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

#### IN THE MATTER OF:

2.

3.

Violation (IPV)?

IN THE MATTER OF:			
	Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	201427822 3005 April 17, 2014 Ionia County DHS	
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully			
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 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 April 17, 2014, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).			
Participants on behalf of Respondent included:			
Respondent did not appear at the hearing and pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Code R 400.3178(5).			
<u>ISSUES</u>			
<ol> <li>Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI)</li> <li>Family Independence Program (FIP)</li> <li>Food Assistance Program (FAP)</li> <li>Medical Assistance (MA)</li> <li>benefits that the Department is entitled to receive</li> </ol>	State Disability A Child Developme	assistance (SDA) ent and Care (CDC)	

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

☐ Family Independence Program (FIP)? ☐ State Disability Assistance (SDA)? ☐ Child Development and Care (CDC)?

Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving

Did Respondent, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program

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 January 8, 2014, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2.	The OIG $\boxtimes$ has $\square$ has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3.	Respondent was a recipient of $\ \square$ FIP $\ \boxtimes$ FAP $\ \square$ SDA $\ \square$ CDC $\ \square$ MA benefits issued by the Department.
4.	Respondent $\boxtimes$ was $\square$ was not aware of the responsibility to report all household income to the Department.
5.	Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6.	The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is August 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012.
7.	During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ in  FIP FAP SDA CDC MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to in such benefits during this time period.
8.	The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA benefits in the amount of \$
9.	This was Respondent's ⊠ first ☐ second ☐ third alleged IPV.
10.	A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and $\boxtimes$ was $\square$ was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.
	CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Adm (BEI Aug Serv Prog	artment policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges inistrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual M), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to ust 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human rices Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Department of Human Services gram Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference edules Manual (RFS).
Res USC Age	The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal consibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193, and 42 6 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence ncy) administers FIP pursuant to MCL 400.10 and 400.57a and Mich Admin Code, 100.3101 to .3131.

Example 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 Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by the Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5, and is implemented by 42 CFR 400.200 to 1008.59. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the MA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105.
☐ The State Disability Assistance (SDA) program is established by the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1119b. The Department of Human Services (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers the SDA program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and Mich Admin Code, R 400.31513180.
The Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IVA, IVE and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.50015020.

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 \$1000 or more, or
  - the total OI amount is less than \$1000, 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 (July 1, 2013), p. 10.

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 (July 1, 2013), p. 6; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. 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.

#### **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 (July 1, 2013), 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.

#### Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

In this case, the Respondent acknowledged the responsibility to report all household income to the Department on her application for assistance dated April 12, 2011. The Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits from August 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012. The Respondent received unemployment compensation benefits starting on June 24, 2011, and failed to report this unearned income to the

Date Signed: April 30, 2014

Date Mailed: April 30, 2014

Department. If the Respondent's unemployment benefits had been reported to the Department, the Respondent would have received a lower amount of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent failed to report her unemployment benefits to the Department for the purposes of receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that she would have been eligible to receive otherwise.

### **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, if any, concludes that:

۱.	The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent $\boxtimes$ did $\square$ did not commit an intentional program violation (IPV).
2.	Respondent $\boxtimes$ did $\square$ did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of from the following program(s) $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA.
3.	The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.
IJ [ ]	is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FIP FAP SDA CDC for a period of 12 months. 24 months. lifetime.
	Levi dul
	Kevin Scully
	Administrative Law Judge
	for Maura Corrigan, Director
	Department of Human Services

**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.

## KS/hj



