

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-27018  
Issue No.: 2000  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: May 21, 2013  
County: Wexford County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Y. Lain

**HEARING DECISION**

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 [REDACTED] from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Regulation Agent, of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent and testify did appear at the hearing.

**ISSUES**

Whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and received an over-issuance of Medical Assistance (MA) benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

**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 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having received concurrent program benefits in two different states and, as such, allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent filed applications with the department on 8/03/05, acknowledging that s/he understood her/his rights and responsibilities to report changes in household circumstances.
4. Respondent failed to report her husband was receiving Veteran Affairs (VA) benefit income for her household during the period from January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2011.

## **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 Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by 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 (DHS or department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Program Reference Manual (PRM).

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

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. BAM 720.

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

- benefit overissuance 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,
  - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed 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.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the over-issuance relates to MA. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710. 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.

In the instant case, respondent acknowledged that she received an over-issuance of benefits and repaid the amount of \$ [REDACTED] on February 15, 2013. Respondent alleged that she did not understand that she was supposed to disclose her husband's income. This Administrative Law Judge finds Respondent's testimony to be credible under the circumstances.

### **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 not commit an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] which has been repaid to the department as of February 15, 2013.

Accordingly, the department's request for a hearing is hereby **DISMISSED**.

*/s/*

**Landis Y. Lain**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: May 23, 2013

Date Mailed: May 23, 2013

2013-27018/LYL

**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.

LYL/las

cc:

