

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 201322173
Issue No.: 2006, 3055
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: March 7, 2013
County: Grand Traverse County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 March 7, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent was represented by [REDACTED] (Respondent's Authorized Hearing Representative). Respondent also appeared and provided testimony.

ISSUES

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and 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 Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

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 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 requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.

3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP and MA benefits during the period of July 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to properly and timely report to the Department that he had relocated outside of Michigan.
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 July 1, 2011 through March 31, 2012.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits and was issued \$ [REDACTED] in MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. Respondent was entitled to \$0 in FAP and \$0 in MA during this time period.
9. Respondent did receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the FAP program. Respondent did receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the MA program
10. The Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV.
11. This was Respondent's first IPV.
12. A notice of disqualification hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and 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.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700.

According to BAM 720, "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.

An 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. BAM 720.

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

- FAP trafficking OIs 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 IPV, **or**
 - The alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, **or**
 - The alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), **or**
 - The alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee. BAM 720.

With regard to FAP cases only, an IPV exists when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. BAM 720.

For MA cases, an IPV exists when the client or authorized representative (AR):

- Is found guilty by a court, **or**
- Signs a DHS-4350 **and** the prosecutor or the office of inspector general (OIG), authorizes recoupment in lieu of prosecution, **or**
- Is found responsible for the IPV by an administrative law judge conducting an IPV or debt establishment hearing. BAM 720.

For FAP cases, the Department will disqualify an active **or** inactive recipient who:

- Is found by a court or hearing decision to have committed IPV, **or**
 - Has signed a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826) or Disqualification Consent Agreement (DHS-830), **or**
 - Is convicted of concurrent receipt of assistance by a court, **or**
 - For FAP, is found by SOAHR or a court to have trafficked FAP benefits.
- BAM 720.

A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. BAM 720. Other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. BAM 720. If the court does not address disqualification in its order, the standard period applies. BAM 720. Clients are disqualified for periods of 1 (one) year for the first IPV, 2 (two) years for the second IPV, a lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and 10 (ten) years for a concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720.

Clients must report changes in circumstances that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105. Clients are required to report changes within 10 (ten) days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105. Clients are required to report changes in circumstances within 10 (ten) days after the client is aware of them. BAM 105. These changes include, but are not limited to changes regarding: (1) persons in the home; (2) marital status; (3) address and shelter cost changes that result from the move; (4) vehicles; (5) assets; (6) child support expenses paid; (7) health or hospital coverage and premiums; or (8) child care needs or providers. BAM 105.

Clients must cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. BAM 105. This includes completion of necessary forms. BAM 105. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. BAM 105. Clients who are able but refuse to provide necessary information or take a required action are subject to penalties. BAM 105.

In the instant matter, Respondent, through his AHR, challenged the Department's finding that he was guilty of an IPV. Respondent did not dispute the presence of an OI or the amounts. The evidence in the record demonstrated that Respondent, during a telephone call on April 19, 2011, advised the Department that he intended to move from Michigan to Minnesota in the future, but he did not provide a specific date. Respondent did not clearly dispute this but testified that he recalled contacting his caseworker at some point to inform the Department that he had moved to Minnesota.

Respondent also argued that he was transient during this time period (July, 2011 through March, 2012). According to Respondent's AHR, Respondent was staying with different family members in an attempt to establish a more permanent residence while receiving FAP from the State of Michigan. Respondent's AHR also indicated that Respondent considered Michigan as his permanent residence during the time period

because he resided with his sister in Grawn, Michigan. The Department's EBT (Michigan Bridge Card) usage history shows that Respondent received Michigan FAP benefits and used his EBT card exclusively outside of Michigan from May 22, 2011 through April 7, 2012. This Administrative Law Judge finds that Respondent was aware that he was to report within 10 days that he had left Michigan. During this time period, Respondent continued to receive and use Michigan-issued EBT card outside of Michigan.

Respondent also argued that one of his caseworkers advised him to leave the state and continue to use his EBT card. This is an issue of credibility that must be weighed by the ALJ. Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996). This ALJ does not find Respondent's statements in this regard to be credible.

The Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to timely and accurately report to the Department all changes in residency. As indicated above, Department policy requires clients to report any change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 (ten) days. BAM 105. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities.

Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application from November 5, 2006 certifies that he was aware that fraudulent participation in FAP and MA could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims. This Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the Department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an intentional violation of FAP, resulting in a \$ [REDACTED] overissuance from and an overissuance of MA in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during July, 2011 through March, 2012. The total overissuance is \$ [REDACTED]. This is Respondent's first FAP IPV. Consequently, the Department's request for FAP program disqualification and full restitution must be granted.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law concludes that:

1. Respondent did commit an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from FAP and a \$ [REDACTED] overissuance of the MA program for a total overissuance of \$ [REDACTED]

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

/s/
C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 8, 2013

Date Mailed: March 11, 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.

CAP/cr

cc:

[REDACTED]