

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2012-39830  
Issue No.: 3055; 6052  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 5, 2012  
County: Wayne County DHS#17

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Carmen G. Fahie

**AMENDED 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 Tuesday, June 5, 2012, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] Agent #88, of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: the claimant.

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

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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP)     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA) | <input checked="" 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 on February 13, 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  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits during the period of April 1, 2006 through April 30, 2009.
4. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report changes in employment and income as verified in her application/redetermination signed on October 24, 2006, January 29, 2008 and December 2, 2008. Department Exhibit 19-26, 29-36, and 41-56. In addition, the respondent used a fictitious address for her daycare provider that does not exist on signed CDC and provider application October 22, 2006. Department Exhibit 12-18. The respondent also claimed to be employed as a daycare provider for her stepsister, but there was no daycare payments made to the respondent for the contested time period. Department Exhibit 37.
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 April 1, 2006 through April 30, 2009.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued of \$ [REDACTED] of  CDC and \$ [REDACTED] of  FAP program benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. Respondent was entitled to of \$0 under the  CDC and \$ [REDACTED] under the  FAP program during this time period.
9. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the  CDC and \$ [REDACTED] under the  FAP program.
10. The Department  has  has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
11. This was Respondent's  first  second  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 AAC, 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.

Additionally, the respondent provided a false address for her day care provider, which made her ineligible for CDC benefits. In addition, the respondent failed to comply with Work First requirements in May 2006. She received her last check from Sunrise Senior Living Management in April, 2006. The respondent failed to provide employment verifications, but continued to receive CDC benefits.

The objective evidence on the record documented that the respondent was given an opportunity to submit proof of employment verification, but failed to do so by the deadline. Department Exhibit 3. She filed no taxes for 2007. In addition, there was no record of the respondent receiving payment under her daycare provider number for the contested time period. In addition, the hours of operation for RDT Provider Services was listed as 9 am to 6 pm, but the respondent claimed to work 10 pm to 6 am from Monday to Wednesday and Thursday to Friday from 4 am to 12 pm. Department Exhibit 38-39.

Upon further reflection of the objective evidence on the record, the department has met their burden under clear and convincing evidence. The standard for Clear and convincing evidence is evidence that "produce[s] in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established, evidence so clear, direct, and weighty and convincing as to enable [the fact finder] to come to a clear conviction, without hesitancy, of the truth of the precise facts in issue." In re Martin, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995), quoting In re Jobes, 108 NJ 394, 407-408; 529 A2d 434 (1987). As a result, the department has met their burden that the respondent committed an intentional program violation and the department is required to recoup the amount of the overissuance.

**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 \$ [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  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 \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
  - The Department is ORDERED to reduce the OI to \_\_\_\_\_ for the period \_\_\_\_\_, in accordance with Department policy.
  - It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from
    - FIP  FAP  SDA for a period of
    - 12 months.  24 months.  lifetime.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Carmen G. Fahie  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: April 10, 2013

Date Mailed: April 10, 2013

201239830/CGF

**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.

CGF/hj

cc:

