

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201332761  
Issue No.: 3052  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 24, 2013  
County: Wayne (18)

**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 24, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Lead 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 March 7, 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 residency 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 January 1, 2010 through August 31, 2010 (the "fraud period").
7. The Department alleges that during the alleged fraud period, Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits in the amount of \$1398.46.
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 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 the following cases:

- FAP trafficking OIs that 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,
    - 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 committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department that she no longer resided in Michigan, but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while out of state. To be eligible for FAP benefits issued by the Department, an individual must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (July 1, 2009 and January 1, 2012), p 1. A person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if he has no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. BEM 220, p

1. A client who resides outside the State of Michigan for more than thirty days is not eligible for FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan. BEM 212 (October 1, 2008), pp 2-3.

The Department established that from January 11, 2010 through August 11, 2010, Respondent used her FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state, in [REDACTED]. While this evidence may be sufficient to establish that Respondent no longer resided in Michigan and was no longer eligible for FAP benefits, to establish an IPV the Department must present clear and convincing evidence that Respondent **intentionally** withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining benefits. The Department did not present any evidence other than Respondent's out of state use to establish Respondent's intent. This evidence alone was not sufficient to establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented her change of address to the Department for the purpose of maintaining her Michigan FAP eligibility. Thus, the Department has failed to establish 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.

In this case, the Department has failed to satisfy its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is not subject to a disqualification under the FAP program.

#### 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 \$1400 in FAP benefits were issued by the State of Michigan to Respondent from January 1, 2010 through July 31, 2010. In support of its FAP OI case, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history showing her use of \$1398.46 in FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state beginning January 11, 2010. Clients are not eligible for FAP

benefits if they do not reside in Michigan. PEM 220 (October 1, 2007), p 1; BEM 220 (July 1, 2009 and January 1, 2012), p 1. As discussed above, Respondent's FAP use out of state established that she did not reside in Michigan. Thus, she was overissued FAP benefits.

To determine the first month of the OI period, BAM 715 and BAM 720 provide that the Department must consider (i) the client reporting period per BAM 105, (ii) the full standard of promptness for change processing per BAM 220, and (iii) the full negative action suspense period per BAM 220. See BAM 715, p 4; BAM 720, p 6. Where reliable information indicates that the group left the state, BAM 220 provides that the action must take effect no later than the month after the change. BAM 220 (January 1, 2011), p 4. The first month after Respondent began using her benefits out of state is February 2010. At the hearing, the Department stipulated to removal of the \$200 in FAP benefits issued to Respondent in January 2010. Removing the \$200 FAP issuance to Respondent for January 2010 reduces the Department's recoupment to \$1198.46. Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup the \$1198.46 in FAP benefits it issued to Respondent for the fraud period between January 2010 and August 2010.


### **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 \$1198.46 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 \$ \_\_\_\_\_ in accordance with Department policy.
- reduce the OI to 1198.46 for the period January 2010 through August 2010, in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: 5/1/2013

Date Mailed: 5/1/2013

201332761/ACE

**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:

