

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2014-6273  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: January 8, 2014  
County: Wayne (17)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Christian Gardocki

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Human Services (DHS), this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, and in accordance with Titles 7, 42 and 45 of the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 8, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. [REDACTED], Regulation Agent for the Office of Inspector General (OIG), testified on behalf of DHS. 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 400.3178(5).

**ISSUES**

The first issue is whether Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

The second issue is whether Respondent received an over-issuance of 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 an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefit recipient through the State of Michigan.
2. For the period of [REDACTED]/11 through [REDACTED]/12, Respondent exclusively spent FAP benefits outside of Michigan.

3. As of [REDACTED]/11, Respondent was not a Michigan resident.
4. Over the course of benefit months 12/2011-9/2012, DHS issued \$1,619 in FAP benefits to Respondent.
5. On [REDACTED]/13, DHS requested a hearing to establish that Respondent committed an IPV for \$1,619 in allegedly over-issued FAP benefits over the benefit months of 12/2011-9/2012.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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. Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) and Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

This hearing was requested by DHS, in part, to establish that Respondent committed an IPV. DHS may request a hearing to establish an IPV and disqualification. BAM 600 (8/2012), p. 3.

The client/authorized representative (AR) is determined to have committed an IPV by:

- A court decision.
- An administrative hearing decision.
- The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing or DHS-830, Disqualification Consent Agreement or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms. *Id.*

There is no evidence that Respondent signed a DHS-826 or DHS-830. There is also no evidence that a court decision found Respondent responsible for an IPV. Thus, DHS seeks to establish an IPV via administrative hearing.

The Code of Federal Regulations defines an IPV. Intentional program violations shall consist of having intentionally: (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system. 7 CFR 273.16 (c).

DHS regulations also define IPV. A 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. BAM 720 (1/2011), p. 1. see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6).

IPV is suspected when there is **clear and convincing** (emphasis added) evidence that the client or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. *Id.* 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. It is a standard which requires reasonable certainty of the truth; something that is highly probable. Black's Law Dictionary 888 (6th ed. 1990).

DHS alleged that Respondent intentionally failed to report a change in residency to DHS resulting in improper FAP benefit issuances. To establish that Respondent committed an IPV, DHS must establish that Respondent lost Michigan residency.

To be eligible for FAP benefits, a person must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (1/2012), p. 1. For FAP benefits, a person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if there is no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. *Id.* Eligible persons may include persons who entered the state with a job commitment or to seek employment or students (this includes students living at home during a school break.) *Id.* Based on DHS policy, the only clearly defined requirement is "living in Michigan".

A loss of Michigan residency does not necessarily coincide with leaving the State of Michigan. DHS has no known policies banning travel or FAP benefit usage outside of Michigan, though DHS policy states that clients absent from a home for longer than 30 days are not considered temporarily absent. BEM 212 (9/2010), p. 2; in other words, if a person is out of a home longer than 30 days, they are no longer in the home. The policy is not necessarily directly applicable to residency, but barring evidence suggesting otherwise, a 30-day period outside of Michigan is a reasonable time to allow before residency in another state is established.

DHS presented Respondent's FAP application (Exhibits 11-22) submitted to DHS on [REDACTED]/11. Respondent's application noted that Respondent intended to remain in Michigan.

DHS presented Respondent's State of Michigan FAP purchase history (Exhibits 23-27). The history verified that Respondent spent State of Michigan issued FAP benefits exclusively outside of Michigan starting [REDACTED]/11 through [REDACTED]/12.

Consideration of Respondent's residency was given to the proximity of Michigan and Georgia, the state where Respondent spent Michigan-issued FAP benefits. The immense distance between the states makes it improbable that Respondent commuted in and out of Michigan but only happened to spend FAP benefits outside of Michigan.

A ten-month period of exclusive FAP benefit use outside of Michigan is sufficient to presume that Respondent was most probably not a Michigan resident for that period. Respondent is found to not be a Michigan resident as of [REDACTED]/11- 30 days after Respondent began an extended period of spending FAP benefits outside of Michigan. Though Respondent is found to not be a Michigan resident as of [REDACTED]/11, this does not prove that an IPV was committed. DHS alleged that Respondent purposely failed to report a change in residency to continue receiving FAP benefits from Michigan.

It is plausible that Respondent reported a change in residency but that DHS failed to act on Respondent's reporting. DHS was not able to present any written statement from Respondent, which claimed residency in Michigan during a period when Respondent was known to be outside of Michigan. Respondent's application statement that he intended to remain in Michigan is not deemed to be persuasive evidence of fraud. The statement was made approximately six months prior to a change in Respondent's residency; the statement was probably accurate at the time that the statement was made.

DHS also could not provide evidence of a verifiable reporting system that established the failure to change Respondent's address was the fault of Respondent. This evidence is supportive of finding that Respondent did not commit fraud.

DHS did not allege that Respondent concurrently received FAP benefits from multiple states. Unless Respondent received FAP benefits from more than one state, there is no apparent motive for Respondent's alleged fraud; this presumes that Respondent could have received FAP benefits from the state in which Respondent resided. Without evidence of a financial incentive, a fraud allegation is much less persuasive.

A claim of fraud is further hindered by DHS allowing the out-of-state FAP purchases for an extended period. If Respondent committed fraud by accessing FAP benefits outside of Michigan, DHS should have stopped the allegedly improper usage sooner.

Based on the totality of evidence, DHS failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV. The analysis will consider whether an overissuance occurred.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the over-issuance (OI). BAM 700 (1/2011), p. 1. An OI is the amount of benefits issued to the client group in excess of what they were eligible to receive. *Id.* Recoupment is a DHS action to identify and recover a benefit OI. *Id.*

DHS may pursue an OI whether it is a client caused error or DHS error. *Id.* at 5. Client and DHS error OIs are not pursued if the estimated OI amount is less than \$125 per program. *Id.*, p. 7. The present case concerns an alleged OI of \$1,000.

Establishing whether DHS or Respondent was at fault for the OI is of no importance to the collectability of over-issued FAP benefits because DHS may collect the over-issuance in either scenario. Determining which party is at fault may affect the over-issuance period and amount.

There is insufficient evidence that Respondent is at fault for the over-issuance. It should be noted that Respondent's use of FAP benefits outside of Michigan is unconvincing evidence of fault when the State of Michigan allows out-of-state transactions. It is found that the over-issuance was due to DHS error.

For over-issuances caused by DHS error, the amount is affected by the full standard of promptness (SOP) for change processing and the negative action period. BAM 705 (7/2012), pp. 4-5. Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105 (9/2012), p. 7. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. *Id.* Other changes must be reported within 10 days after the client is aware of them. *Id.* For non-income changes, DHS is to complete the FAP eligibility determination and required case actions in time to affect the benefit month that occurs ten days after the change is reported. *Id.*

It was found above that Respondent was not a Michigan resident as of [REDACTED]/11. Allowing Respondent 10 days to report a residency change and DHS 10 days to process the change, the first benefit month affected would be 1/2012.


DHS presented Respondent's FAP benefit issuance history (Exhibits 28-29). Respondent's issuance history verified that Respondent received a total of \$1,419 in FAP benefits during the overissuance period of 1/2012-9/2012. It should be noted that Respondent received no benefit issuances for the period of [REDACTED]/12 through [REDACTED]/12. The stoppage in benefits does not change any of the prior analysis. DHS established that Respondent received an over-issuance of \$1,419 in FAP benefits for the periods of 1/2012-3/2012 and [REDACTED]/12-[REDACTED]12.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV for FAP benefits issued for the benefit months of 12/2011-9/2012. The hearing request of DHS is **PARTIALLY DENIED**.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that DHS established that \$1,419 in FAP benefits were over-issued to

Respondent for the periods of 1/2012-3/2012 and [REDACTED]/2012. The hearing request of DHS is **PARTIALLY AFFIRMED**.

  
Christian Gardocki  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 1/22/2014

Date Mailed: 1/22/2014

**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.

CG/hw

cc:

[REDACTED]