

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2012-65309  
Issue No.: 3055  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: September 5, 2012  
County: Wayne (82-43)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Robert J. Chavez

**HEARING DECISION FOR CONCURRENT BENEFITS**  
**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 September 5, 2012 from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Agent [REDACTED] of 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 400.3187(5).

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of

- Family Independence Program (FIP)     Food Assistance Program (FAP)  
 Medical Assistance Program (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 Program (FIP)     Food Assistance Program (FAP)

### **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 February 6, 2012, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having received concurrent program benefits and, as such, 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  FAP  FIP  MA benefits during the period of October 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on July 26, 2006, Respondent indicated that she understood her responsibility to report any changes.
5. The fraud period in question is from October 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.
6. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$5,636 in  FAP  FIP  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$5,576 in  FAP  FIP  MA benefits from the State of Missouri.
8. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
9. 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 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 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).

- (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).

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases when:

- benefit overissuance 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, or
  - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed 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, or except when the OI 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.

A person is disqualified for a period of 10 years if found guilty through the Administrative Hearing Process, convicted in court or by signing a repayment and disqualification agreement (e.g., DHS-826, DHS-830) of having made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his or her identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203, pg. 1 (2011).

Therefore, the undersigned may only find an IPV if there is clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally made a false or misleading statement, or intentionally withheld information with the intention to commit an IPV, with regard to the FAP program. Thus, the Department must not only prove that the respondent committed an act, but that there was intent to commit the act.

In this case, the Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all changes to the Department. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. However, the undersigned is not convinced that the Department has met its burden of proof in providing clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intended to defraud the Department with regard to her FAP eligibility.

The burden of proof that the Department must meet in order to prove IPV is very high. It is not enough to prove that the respondent was aware of the requirements to report at some point, nor is it enough to prove that the respondent did not report in a timely manner. The Department must prove in a clear and convincing manner that, not only did the respondent withhold critical information, but also the respondent withheld this information with the intent to commit an IPV.

In other words, the Department must prove that the respondent did not simply forget to meet his or her obligations to report, but, rather, actively sought to defraud the Department.

The Department has failed to prove that in the current case. Respondent most recently applied for FAP benefits on July 26, 2006. These benefits were approved; they then ceased in October 2006. In September 2006, Respondent applied for FAP benefits in the State of Missouri. These benefits were approved and started in December 2006. Respondent's Michigan benefits started again in October 2007, and Respondent continued her Missouri benefits through that period of time. However, the Department does not provide any information as to how or why these benefits started. No application, redetermination, or other form was presented to show why these benefits started. It is unknown whether Respondent even requested these benefits to start, or if Respondent even had moved back into Michigan. The Department has presented no evidence as to whether Respondent intentionally misled or failed to report receiving Missouri benefits.

Additionally, the Department has not presented evidence that Respondent used these two sets of benefits simultaneously, by spending both sets. While the Department alleges in their investigative report that this occurred, no evidence was presented to substantiate this allegation.

Either of those two pieces of evidence—a 2007 application or a showing that Respondent spent both sets of benefits—would have been enough to show by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld information with the intent to commit an IPV. However, the Department has not presented this information and,

therefore, has not met their burden of proof. The evidence shows that Respondent left the State in 2006, and then her Michigan benefits reopened in 2007. The evidence does not show that Respondent caused her Michigan benefits to reopen, or was even aware that they were open.

The Administrative Law Judge, therefore, cannot say that the Department has proven their case by clear and convincing evidence and declines to find an IPV.

However, the Department has proven that Respondent received \$5,636 in FAP benefits that were unlawfully issued by virtue of Respondent already receiving benefits in Missouri at the time these benefits were issued, and the Administrative Law Judge holds that the Department may lawfully recoup this OI. However, the Administrative Law Judge also holds that the evidence does not show clearly and convincingly that this OI was obtained with an intent to commit an IPV.

### **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.
  2. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$5,636 from the following program(s)  FAP  FIP  MA.
- The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.
- The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$5,636 in accordance with Department policy.



---

**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: September 14, 2012

Date Mailed: September 14, 2012

2012-65309/RJC

**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.

RJC/pf

cc:

