

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-20111
Issue No.: 3052
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: February 27, 2013
County: Wayne (18)

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 February 27, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent, [REDACTED] (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).

On April 25, 2013, this case was reassigned to Administrative Law Judge Jan Leventer for preparation of a decision and order.

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 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

- Family Independence Program (FIP) Food Assistance Program (FAP)
 State Disability Assistance (SDA) 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 January 25, 2013 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 October, 2010, through October, 2011.
4. Respondent was was not aware of the responsibility to report truthful information, and, of the responsibility to report complete and accurate information, for the purpose of receiving only those benefits to which he was entitled.
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 October, 2010-October, 2011.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,983.00 in FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. Respondent was entitled to \$0.00 in FIP FAP SDA CDC MA during this time period.
9. Respondent did did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the FIP FAP SDA CDC MA 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 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.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (2013).

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. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (2013).

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, or
- 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. *Id.*

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. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 710 (2009). 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, in an IPV case the first element that must be proved is that the Respondent intentionally concealed information, or provided inaccurate or incomplete information, for the purpose of receiving benefits to which he was not entitled. BAM 720, p. 1. Having reviewed all of the evidence in this case in its entirety, it is found and determined that there is no evidence that Respondent intentionally concealed information, or that he intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information, to the Department, for the purpose of receiving benefits to which he was not entitled. The evidence in this case consists of FAP benefit and purchase records, and materials relating to the store where the purchases were made. Dept. Exh. 1, pp. 11-38. There is also a report of an interview with Respondent, and these notes do not contain information supporting a conclusion that Respondent intentionally failed to report information or that he intentionally reported inaccurate or incomplete information.

Also in the record is an "Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement," signed by Respondent on February 4, 2013. Having examined the text of this document, it is found and determined that there is nothing in this document to indicate that Respondent acknowledged by his signature that he intentionally failed to report information, or that he reported inaccurate or incomplete information, for the purpose of receiving benefits for which he was not entitled. Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement, February 4, 2013. The text of this document explains the repayment procedures, a payment plan, default consequences, and it does not address the essential IPV question of intent.

Accordingly, having considered all of the evidence in this case as a whole, it is found and determined that the Department failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent had the necessary intent to commit an IPV. The Department's request for a finding of IPV is DENIED.


The second request by the Department in this action is whether an overissuance occurred in this case. In this case the Respondent signed a repayment agreement acknowledging the overpayment and agreeing to pay it back. As the Respondent agrees that there was an overissuance, there is no need for the factfinder to take this question under consideration. The Department's request for a finding of overissuance is GRANTED.

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 \$1,983.00 from the following program(s) FIP FAP SDA CDC MA.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1,983.00 in accordance with Department policy.



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

Date Signed: May 13, 2013

Date Mailed: May 13, 2013

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/tm

cc:

