

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201228668  
Issue No.: 3055  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 22, 2012  
County: Jackson 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 [REDACTED] 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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)       | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> State Emergency Relief (SER) |   |
- benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

2. Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?

3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA) | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)?        |

**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 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  FAP  SDA  CDC benefits during the period of September 1, 2010 through October 31, 2010.
4. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report changes to the Department.
5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is September 1, 2010 through October 31, 2010.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC program.
9. The Department  has  has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
10. This was Respondent's  first  second  third IPV.
11. 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.

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.

In accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 725, p 18, an IPV hearing may not proceed and must be dismissed, where the respondent or her representative fails to appear and the notice of hearing is returned as undeliverable.

Here the OIG provided unequivocal evidence that Respondent failed to notify the Department regarding her husbands return to work in order to receive FAP benefits.

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.

In addition, it was determined that the notice of hearing, hearing summary, and related documents that were mailed to the claimant's last known address were returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable. In accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 725, p 18, \*a debt collection \*intentional program violation hearing may not proceed and must be dismissed, where the respondent or \*his/her representative fails to appear and the notice of hearing is returned as undeliverable in regards to all issues other than FAP. Therefore, the SER issue is dismissed without prejudice.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, concludes that:

1. Respondent  did  did not commit an IPV in regards to the **FAP only**.
2. Respondent  did  did not receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of \$1,588 from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] for the overissuance of **FAP benefits only**, in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from

FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC for a period of  
 12 months.  24 months.  lifetime.

3. The Department's request for a hearing regarding the  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA  SER program is **DISMISSED** WITHOUT PREJUDICE because the notice of hearing, hearing summary, and related documents that were mailed to the claimant's last known address were returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable.

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

Date Signed: March 23, 2012

Date Mailed: March 23, 2012

201228668/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

cc:

