

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-46825  
Issue No.: 1006, 3000  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 4, 2014  
County: Midland

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** C. Adam Purnell

**HEARING DECISION**

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Services (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Respondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in accordance with 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18, 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250, 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33, and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 4, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED] (Recoupment Specialist).

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 Respondent's absence in accordance with Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 725 (7-1-2013), pp. 13-17.

**ISSUE**

Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Family Independence Program (FIP)?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Respondent was a recipient of FIP benefits from the Department.
2. The Department alleges Respondent received a FIP OI during the period of October 1, 2011 through November 30, 2012 due to Department's error.
3. The Department alleges that Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] OI that is still due and owing to the Department.
4. The Department requested a hearing on March 29, 2013.

## 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).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance (OI). BAM 700, p 1 (7-1-2013). An overissuance (OI) is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what it was eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). BAM 700, p 1 (7-1-2013).

An agency error OI is caused by incorrect action (including delayed or no action) by DHS staff or department processes. BAM 700, p 4 (7-1-2013). If unable to identify the type of OI, the Department records it as an agency error. BAM 700, p 4 (7-1-2013).

Here, the Department contends that Respondent received an OI of FIP benefits due to an agency error. The error occurred after the Department, due to a coding mistake, failed to remove Respondent from the FIP group. Respondent was not eligible for FIP during the above time period due to a criminal justice disqualification; however the Department failed to properly remove her from the group.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The record evidence shows that the Department did err when it continued to provide Respondent with FIP benefits despite the fact that she had received several drug-related felonies in 2008. The substantial, material and competent evidence, based on the whole record, indicates that Respondent was improperly issued FIP benefits despite Respondent's ineligibility due to a criminal justice disqualification.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department did establish a FIP benefit OI to Respondent totaling \$ [REDACTED]


The Department initially requested a debt collection hearing concerning an alleged OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits issued to Respondent. During the hearing, the Department's Recoupment Specialist indicated that the FAP OI being pursued had been paid in full on December 1, 2013, and, therefore, it no longer wished to move forward with the hearing concerning the FAP.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department is **AFFIRMED**.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate collection procedures for a \$ [REDACTED] OI in FIP in accordance with Department policy.

Therefore, pursuant to Mich Admin Code, R 400.906, the request for hearing concerning the FAP is **DISMISSED**.



---

**C. Adam Purnell**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 12, 2014

Date Mailed: March 12, 2014

**NOTICE OF APPEAL:** The claimant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration was made, within 30 days of the receipt date of the Decision and Order of Reconsideration or Rehearing Decision.

Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS) may order a rehearing or reconsideration on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final decision cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request (60 days for FAP cases).

A Request for Rehearing or Reconsideration may be granted when one of the following exists:

- Newly discovered evidence that existed at the time of the original hearing that could affect the outcome of the original hearing decision;
- Misapplication of manual policy or law in the hearing decision which led to a wrong conclusion;

- Typographical, mathematical or other obvious error in the hearing decision that affects the rights of the client;
- Failure of the ALJ to address in the hearing decision relevant issues raised in the hearing request.

The Department, AHR or the claimant must specify all reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration. A request must be *received* in MAHS within 30 days of the date the hearing decision is mailed.

The written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088 and be labeled as follows:

Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings  
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-07322

CAP/las

cc:

