

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 201326689  
Issue No.: 3052  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 10, 2013  
County: Wayne (41)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Alice C. Elkin

**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 April 10, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent 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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <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

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <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)?        |

**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 5, 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 relevant periods at issue.
4. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report changes in income and employment to the Department.
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 July 1, 2009 through February 28, 2011 (the "fraud period").
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$3656 in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits from the State of Michigan, and the OIG alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$2254 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits in the amount of \$1402.
9. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
10. 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 Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services, Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).

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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 400.3015.

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

- FAP trafficking OIs are not forwarded to the prosecutor,
- prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
  - the total OI amount is \$1000 or more, or
  - the total OI amount is less than \$1000, and
    - the group has a previous IPV, 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. [BEM 720 (February 1, 2013), p 10.]

#### Intentional Program Violation

Suspected IPV means an overissuance (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. [BAM 720, p 1 (emphasis in original).]

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p 1.

An IPV requires that the Department establish by 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, p 1 (emphasis in original). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true. See M Civ JI 8.01.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent intentionally failed to report her employment and income with [REDACTED] d/b/a [REDACTED] between July 1, 2009 and February 28, 2011, for the purpose of increasing her FAP benefits. The Department presented subpoenas completed by [REDACTED] showing that Claimant was employed by

the company between June 20, 2008, and February 2011. The Department also presented several documents submitted by Respondent between July 2009 and February 2011 in which Respondent identified her employment and income with Quality Inn, but never identified [REDACTED] as another employer. Under these facts, the Department established, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent intentionally withheld information for the purpose of increasing her FAP benefits. Thus, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits.

#### Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an 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, p 12.

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 (October 1, 2009), p 2. 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, p 13.

Because the Department satisfied its burden of establishing that Respondent committed a first IPV of FAP benefits, Respondent is subject to a one year FAP disqualification.

#### Recoupment of Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (February 1, 2013), p 1. The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p 6; BAM 715 (February 1, 2013), pp 1, 5; BAM 705 (February 1, 2013), p 5.

At the hearing, the Department established that \$3656 in FAP benefits were issued by the State of Michigan to Respondent from July 1, 2009 through February 28, 2011, excluding December 2009. The Department presented FAP OI budgets for July 2009 through November 2009 and January 2010 through February 2011, which showed the FAP benefits Respondent would have been eligible to receive if her [REDACTED] income had been properly budgeted. The FAP OI budgets establish that Respondent was eligible for only \$2254 in FAP benefits between July 1, 2009 and February 28, 2011. Thus, the Department established that it was entitled to recoup \$1402 in FAP benefits issued to Respondent (the difference between the \$3656 in FAP benefits she received and the \$2254 in FAP benefits she was eligible to receive) for the period between July 1, 2009, and February 28, 2011.

**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 \$1402 from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA.

The Department is ORDERED to

- delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.
- initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1402 in accordance with Department policy.
- reduce the OI to \_\_\_\_\_ for the period \_\_\_\_\_, in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from

- FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC for a period of
- 12 months.  24 months.  lifetime.

  
**Alice C. Elkin**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 5/3/2013

Date Mailed: 5/3/2013

**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.

ACE/hw

cc:

