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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: Issue No.:	

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice G. Spodarek

## 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 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by with the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

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 400.3178(5).

## **ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of



Family Independence Program (FIP)

State Disability Assistance (SDA)

Medical Assistance (MA)

benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

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

Family Independence Progr	am (F	FIP)
State Disability Assistance	(SDA)	)

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

Food Assistance Program (FAP)

Child Development and Care (CDC)

# FINDINGS OF FACT

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

#### 2012-60771/JGS

- 1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on set to be 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 MA benefits during the period of for the FAP program and for the MA program.
- 4. Respondent ⊠ was □ was not aware of the responsibility to report all changes in household circumstances per a DHS-1171.
- 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 the FAP program and for the MA program.
- 7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,101 in FAP benefits and \$147.95 in MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
- 8. The department's evidence regarding the usage and cashing of the FAP benefits out of the State of Michigan contained a number of transaction days that do not indicate the retailer, address, or the state where the FAP benefits were cashed. There is also an interruption where claimant obviously returned to Michigan (on

) which was continuously counted as an out of state cashing of Michigan FAP benefits. The department's evidence is not clear and convincing evidence of an IPV.

- 9. Respondent i did i did not receive an OI based upon the department's evidence presented at the hearing.
- 10. The Department in has in has not established that Respondent committed IPV's. The department stipulated that the threshold amount was no longer meet which was based evidentially on the policy at the time at issue for the fraud herein.
- 11. 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,

2012-60771/JGS

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,

#### 2012-60771/JGS

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.

As noted in the findings of facts, the department's evidence was not clear and convincing evidence of an IPV of the FAP and MA programs. The reasons, as stated in the findings of facts, is that the evidence submitted with regards to the usage of these benefits out of state contain a number of dates which do not show the retailer name and/or the state in which the benefits were utilized and/or cashed. Moreover, when these amounts are deducted, the remaining amount does not meet the minimum threshold for an IPV. The policy in affect at the time of the alleged fraud was less than current policy. The department stipulated that the threshold was not meet and that this case did not have sufficient evidence to warrant going forward.

This ALJ wishes to note that the evidence is insufficient to find by a preponderance of evidence whether or not there is an OI.

This ALJ finds that there is no IPV of the FAP and MA program for the alleged fraud time period as specified herein.

### DECISION AND ORDER

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

- 1. Respondent i did i did not commit an IPV's of the FAP and MA programs.
- There is no evidence based upon a preponderance of evidence with regards to an OI regarding the FAP and MA programs for the alleged time period. The department may choose to bring another action with new evidence. The department stipulated that the evidence herein is insufficient.
- The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.

/s/ Janice G. Spodarek Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed:

Date Mailed:

**<u>NOTICE</u>**: 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.

JGS/jk

CC:

