

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES**

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 201316578
Issue No.: 3055
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: April 17, 2013
County: Eaton

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Gary F. Heisler

HEARING DECISION

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge for an Intentional Program Violation hearing 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' request. After due notice, a hearing was held on April 17, 2013. Respondent did not appear. The record did not contain returned mail. In accordance with Bridges Administration Manual (BAM) 720 the hearing proceeded without Respondent.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and whether Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] over-issuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits between June 1, 2011 and November 30, 2011 which 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) Respondent intentionally failed to report information or gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination by failing to report his change of physical residence to another state.
- (2) Respondent was clearly and correctly instructed regarding reporting responsibilities as evidenced by his signature of the assistance application.
- (3) Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill their reporting responsibilities.

- (4) Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) by intentionally failing to report his change of physical residence to [REDACTED] and continuing to receive and use Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits through Michigan when he was no longer a resident of Michigan and no longer eligible for benefits through Michigan.
- (5) June 1, 2011 to November 30, 2011 has correctly been determined as the over-issuance period in this case.
- (6) As a result of the Intentional Program Violation (IPV) Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] over-issuance of benefits during the over-issuance period.
- (7) On December 12, 2012, the Office of Inspector General submitted the agency request for hearing of this case.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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 1997 AACS R 400.3001-3015.

In this case, the Department has requested a disqualification hearing to establish an over-issuance of benefits as a result of an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and the Department has asked that Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits. Department policies provide the following guidance and are available on the internet through the Department's website.

BAM 720 INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATIONS DEPARTMENT POLICY All Programs

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

BAM 700 explains OI discovery, OI types and standards of promptness. BAM 705 explains agency error and BAM 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.

**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.

A detailed analysis of the evidence presented, applicable Department policies, and reasoning for the decision are contained in the recorded record.

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, finds that the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) which resulted in a \$ [REDACTED] over-issuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup.

It is ORDERED that the actions of the Department of Human Services, in this matter, are UPHeld.

/s/
Gary F. Heisler
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 5/7/13
Date Mailed: 5/10/13

201316578/GFH

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.

GFH/tb

cc:

