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

IN	THE MATTER OF:		
		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	2013-31428 3055, 4060 April 30, 2013 Bay
AD	MINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully		
	HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIO	NAL PROGRAM V	IOLATION
and hea	s matter is before the undersigned Administ r d MCL 400.37 upon the Departm ent of Huma aring. After due notice, a telephone hearin nsing, Michigan. The Depar tment was repre	an Servic es' (Depai ng was held on	
	Participants on behalf of Respondent include	ed:	
pur	Respondent did not appear at the hearing and suant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Code 0.3187(5).		
	ISSUES	i	
1.	Did Respondent receive an overissuance (O	l) of	
		⊠ Food Assistance ⊠ Medical Assistan	
	benefits that the Department is entitled to red	coup?	
2.	Did Respondent commit an Intentional Progr	am Violation (IPV)?	
3.	Should Respondent be disqualified from rece	eiving	
		∑ Food Assistance ☑ Medical Assistan	• ,

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on t he competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

 The Department's OIG filed a hear ing request on February 27, 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 reques ted that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ MA benefits during the period o
 Respondent ⋈ was ☐ was not awar e of the responsibility to report any change of residency to the Department.
Respondent had no apparent physical or mental im pairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates t hat the time period they are considering the fraud period is
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued ☐ n ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. Respondent was entitled to n FIP FAP SDA MA during this time period.
9. Respondent ⊠ did ☐ did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ under the:
☐ FIP ☑ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ MA program.
10. During the alleged fra ud period, Respondent was issued \$ ☐ in ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☒ MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
11. Respondent was entitled to in \square FIP \square FAP \square SDA \boxtimes MA during this time period.
12. Respondent
☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☒ MA program.

13. The Department ⊠ has ☐ has not establish ed that Respondent committed an IPV.
14. This was Respondent's ⊠ first ☐ second ☐ third IPV.
15. A notice of disqualification 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 Bri dges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established purs uant to the Persona Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193 42 USC 601, et seq. The Department (formerly k nown as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 1999 AC, Rule 400.310 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.
The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [form erly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program] is establishhed 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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The D epartment of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and 20 00 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.
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 s eq., and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administer rative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligib ility Manual (BEM), Reference Table Manual (RFT), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).
When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- The client intentionally failed t o 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 sus pected when there is clear and convinc ing evidenc e that the client has intentionally withheld or misr epresented 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 overissuanc es 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 previ ous intentional program violation, or
 - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
 - the alleged fraud involves c oncurrent receipt of assistance,
 - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IP V 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. Clients are disqualifi ed for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, lifet ime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720.

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
3. Respondent ☐ did ☐ did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of from the following program(s) ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ MA.
☐ The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.
☑ It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from
☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ MA for a period of ☐ 12 months. ☐ 24 months. ☐ lifetime.
<u>/S/</u>
Kevin Scully
Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services
Date Signed: 05/03/2013

Date Mailed: <u>05/03/2013</u>

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 fo r the county in which he/she lives.

KS/kl



