

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No: 2013-31467  
Issue No: 4060  
Case No: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 27, 2013  
Macomb-12 County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Corey A. Arendt

**HEARING DECISION**

This matter is assigned to me pursuant to 7 CFR 273.18; 45 CFR 233.20(a)(13); MCL 400.9; MCL 400.37; MCL 400.43(a); MAC R 400.941 and MCL 201.24, *et seq.*, upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (Department) to establish an over issuance of benefits to Respondent. After due notice was mailed to Respondent, a hearing was held on March 27, 2013, at which Respondent did not appear. This matter having been initiated by the Department and due notice having been provided to Respondent, the hearing was held in accordance with Bridges Administrative Manual, Item 725.

**ISSUE**

Whether Respondent received an over issuance (OI) of Family Independence Program (FIP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

I, based upon the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, find as material fact:

1. Respondent was an active FAP and FIP recipient from July 14, 2010 through July 31, 2011.
2. On July 14, 2010, the Respondent applied for FAP and FIP benefits on behalf of his great-nephews.
3. On December 9, 2010, the Respondent's great-nephews were removed from his home and placed with their mother.
4. At no point in time between December 9, 2010 and July 31, 2011 did the Respondent notify the Department about his great-nephews being removed from his home.

5. The failure to notify the Department about the children being removed, led to an over issuance of \$ [REDACTED] in FIP benefits.
6. The amount of \$ [REDACTED] is still due and owing to the Department.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The FAP 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 administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

The FIP was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 8 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department administers the FIP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MAC R 400.3101-3131. The FIP program replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Departmental policy, states that when the client group receives more benefits than the group is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. Repayment of an OI is the responsibility of anyone who was an eligible, disqualified, or other adult in the program group at the time the OI occurred. Bridges will collect from all adults who were a member of the case. OIs on active programs are repaid by lump sum cash payments, monthly cash payments (when court ordered), and administrative recoupment (benefit reduction). OI balances on inactive cases must be repaid by lump sum or monthly cash payments unless collection is suspended. BAM 725.

In this case, I find the Respondent did receive an OI of FIP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] due to the Respondent's own failure to inform the Department about the children being removed from his care. However, I cannot possibly find an OI of FIP benefits as the Department determined the FAP OI while budgeting a FIP grant of \$ [REDACTED] a month. The same \$ [REDACTED] the Department indicated the Respondent was not eligible for.

I find the evidence presented by the Department shows the Respondent received more benefits than he was entitled to receive. Therefore, Respondent is responsible for repayment of the OI.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

I find, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decide the Respondent received an OI of FIP benefits but did not receive an OI of FAP benefits. The Department is entitled to recoup the OI of FIP benefits.

The Department is therefore entitled to recoup the remaining FIP OI of \$ [REDACTED] from the Respondent.

The Department shall initiate collection procedures in accordance with Department policy.



Corey A. Arendt  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura D. Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 28, 2013

Date Mailed: March 28, 2013

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 60 days of mailing of the above Decision the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she resides or has his or her principal place of business in this state, or in the circuit court for Ingham County. Administrative Hearings, on its own motion, or on request of a party within 60 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision, may order a rehearing.

CAA/las

cc:

