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:	2013-59264 3055 October 29, 2013					
	County:	Wayne #17					
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie							

HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

Upon the request for a hearing by the Depar tment of Human Services (Department), this matter is before the under signed Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, and in acc ordance with Titles 7, 42 and 45 of the Code of Federal Regulat ion (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a teleph one hearing was held on Tuesday , October 29, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. The D epartment was represented by Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).						
Participants on behalf of Respondent included: Respondent.						
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>						
 Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Family Independence Program (FIP) State Disability Assistance (SDA) Food Assistance Program (FAP) Child Development and Care (CDC) Medical Assistance (MA) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup? 						
2. Did Respondent, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?						
 Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving □ Family Independence Program (FIP)? □ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? □ Food Assistance Program (FAP)? □ Child Development 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 18, 2013, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. T	he OIG \boxtimes has \square has not requested that Respondent be dis qualified from receiving program benefits.
3.	Respondent was a recipient of \square FIP \boxtimes FAP \square SDA \square CDC \square MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. R	espondent \boxtimes was \square was not aw are of the res ponsibility to report changes in his employment where he received \$ in self-employment for 2011.
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 October 31, 2011 (fraud period).
7.	On the As sistance Application, DHS 1171, signed by Respondent on March 8 2011, and a Redetermination Application, DHS 1010, signed by the Res pondent on March 28, 2011, Respondent reported that she/he understood the responsibility to report changes in employment to the department within 10 days.
8.	During the fraud period, Re spondent was issued \$ in FIP \(\subseteq FAP \) SDA \(\subseteq CDC \) MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$ in suc h benefits during this time period.
9.	The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in ☐ FIP ☐ FAP ☐ SDA ☐ CDC ☐ MA benefits in the amount of \$
10.	This was Respondent's \boxtimes first \square second \square third alleged IPV.
11.	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

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Service s Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Re ference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to

August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administra tive Manuals (PAM), Depar tment of Human Services Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Hu man Services Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).
☐ The Family Independence Program (FIP) wa s established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and W ork Opportunity Reconc iliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 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 feder all regulations contained in 7 CF R 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family 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 established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program 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 Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program purs uant 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 the 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 to 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

2013-59264/CGF

the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, li fetime 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 failed to report that he had self-employment income for the year 2011, which res ulted in him receiving an overissuance of FAP benefits of \$ that the Department is required to recoup.

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, if any, concludes that:								
1. Respondent	Respondent 🗵 did 🗌 did not commit an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.							
2. Respondent								
The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action. initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ in accordance with Department policy. reduce the OI to \$ for the per iod , and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy.								
FIP 🛛 FAI	R ORDERED that F P	for a period o		lified from				

Carmen G. Fahie

Administrative Law Judge for Maura Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Carmon II. 3

Date Signed: November 20, 2013

Date Mailed: November 21, 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



