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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.:2Issue No.:3Case No.:4Hearing Date:5County:6



ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jan Leventer

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 July 9, 2012, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by

Participants on behalf of Respondent included:

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 F	Progr	am (F	FIP)
State Disability Assista	nce ((SDA))

Medical Assistance (MA)

☐ Food Assistance Program (FAP)
☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)

benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

- 2. Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
- 3. Should Respondent be disqualified 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 June 6, 2012, 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 June 1, 2011, through April 30, 2012.
- 4. Respondent was was not aware of the responsibility to report a change of address to the Department within ten days of the change.
- 5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit his understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
- 6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is June 1, 2011-April 30, 2012.
- 8. Respondent was entitled to \$2,200 in FIP K FAP SDA CDC MA during this time period.
- 9. Respondent ☐ did ⊠ did not receive an OI in the amount of \$2,200 under the ☐ FIP ⊠ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ MA program.
- 10. The Department \Box has \boxtimes has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
- 11. This was Respondent's \boxtimes first \square second \square third IPV.
- 12. A notice of 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 Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

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 (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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

☐ The Medical Assistance (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
 - the group has a previous intentional program violation, or
 - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
 - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance,
 - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IPV disqualifies that client from receiving certain 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, or except when the overissuance relates to MA. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710. 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.

With regard to the Department's allegation of IPV in this case, the Department failed to submit proof that Respondent was informed of his duty to report changes to the Department within ten days of the change. The Department did not submit an application or other document signed by Respondent in which Respondent acknowledged the responsibility to report changes. Without such proof, the Department has not established that Respondent was clearly and correctly instructed as to his responsibility to report changes. Without such instruction, the Department cannot establish that Respondent had the intent to commit an IPV.

Therefore, no IPV has been established by the Department in this case.

With regard to the Department's allegation of an OI in this case, the Department's allegation is that Respondent failed to report a change of address from Michigan to Kentucky within ten days of the change. It must first be shown that the Department's allegation is true, i.e., that there was in fact a change of address event. If a change of address never occurred, there was no OI.

The evidence of record indicates that Respondent made FAP purchases in the State of Kentucky. However, examination of the Department's purchase record does not establish that Respondent changed his residence. The purchase record indicates that he made purchases over ten months only during 1-11 days in any one month. Respondent's whereabouts for the remaining 3-4 weeks out of each month is unknown. The purchase record does not establish that Respondent changed his Michigan address at any time. The purchase record proves only that purchases were made, but not that a change of residence occurred.

It is found and determined that the evidence relied upon by the Department is insufficient to establish a change of residence. Therefore, no IPV or OI has been established by the Department in this case.

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 \Box did \boxtimes did not commit an IPV.
- 2. Respondent ☐ did ⊠ did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$2,200 from the following program(s) ☐ FIP ⊠ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ MA.
- The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.

Jan One ...

Jan Leventer Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 11, 2012

2012-51478/JL

Date Mailed: July 11, 2012

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.

JL/pf

