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

IN THE MATTER OF:

Reg. No: 201359122 Issue No: 3006

Case No:

Hearing Date: February 27, 2014

Macomb County DHS #12



ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

HEARING DECISION

Upon a hearing request by the Department of Human Se rvices (Department) to establish an overissuance (OI) of benefits to Res pondent, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 400.43a, and 24.201, et seg., and Mich Admin Code, R 400.941, and in acc ordance 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. Following due notice mailed to Re spondent at his last known address on file with the Department, which notice was not returned to the Michigan Administrative Hearing System as undeliverable mail, a telephone hearing was held on February 27, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. 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, pp. 13-17. The department was represented a recoupment specia list with the department's Macomb County by office.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent received an over iss uance (OI) of Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) benefits that the department is entitled to recoup?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

- 1. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits at all times relevant to this matter.
- On February 16, 2013, the Department discovered that, due to agency error, the department erroneously approved Resp ondent for FAP b enefits despite Respondent having reported in his April 21, 2011 assistance application that he was a full-time college student work ing less than 20 hours per week. (Department Exhibits 1-3, pp. 5-30)

201359122/SDS

- 3. Due to the Department's agency error, Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ for the period of June 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013. (Department Exhibit 4, pp. 31-32; Exhibit 5, pp. 33-34; Exhibit 8, pp. 42-71)
- 4. On July 9, 2013, the Department mailed Respondent a written notice (DHS-4358-A) that he received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of for the period of J une 1, 2012 through Ma rch 31, 2013 as a r esult of agency error. (Department Exhibit 7, pp. 38-41)
- 5. On July 19, 2013, Res pondent submitted a hearing request, protesting the department's determination that he must repay the FAP over issuance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Clients have the right to cont est a department decis ion affect ing eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to rev iew the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Serv ices Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (2011), p. 1. The regulations gov erning the hearing and appeal process for applicants and recipients of public assistance in Michigan are found in sections 400.901 to 400.951 of the Michigan Administrative Code (Mich Admin Code). An opportunity for a hearing shall be granted to an applicant who requests a hearing because his claim for assistance is denied. Mich Admin Code R 400.903(1).

The Food Assistanc e Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is establis hed by the Food St amp 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 of Human Services (DHS or department) administers the FAP program pursuant to MCL 400.10, et seq., and MAC R 400.3001-3015. Department policies are found in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) and the Bridges Reference Manual (BRM).

Effective October 1, 2010, Department polic y provides that clients in student status are no longer eligible to receive FAP benefits based solely on an approved education plan. BEM 245. A person is in st udent status if t he person is 18 through 49 years old and enrolled half-time or mo re in: (i) a vocational, trade, business, or technical school that normally requires a high school diploma or an equivalency certificate; or (ii) a regular curriculum at a college or univer sity that offers degree programs regardless of whether a diploma is required. BEM 245.

In order for an individual in student status to be eligible for FAP benefits, the individual must meet one of the following criteria:

- Receiving Family Independence Program benefits.
- Enrolled in an institution of higher education as a result of participation in:
 - Approved employment -related activities.
 - •• A JTPA program.

- •• A program under Section 236 of the Trade Readjustment Act of 1974.
- •• Another State or local government employment and training program.
- Physically or mentally unfit for employment.
- Employed for at least 20 hours per week and paid for such employment.
- Self-employed for at least 20 hours per week and earning weekly income at least equivalent to the federal minimum wage multiplied by 20 hours.
- Participating in an on-the-job training program. A person is considered to be participating in an on-the-job training program only during the period of time the person is being trained by the employer.
- Participating in a state or federally-funded work study program (funded in full or in part under Title IV-C of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended) during the regular school year. To qualify under this student status eligibility provision, the student must be approved for work study during the school term and anticipate actually working during that time, unless exempted because the student:
 - •• Starts the month the school term begins or the month work study is approved, whichever is later.
 - •• Continues until the end of the month in which the school term ends, or when you become aware that the student has refused a work-study assignment.
 - •• Remains between terms or semesters when the break is less than a full month, or the student is still participating in work study during the break.
- Providing more than half of the physical care of a group member under the age of six.
- Providing more than half of the physical care of a group member age six through eleven and the local office has determined adequate child care is not available to:
 - •• Enable the person to attend class and work at least 20 hours per week.
 - •• Participate in a state or federally-financed work study program during the regular school year.
- A single parent enrolled full-time in an institution of higher education who cares for a dependent under age 12. This includes a person who does not live with his or her spouse, who has parental control over a child who does **not** live with his or her natural, adoptive or stepparent. BEM 245. (Emphasis added)

A person remains in student status while attending classes regularly. Student status continues during official school vacations and periods of extended illness. Student status does not continue if the student is suspended or does not intend to register for the next school term (excluding summer term). BEM 245.

201359122/SDS

An over issuance is the amount of benefits issued to the cli ent group in excess of what they were eligible to receive. BAM 705. The amount of the over issuance is the amount of benefits the group actually received minus—the amount the group was eligible t—o receive. BAM 720. When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the over issuance. BAM 700.

Department errors are caused by incorrect actions by the Department. BAM 705. Department error over issuances are not pursued if the estimated over issuance is less than \$250 per program. BAM 705. Clie nt e rrors occur when the customer gave incorrect or incomplete information to the Department. Client errors are not established if the over issuance e is less than \$125 unle so the client group is active for the over issuance program, or the over i ssuance is a re sult of a quality control audit finding . BAM 700.

In this case, at the February 27, 2014 hearing, the department's representative, recoupment specialist, Linda Clark-Blythe, provided sufficient and undisputed testimony and documentary evidence establishing that, despite Respondent having reported in his April 21, 2011 ass istance application that he was a full-time c ollege student working less than 20 hours per week, the Department erroneously approved Respondent for FAP benefits, contrary to BEM 245, resu Iting in Respondent's receipt of an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ for the period of June 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013.

Testimony and other evidence must be we ighed 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). Moreover, the weight and credi bility 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).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record and finds—that, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence present ed during the February 27, 20—14 hearing, the department properly determined that Respon dent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$2,000.00 for the period of June 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the department properly determined that Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of for the period of June 1, 2012 through March 31, 2013, which the department is required to recoup. Accordingly, the department's recoupment of Respondent's over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of **UPHELD** and the Department is ORDERED to initiate collection procedures in this amount in accordance with Department policy.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

Administrative Law Judge for Maura D. Corrigan, Director Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 5, 2014

Date Mailed: March 5, 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 req uest of a p arty within 30 days of the mailing date of this De cision and Order. MAHS will not order a rehearing or reconsideration on the Department's motion where the final deci sion 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 existe d 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 a ddress 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

201359122/SDS

SDS/hj

