

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-46352
Issue No.: 3055, 2000
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: August 7, 2013
County: Ingham County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Corey A. Arendt

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 August 7, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

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 checked="" 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"/> Medical Assistance (MA) | <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 May 15, 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 FAP and MA benefits during the period of June 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011.
4. Respondent was was not aware of the responsibility to report all changes within 10 days.
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 June 1, 2010 through August 31, 2011.
7. On or around June 1, 2010, the Claimant's son moved out of the Claimant's home. The Claimant did not report the move until September 14, 2011.
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits and from the State of Michigan.
9. Respondent was entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during this time period.
10. Respondent did did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the FAP program.
11. The Department has has not established that Respondent committed an IPV regarding the FAP program but not the MA program.
12. This was Respondent's first second third IPV.
13. 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The 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 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.

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 overissuances 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

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.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. 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 this case, the OIG provided unequivocal evidence that Respondent continued to report her son as living with her after the son had left the home. This resulted in the Respondent receiving more FAP benefits than she was eligible for. In regards to the

MA overissuance, the Department was unable to identify how they calculated the overissuance amount. For this reason, I am unable to find the Respondent to have committed an IPV regarding the MA program.

Based on the credible testimony and other evidence presented, I have concluded the OIG established, under the clear and convincing standard, that Respondent committed an IPV in this matter. The Respondent continued to falsely report her child as living with her in order to receive benefits.

DECISION AND ORDER

I have concluded, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law:

1. Respondent did did not commit an IPV
2. Respondent did did not receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP program.
3. Respondent did did not receive an overissuance of program benefits from the MA program.

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

The MA issue is dismissed without prejudice.



Corey A. Arendt
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 8, 2013

Date Mailed: August 8, 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.

2013-46352/CAA

CAA/las

cc:

