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:	2013-58804 3055 October 29, 2013 Wayne #17	
ADN	IINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. F	ahie		
	HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTION	NAL PROGRAM V	OLATION	
this r and i parti After Lans	n the request for a hearing by the Depar — the matter is before the under signed Administration in acc ordance with Titles 7, 42 and 45 of the cularly 7 CFR 273.16, and with Mich Admin due notice, a teleph—one hearing was held sing, Michigan. The Department was repre- culation Agent with the Office of Inspector Gen	ive Law Judge pursone Code of Federal Code, R 400.313 on Tuesday , October the Control of the Co	suant to MCL 400.9, Regulat ion (CFR), 30 and R 400.3178.	
□ F	Participants on behalf of Respondent include	d: .		
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 400.3178(5).				
	<u>ISSUES</u>			
1.	Did Respondent receive an overissuance (C Family Independence Program (FIP) Food Assistance Program (FAP) Medical Assistance (MA) benefits that the Department is entitled to re	State Disability A Child Developme	ssistance (SDA) ent and Care (CDC)	
2.	Did Respondent, by clear and convincing eviolation (IPV)?	vidence, commit an	Intentional Program	
3.	Should Respondent be disqualified from red Family Independence Program (FIP)?	State Disability A	ssistance (SDA)? nt and Care (CDC)?	

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1.	The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on July 22, 2013, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.			
2. TI	ne OIG \boxtimes has \square has not requested that Res pondent be disqualifie d from receiving program benefits.			
3.	Respondent was a recipient of $\ \ \Box$ FIP $\ \ \Box$ FAP $\ \ \Box$ SDA $\ \ \Box$ CDC $\ \ \Box$ MA benefits issued by the Department.			
4. Respondent ⊠ was ☐ was not awar e of the responsibility of the proper usage of a Michigan Bridge Card.				
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 it is considering the period is March 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012 (fraud period).			
7.	During the fraud period, Res pondent was issued \$ in FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.			
8.	The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in SDA CDC MA benefits in the amount of \$			
9.	This was Respondent's ⊠ first ☐ second ☐ third alleged IPV.			
10.	A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and \square was \boxtimes was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.			
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW			
Adm (BEI Augu Serv Prog	artment policies are contained in the Department of Human Service s Bridges inistrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual M), and Department of Human Services Re ference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to ust 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human rices Program Administra tive Manuals (PAM), Depar tment of Human Services gram Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference edules Manual (RFS).			
	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal			

USC 601 to 679c. The Depar tment (formerly known as the Family Independenc e Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MC L 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.
☑ The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [fo rmerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as ame nded, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Fam ily Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.
☐ The Medical Ass istance (MA) program is es tablished by the Title XIX of the Soc ial Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is esta blished by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The D epartment of Human Services (f ormerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA pr ogram pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.31513180.
☐ The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is establis hed by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Ac t, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Res ponsibility and Work Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1- 99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.50015020.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- FAP trafficking OIs that are not forw arded to the prosecutor,
- prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a r eason other than lack of evidence, and
 - the total OI amount for t he FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$1000 or more, or
 - the total OI amount is less than \$1000, and
 - > the group has a previous IPV, or
 - > the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
 - the alleged fraud involves c oncurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), or
 - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

BAM 720, p. 10.

Intentional Program Violation

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 co rrectly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ab ility to fulfill reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700, p. 6; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV requires that the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the client has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing r eduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720, p. 1 (emphasis in original); se e also 7 CF R 273(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true. See M Civ JI 8.01.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV di squalifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 12. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 13.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the OI relates to MA. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will no t cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710, p. 2. 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 FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

In this case, the Respondent us ed her/his FAP benefits at was a stor e that was identified and conv icted of FAP benefit trafficking. Department Exhibit 18-36. The Respondent was a Client identified during the investigation with

transaction histories of greater than \$8 to \$9 at the store that exceeded the normal dollar transaction amount of a store that si ze with the limited number of items available for sale. Department Exhibit 37-40. Therefore, the Department has met its burden that the Respondent did not utilize proper usage of a Michigan Bridge Card. As a result, the Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits of \$ that the Department is required to recoup.

DECISION AND ORDER

Carmen G. Fahie
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: November 14, 2013

Date Mailed: November 14, 2013

NOTICE: The law pr ovides 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.

CGF/pw



