, 2010 through October 31, 2011 for MA.
- 8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued in FAP benefits and in MA benefits.
- 9. Respondent was entitled to \$0 in \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square SDA \square CDC \boxtimes MA benefits during the fraud period.
- 10. Respondent 🖾 did 🗌 did not receive an OI in the amount of under the FAP program and an OI in the amount of under the MA program.
- 11. The Department \boxtimes has \square has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
- 12. This was Respondent's \boxtimes first \square second \square third IPV.
- 13. A notice of disqualification hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and □ was ⊠ was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

The MA program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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

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.

IPV is suspected when there is clear and convincing evidence that the client has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720.

The Department's OIG requests IPV 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

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IPV 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 who commit an IPV 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.

Here the OIG provided unequivocal evidence that Respondent became a resident of North Carolina as early as September 15, 2010, when the Respondent began using her EBT card exclusively in North Carolina. On that date, the Respondent was no longer eligible to receive FAP or MA benefits. BEM 220, p 1.

Based on the credible testimony and other evidence presented, I have concluded the OIG established, under the clear and convincing standard, that Respondent committed an IPV in this matter. As at no time did the Respondent inform the Department of her move to the State of North Carolina as she knew she was required to do in order to receive additional benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

I have concluded, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

- 1. Respondent \boxtimes did \square did not commit an IPV
- 2. Respondent 🖂 did 🗌 did not receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of **second** for the FAP program and **second** for the MA program.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.

<u>/s/</u>

Corey A. Arendt Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 23, 2012

Date Mailed: March 23, 2012

201224236/CAA

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.

CAA/cr

