

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-23430  
Issue No.: 3055  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: July 30, 2013  
County: Lake/Kent County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Y. Lain

**HEARING DECISION**

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 July 30, 2013, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent, 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 400.3178(5). Notice was sent to claimant's last known address and was returned as undeliverable.

**ISSUES**

Whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and received an over-issuance Food Assistance Program (FAP) that the department is entitled to recoup?

**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 Office of Inspector General (OIG) filed a hearing request to establish an over-issuance of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV); the OIG also requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
2. Respondent signed Assistance Application \_\_\_\_\_ (DHS-1171) on November 16, 2010, acknowledging that he understood that failure to give

timely, truthful, complete and accurate information about circumstances could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against respondent.

3. Respondent applied for FAP benefits in the State of Michigan but cashed the FAP benefits exclusively in the State of New York from February 1, 2011-November 30, 2011.
4. Respondent failed to report the change of State of Residency as required.
5. Respondent received an over-issuance of Food Assistance Benefits in the amount of \$2688 from February 1, 2011- November 30, 2011.
6. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report all employment, residency and income changes to the department.
7. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill the income reporting responsibilities.
8. Respondent had not committed any previous intentional program violations of the FAP program.
9. Respondent was receiving cash assistance in the state of New York at the same time that she was receiving FAP benefits in Michigan.

### **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 Food Assistance Program (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.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS 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 over-issuance 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 over-issuance amount is \$1000 or more, or
- the total over-issuance amount is less than \$1000, and
  - the group has a previous intentional program violation, or
  - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
  - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance,
  - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed 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, or except when the over-issuance relates to MA. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710. 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 the instant case, the department OIG has established that the Respondent received an over-issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]. Evidence on the record indicates that respondent was no longer a resident of the State of Michigan during the relevant time period and used her benefits in the state of New York exclusively during the relevant times. The department OIG has established by the necessary competent, substantial and material evidence on the record that claimant committed an Intentional

Program Violation for the Food Assistance Program for which respondent must be disqualified.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, determines that clear and convincing evidence establishes, and for the reasons stated on the record, concludes that:

1. Respondent did commit an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the Food Assistance Program.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] for Food Assistance Program in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the Food Assistance Program for 1 year. This disqualification period shall begin immediately as of the date of this Order.

/s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
Landis Y. Lain  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: July 30, 2013

Date Mailed: July 31, 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.

LYL/hj

cc:

[REDACTED]