## STATE OF MICHIGAN STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

## ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

IN THE MATTER OF:

Respondent

Reg. No:2009-1774Issue No:6052Case No:1000Load No:1000Hearing Date:1000November 26, 20081000Kent County DHS

## ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Gary F. Heisler

## HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37, 7 CFR 273.16, MAC R 400.3130, and MAC R 400.3178 upon the Department of Human Services (department) request for a disqualification hearing. After due notice, a hearing was held on November 26, 2008. Respondent did not appear.

## <u>ISSUE</u>

Whether respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and whether

respondent received an overissuance of benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

## FINDINGS OF FACT

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

(1) On the control of the control of

. The application was marked that the care provider was the children's but that care was not provided in the home the children lived in.

(2) On second and the second of the second s

(3) Between and and child care for respondent's children was billed, and paid, in the amount of \$

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Child Development and Care 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 of Human Services (DHS or department) provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and MAC R 400.5001-5015. Department policies are contained in the Program Administrative Manual (PAM), the Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

In this case, the department has requested a disqualification hearing to establish an overissuance of benefits as a result of an IPV and the department has asked that respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits. The department's manuals provide the following relevant policy statements and instructions for department caseworkers:

# PAM 720 INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION DEPARTMENT POLICY

#### **All Programs**

Recoupment policies and procedures vary by program and overissuance (OI) type. This item explains Intentional Program Violation (IPV) processing and establishment.

2

PAM 700 explains OI discovery, OI types and standards of promptness. PAM 705 explains agency error and PAM 715 explains client error.

# DEFINITIONS

# All Programs

**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 or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility.

# FAP Only

IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits.

# IPV

# FIP, SDA and FAP

The client/authorized representative (AR) is determined to have committed an IPV by:

- A court decision.
- An administrative hearing decision.
- The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing or DHS-830, Disqualification Consent Agreement or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms.

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 (\_\_\_\_\_), quoting *In re Jobes*, 108 NJ 394, 407-408; 529 A2d 434 (1987).

The evidence does show that an over-issuance of Child Development and Care (CDC) benefits occurred. Respondent's child care was being provided by a relative care provider in the relative's home. The provider would submit the billed hours and be paid directly. The evidence in the record is insufficient to determine whether respondent took the children and left them for care. Knowing culpability for the over-issuance is necessary to establish an intentional program violation against either **evidence** or the **evidence** neither can be determined from the evidence in this record.

#### DECISION AND ORDER

Program Violation on the part of either Respondent or her relative care provider.

<u>/s/</u> Gary F. Heisler Administrative Law Judge for Ismael Ahmed, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: \_\_February 9, 2009

Date Mailed: February 10, 2009

<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.

GFH/om

