

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-30754  
Issue No.: 3055  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: [REDACTED]  
County: Washtenaw DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

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

An intentional program violation hearing will be conducted with or without the individual or authorized representative present if the hearing notice is not returned by the post office as undeliverable. Mich Admin Code R 400.3130.

On [REDACTED], the Medical Assistance (MA) sent the Respondent a Notice of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-827) with a hearing date of [REDACTED]. On [REDACTED] the Respondent requested that her hearing be postponed. This Administrative Law Judge found that good cause for an adjournment had not been shown and denied the request. On [REDACTED], the Respondent made a second request for an adjournment and this request was denied. On [REDACTED], the Respondent made an oral request for an adjournment and this request was denied. The Respondent was given the opportunity to participate in the hearing by telephone because she was available to be reached by telephone and capable of requesting an adjournment by telephone.

However, instead of exercising her right to participate in the hearing and present evidence and testimony in her defense, the Respondent chose not to speak on the record. The Respondent listened to the hearing proceedings by telephone. The hearing was held without input from the Respondent and a decision was based solely on the evidence and testimony presented by the Department.

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of

- Family Independence Program (FIP)       Food Assistance Program (FAP)  
 State Disability Assistance (SDA)       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

- Family Independence Program (FIP)       Food Assistance Program (FAP)  
 State Disability Assistance (SDA)       Medical Assistance (MA)?

**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 [REDACTED], 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  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits during the period of [REDACTED], through [REDACTED].
4. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits during the period of [REDACTED], through [REDACTED].
5. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits during the period of [REDACTED], through [REDACTED].
6. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits during the period of [REDACTED], through [REDACTED].
7. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report any change of her residency to the Department within ten days.
8. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.

9. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
10. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA during this time period.
11. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA program.
12. From [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
13. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED]  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA during this time period.
14. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA program.
15. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
16. From [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA during this time period.
17. From [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA program.
18. From [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
19. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED]  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA during this time period.
20. From [REDACTED], through [REDACTED], Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA program.
21. The Department  has  has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.

22. This was Respondent's  first  second  third IPV.
23. 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 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.
- The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by 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 (DHS or Department) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Reference Table Manual (RFT), and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

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
  - 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 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.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medical Assistance (MA) benefits that she was not eligible for as a result of her intentional failure to report that she was no longer a resident of Michigan. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Respondent's intentional withholding of her change of residency was for the purposes of receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medical Assistance (MA) that the Respondent was not entitled to. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has established intentional program violations of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medical Assistance (MA) programs.

### **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, concludes that:

1. Respondent  did  did not commit an IPV.

2. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA.

3. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  MA.

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
/S/  
**Kevin Scully**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 06/05/2013

Date Mailed: 06/05/2013

**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.

KS/kl

cc:

[REDACTED]