

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████
██████████
██████████

Reg. No.: 2013-60293
Issue No.: 3055
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: October 17, 2013
County: St. Clair (00)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun

HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Human Services (Department), this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, and in accordance with Titles 7, 42 and 45 of the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a three way telephone hearing was held on October 17, 2013 from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: Respondent, Coreen Flynn.

ISSUES

1. 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)?
3. 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 the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on July 25, 2013, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV by failing to report an out-of-state move and continuing to receive and use Michigan-issued benefits while out of state.
2. The OIG has has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was was not aware of the responsibility to report changes in household circumstances, such as a change in residence.
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 fraud period is September 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$██████ in FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0.00 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits in the amount of \$3,000.
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 was was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Department of Human Services

Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 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 Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

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

- FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor,
- prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason 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 concurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), or
 - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

BAM 720 (July 2013), 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 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 reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (July 2013), 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 reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720, p. 1 (emphasis in original); see also 7 CFR 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.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department that she no longer resided in Michigan but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while out of state. To be eligible for FAP benefits issued by the Department, an individual must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (January 2012), p. 1. For FAP purposes, a person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if he has no intent to remain in the State permanently or indefinitely. BEM 220, p. 1. A client who resides outside the State of Michigan for more than thirty days is not eligible for FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan. BEM 212 (November 2012), pp. 2-3.

At the hearing, the Department established that from July 27, 2011 to May 23, 2012 and from June 30, 2012 to October 29, 2012, Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state, in New York. The Department presented a public data report from Lexis Nexis showing an address associated with Respondent in Auburn, NY and the EPPIC Card Management Transaction Details which establish that Respondent's transaction history for the time period of the out of state usage were made specifically in Auburn, NY and near the address associated with Respondent. Respondent stated that she went to NY in July 2011 to care for a friend and that the Auburn address was for the person for whom she was caring. Respondent indicated that she did not know how long she would be there and that she intended on moving back to MI.

While the evidence presented by the Department may be sufficient to establish that Respondent no longer resided in Michigan and was no longer eligible for FAP benefits, to establish an IPV, the Department must present clear and convincing evidence that Respondent **intentionally** withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining benefits.

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented evidence that Respondent registered to vote in Auburn, NY on November 23, 2011 and that in April 2012, during the alleged fraud period, Respondent completed a Redetermination for her FAP benefits and did not report a change of address. Respondent confirmed that she registered to vote in the State of NY on November 23, 2011 and submitted the Redetermination while she was in NY. Respondent stated that she was not aware of the requirement to report her move to NY; however, the

Redetermination form clearly instructed Respondent to report a change in address and to report a move from the address on file, as well as the penalties for failing to do so.

Based on the foregoing information, there was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of her responsibility to report changes in residence and that she intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. Therefore, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies 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 not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (May 2013), 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.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV by failing to report her permanent relocation to NY. Because this was Respondent's first IPV, she is subject to a one-year disqualification under the FAP program. BEM 720, pp 13, 14.

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.

At the hearing, the Department presented a FAP transaction history that established that Respondent used Michigan-issued FAP benefits out of state from July 27, 2011 to May 23, 2012 and from June 30, 2012 to October 29, 2012.

Clients are not eligible for FAP benefits if they do not reside in Michigan. BEM 220, p. 1. Respondent's FAP use out of state established that she did not reside in Michigan. Thus, she was was not eligible for FAP benefits and was overissued FAP benefits for any period she was ineligible to receive FAP benefits.

Under Department policy, the calculation of the first month of the OI requires that the Department apply the 10-day client reporting period, the 10-day processing period, and the 12-day negative action suspense period. BAM 720, p. 6. Applying this standard and in consideration of out-of-state use that began July 27, 2011, the OI period begins

September 2011. In establishing the OI amount, the Department presented a benefit summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan from September 2011 through November 2012 totaling \$3,000 . Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup [REDACTED] FAP benefits it issued to Respondent between September 1, 2011, and November 30, 2012.

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 did did not commit an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.
2. Respondent did did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$3,000 from the following program(s) FIP FAP SDA CDC MA.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] accordance with Department policy.

- It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from
 FIP FAP SDA CDC for a period of
 12 months. 24 months. lifetime.



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

Date Signed: November 14, 2013

Date Mailed: November 14, 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.

ZB/tm

cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]