

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2014-5575  
Issue No(s): 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 11, 2015  
County: Wayne #35

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E Harris

**HEARING DECISION FOR  
INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Human Services (Department), 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 Regulations, 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 February 11, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

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**

1. Did Respondent receive an over-issuance (OI) of  Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?
2. Did Respondent, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving  Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

**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 October 1, 2013 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having received concurrent program benefits and, as such, allegedly committed an IPV.

2. The OIG  has requested that the Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of  FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on July 6, 2011, Respondent reported that she intended to stay in Michigan.
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in her residence to the Department.
6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. Respondent began using  FAP benefits outside of the State of Michigan beginning on October 5, 2011.
8. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is November 1, 2011 through August 30, 2013.
9. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in  FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
10. This was Respondent's  first alleged IPV.
11. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and  was returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

### **PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

This matter was originally scheduled for [REDACTED] 013. On that day, Administrative Law Judge [REDACTED] issued an order granting adjournment. The hearing was rescheduled to [REDACTED] and commenced as rescheduled.

### **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). Prior to August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Department of Human Services Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).

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.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor,
- prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
  - the total OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$ [REDACTED] or more, or
  - the total OI amount is less than \$ [REDACTED] and
    - the group has a previous IPV, or
    - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
    - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance (see BEM 222), or
    - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

BAM 720 (2011), p. 10.

### **Intentional Program Violation**

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 reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (2011), p. 6; BAM 720, p. 1.

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); see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6). 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.

DHS alleged the Respondent intentionally failed to report a change in residency to DHS resulting in improper FAP benefit issuances. To be eligible for FAP benefits, a person must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (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.*

A requirement to the IPV claim is that the Respondent lost Michigan residency. A loss of Michigan residency does not necessarily coincide with leaving the State of Michigan. DHS has no known policies preventing people from traveling outside of Michigan, though there is a DHS policy concerning the duration a person can be absent from a household before the person is considered out of the household. FAP benefit group composition policy states that clients absent from a home for longer than 30 days are not considered temporarily absent. BEM 212 (2012), pp. 2, 3; in other words, if a person is out of a home longer than 30 days, they are no longer in the home. The absence may last longer than 30 days if the absent person is in a hospital and there is a plan for the absent person to return home. The policy is not necessarily directly applicable to residency, but it seems reasonable to allow clients a 30-day period before residency in another state is established; the 30-day period beginning with a client's first out-of-Michigan food purchase.

Based on the presented evidence, the Respondent is found to not be a Michigan resident as of 11/4/11; 30 days after the Respondent first accessed FAP benefits outside of Michigan. Though the Respondent is found to not be a Michigan resident as of 11/4/11, this does not prove that an IPV was committed. DHS assumed that the Respondent purposely failed to report a change in residency to continue receiving FAP benefits from Michigan. It is plausible that the Respondent reported a change in residency but that DHS failed to act on the Respondent's reporting. DHS was not able to present any written statement from the Respondent that claimed residency in Michigan during a period when the Respondent was known to be outside of Michigan. DHS also could not provide evidence of a verifiable reporting system that established the failure to change the Respondent's address was the fault of the Respondent. This is somewhat supportive of finding that the Respondent did not commit fraud.

The Respondent exclusively accessed FAP benefits in Georgia, from 10/5/11-10/24/12 for a 12-month period. On 11/1/12, the Respondent accessed her FAP benefits in Michigan until 1/23/13. On 1/25/13, the Respondent began accessing FAP benefits in [REDACTED] again until 9/9/13, for another seven-month period of time. It is possible that the Respondent maintained Michigan residency while buying her food elsewhere during this time. It is possible that the Respondent always intended to return to Michigan. Though there are possibilities that the Respondent was a Michigan resident between 11/4/11 and 9/9/13, it is improbable. It is particularly less possible when the Respondent failed to appear to rebut any of the DHS allegations.

Consideration was also given to the proximity between the Respondent's reported address and the state in which FAP benefits were accessed. The Respondent reported an address known to be several hours from ██████████. If the address and state were in closer proximity, a loss of residency becomes less likely. The ample distance is supportive of a finding that the Respondent lost Michigan residency.

DHS did not allege that the Respondent concurrently received FAP benefits from multiple states. Unless the Respondent received FAP benefits from more than one state, there is no apparent motive for the Respondent's alleged fraud; this presumes that the Respondent could have received FAP benefits from the state in which the Respondent resided. Without evidence of a financial incentive, a contention of fraud is much less persuasive. Based on the presented evidence, DHS failed to establish that the Respondent intentionally failed to report a change in residency. Accordingly, it is found that DHS failed to establish that the Respondent committed an IPV. Even though DHS failed to establish that the Respondent committed an IPV, it must still be determined whether an over-issuance of benefits occurred.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 12. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 13.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the OI relates to MA. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (2011), 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 FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Administrative Law Judge has already determined that the Respondent did not commit an IPV. As such, no disqualification shall be imposed.

### **Over-issuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (July 2013), 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.* For over-issued benefits to clients who are no longer receiving benefits, DHS may request a hearing for debt establishment and collection purposes. The hearing decision determines the existence and collectability of a debt to the agency. BAM 725 (2012), p. 13. Over-issuance balances on inactive cases must be repaid by lump sum or monthly cash payments unless collection is suspended. *Id.* at 6. Other debt collection methods allowed by DHS regulations include: cash payments by clients, expunged FAP benefits,

State of Michigan tax refunds and lottery winnings, federal salaries, federal benefits and federal tax refunds. *Id.* at 7.

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 OI in either scenario. Determining which party is at fault may affect the OI period. There is insufficient evidence that Respondent is at fault for the OI. It should be noted that Respondent's use of FAP benefits outside of Michigan is unpersuasive evidence of fault because there is no reason for a client to believe that such use is improper. It is found that the OI was due to DHS error.

For OIs 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 (2012), pp. 4-5. Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105 (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.*

DHS alleged that FAP benefits were over-issued to Respondent over the period of 11/1/11-8/30/13 due to Respondent's loss of Michigan residency. It was found above that Respondent was not a Michigan resident as of 11/4/11. Allowing 10 days for reporting of the change and 10 days to calculate the benefit month affected results in a date of 11/24/11 and an effective benefit month of 12/11. It is found that the FAP benefit OI period was therefore not correctly determined to be from 11/1/11-8/30/13. Furthermore, after a close review of the record, this Administrative Law Judge is not persuaded that the OI amount has been properly determined because it is unclear which months were calculated in the OI and as there were some months when the Respondent was in Michigan. Therefore, the evidence is insufficient to establish that Respondent received a total of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan over the period of 11/1/11-8/30/13.

### **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. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent  did not commit an intentional program violation (IPV).
2. Respondent  did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the following program  FAP.

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

*Susanne E. Harris*

---

Susanne E Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 3/4/14

Date Mailed: 3/5/14

**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.

SEH/tb

cc:

