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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 2014-9015 Issue No.: 1006, 3006

Case No.: Hearing Date:

March 19, 2014

County: Isabella

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

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 three-way telephone hearing was held on March 19, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. Participants on behalf of the Department included (Recoupment Specialist). Respondent participated via telephone and provided testimony.

ISSUE

Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Family Independence Program (FIP) 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 and FIP benefits from the Department.
- 2. The Department alleges Respondent received a FAP OI during the period of July 1, 2006 through February 28, 2007 due to Department's error.
- 3. The Department alleges that Respondent received a \$ FAP OI that is still due and owing to the Department.
- 4. The Department alleges Respondent received a FIP OI during the period of July 1, 2006 through February 28, 2007 due to Department's error.
- 5. The Department alleges that Respondent received a \$ FIP OI that is still due and owing to the Department.

6. The Department requested a hearing on October 8, 2013.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administrative Manual (PAM), Department of Human Services Program Eligibility Manual (PEM) and Reference Tables (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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). PAM 700, p 1 (7-1-2005). 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). PAM 700, p 1 (7-1-2005).

An agency error OI is caused by incorrect action (including delayed or no action) by DHS staff or department processes. PAM 700, p 4 (7-1-20005). If unable to identify the type of OI, the Department records it as an agency error. PAM 700, p 4 (7-1-2005). 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. PAM 700, p 6 (7-1-2005).

Here, the Department contends that Respondent received an OI of FIP and FAP benefits due to an agency error. The Department alleges that it failed to properly and timely budget Social Security Income (SSI) received by Respondent's son which began in May, 2006. During this time period, the Department contends that Respondent received an OI of FIP and FAP. The Department asserts that it discovered the error during an audit on February 26, 2007. The Department apparently initiated this debt collection/recoupment action in 2008, but for some reason, failed to properly proceed until now. Respondent does not challenge the Department's assertions that it was an agency error.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed 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). The weight and credibility 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). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The Administrative Law Judge is unaware of any policy that prohibits the Department from pursuing the Ols in the instant matter. The record evidence shows that the Department failed to properly include unearned income from SSI received by Respondent's son during the above time period. During this period, Respondent's son should have been removed from FIP and his income budgeted for FAP. The substantial, material and competent evidence, based on the whole record, indicates that Respondent did receive an OI of FIP and FAP due to agency error.

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department did establish a FIP benefit OI to Respondent in the amount of \$ and a FAP OI to Respondent of \$ and a FA

DECISION AND ORDER

Accordingly, the Department is **AFFIRMED.**

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

C. Adam Purnell

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

CAO D

Date Signed: March 26, 2014

Date Mailed: March 26, 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

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

CAP/las

CC:

