


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2013-63754  
Issue No(s): 3006  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 11, 2014  
County: Genesee County DHS #6

**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 (July 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 benefits from the Department.
2. The Department alleges Respondent received a FAP OI during the period August 2007, through October 2007, due to Respondent's error.
3. The Department alleges that Respondent received an \$ [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 Respondent's error. Specifically, the Department asserts that Respondent failed to timely report changes in the household composition when a FAP group member moved out of the home. A case note indicates this change was not reported to the Department for Respondent's case until October 4, 2007. (Exhibit A, page 9) However, in March 2008, this individual reported to the Department that he had lived at a different address than Respondent's address since June 2007. (Exhibit A, pages 10-11)

Respondent's failure to timely report the change in the household composition resulted in an OI FAP benefits of \$█ because FAP benefits were issued including an individual in the FAP group who was no longer living in the home.

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The evidence of record shows that the Respondent erred when she failed to timely report a change in the household composition. The OI period


is August 2007 through October 2007. When the FAP budgets were re-calculated with the correct group composition, the difference between the benefit amounts the Respondent received and the benefit amounts the Respondent was entitled to receive was \$ [REDACTED] (Exhibit A, page 19)

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 an \$ [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:

201363754/CL

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

CL/hj

cc:

