

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-61252  
Issue No(s): 3006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 11, 2014  
County: Calhoun County DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Colleen Lack

**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 11, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included [REDACTED] [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. 16-22.

**ISSUE**

Did Respondent receive an OI Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

**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 FAP benefits from the Department.
2. The Department alleges Respondent received a FAP OI during the period March 1, 2013, through May 31, 2013, due to Department's error.
3. The Department alleges that Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] OI that is still due and owing to the Department.

## 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 Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

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 DIT 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).

A client error OI occurs when the client received more benefits than they were entitled to because the client gave incorrect or incomplete information to the department. BAM 700, p 6 (7-1-2013).

A Claimant must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, p.7 (11/1/2012).

Client and Agency error OIs are not pursued if the estimated OI amount is less than \$250 per program. BAM 700, p 9 (7-1-2013).

Here, the Department contends that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits due to an agency error. Specifically, the Department asserts that the Department failed to timely and properly re-determine Respondent's FAP eligibility after Respondent reported unemployment compensation benefits on March 14, 2013. The Department's failure to timely re-determine the Respondent's eligibility when the unemployment compensation benefits were reported resulted in an OI of FAP benefits of \$ [REDACTED]

Pursuant to BAM 700, recoupment is pursued for OIs greater than \$250, even when it was the Department's error that caused the OI.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The evidence of record shows that the Department did err when it failed to timely re-determine Respondent's FAP eligibility after Respondent reported unemployment compensation benefits. The OI period is March 2013 through May 2013. When the income from the Respondent's unemployment compensation

benefits was included in the FAP budgets, the difference between the benefit amounts the Respondent received and the benefit amounts the Respondent was entitled to receive was \$ [REDACTED]

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

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department is **AFFIRMED**.

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



\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen Lack  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 19, 2014

Date Mailed: March 19, 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

201361252/CL

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

CL/hj

cc:

