

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013 5725  
Issue No.: 3052,2052  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 23, 2013  
County: Oakland (04)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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 January 23, 2013, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED].

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: .

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 400.3187(5).

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP)       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA)       | <input type="checkbox"/> Child Development and Care (CDC)         |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Medical Assistance (MA)(AMP) |   |

benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

2. Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?

3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family Independence Program (FIP) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Food Assistance Program (FAP) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Disability Assistance (SDA) | <input type="checkbox"/> 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 10/10/12 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  CDC  MA benefits during the period of 8/1/10, through 9/30/12.
4. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA AMP benefits during the period of 8/1/10 through 2/29/12.
5. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report change of address and relocation out of state.
6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is the periods set forth in paragraphs 3 and 4 above.
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$5048 in  FIP  FAP Item 5 pp 50 – 54  SDA  CDC  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
9. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$4620.09 in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  AMP MA benefits from the State of Michigan. Item 6 pp55-58.
10. Respondent was entitled to \$0 in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  AMP during this time period.
11. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of \$5048 under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA program.
12. The Department  has  has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
13. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of \$4620.09 under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA AMP program.

14. This was Respondent's  first  second  third IPV.
15. 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law 104-193, 42 USC 601, *et seq.* The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3101 through Rule 400.3131. FIP replaced the Aid to Dependent Children (ADC) program effective October 1, 1996.

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 State Disability Assistance (SDA) program, which provides financial assistance for disabled persons, is established by 2004 PA 344. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 2000 AACS, Rule 400.3151 through Rule 400.3180.

The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The program is implemented by Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 98 and 99. The Department provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and 1999 AC, Rule 400.5001 through Rule 400.5015.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the 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 (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and MCL 400.105.

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 certain 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 overissuance 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.

Additionally, in this case the evidence demonstrated that shortly after his initial receipt of FAP and MA/AMP in Michigan, the Claimant then began using his Michigan FAP benefits exclusively in Texas. Item 4 pp 42 - 49. In February 2012 the Claimant applied for FAP benefits in the State of Michigan, again representing to the Department that his address was [REDACTED]. The evidence demonstrated that both before and after the Michigan FAP application the Claimant continued to use his FAP benefits exclusively in Texas. Item 4 pp 49. This evidence is deemed to satisfy an intent to defraud as the Claimant misrepresented his address so his FAP benefits in Michigan would continue and he continued to spend and use benefits in Texas.

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). 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 the FAP benefits because he failed to notify the Department that he 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 (July 1, 2009 and January 1, 2012), p 1. 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 (October 1, 2008), pp 2-3.

The Department established that from 8/1/10 to 9/30/12, Respondent used his FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state in Texas. While this evidence 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.

To establish Respondent's intent to defraud, the Department testified that Respondent signed a new application for FAP benefits on 2/23/12, in which Respondent reported a Michigan address. The fact that Respondent used his Michigan-issued FAP benefits exclusively in Texas in the two years prior to completing the new application and the 7 months after he completed the application establishes his intent to misrepresent information concerning his residency for the purpose of maintaining FAP benefits. Thus, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits.

Disqualification

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, p 12.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the overissuance relates to MA. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (October 1, 2009), 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 concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p 13.

Because the Department satisfied its burden of establishing that Respondent committed a first IPV of FAP benefits, Respondent is therefore subject to a one year FAP disqualification. BAM 720, p 13.

Recoupment of Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (December 1, 2011), p 1. The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p 6; BAM 715 (December 1, 2011), pp 1, 5; BAM 705 (December 1, 2011), p 5.

At the hearing, the Department established that \$5048 in FAP benefits were issued by the State of Michigan to Respondent from August 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012. The Department alleges that Respondent was eligible for \$0 in FAP benefits during this period.

In support of its FAP OI case, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history showing his use of FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state beginning 8/8/10. Respondent became ineligible for FAP benefits once his FAP transaction history showed that he was using his Michigan-issued FAP benefits outside Michigan for more than 30 days. See BEM 212, pp 2-3. Therefore, he became ineligible for FAP benefits on September 8, 2010.

Therefore, the Department is entitled to recoup \$5048 in FAP benefits it issued to Respondent between September 1, 2010 and September 30, 2012.

Likewise the Department, based on the Claimant's receipt of AMP premium reimbursements paid on his behalf, also received an overissuance of AMP benefits in the amount of \$4620.09. In order to be eligible to receive AMP benefits the recipient

must be a resident of Michigan. BEM 220 provides : A person is a resident if **all** of the following apply:

- Is not receiving assistance from another state.
- Is living in Michigan, except for a temporary absence.
- Intends to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely.

Under the facts presented it is determined that the Claimant was not eligible to receive AMP due to his presence in Texas for over two years which was not a temporary absence, and thus it is determined that Respondent was no longer a resident of Michigan and not entitled to receive AMP.

**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 \$5048 FAP and \$4062.09 AMP from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA/AMP.

The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$5048 in FAP benefits and \$4062.09 in AMP benefits in accordance with Department policy.

The Department is ORDERED to reduce the OI to \_\_\_\_\_ for the period \_\_\_\_\_, 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.



**Lynn M. Ferris**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: February 13, 2013

Date Mailed: February 13, 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.

LMF/cl

cc:

