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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[redacted]

Reg. No: 20147604
Issue No: 3006
Case No: [redacted]
Hearing Date: March 20, 2014
Calhoun County DHS

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Suzanne D. Sonneborn

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. Following due notice mailed to Respondent 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 March 20, 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 by [redacted] a recoupment specialist with the Department's Calhoun County office.

ISSUE

Whether Respondent received an over issuance (OI) of Food Assistance 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. (Department Exhibit 4, pp. 2-13)

2. On October 8, 2013, the Department discovered that Respondent failed to timely and accurately report to the Department his incarceration from July 23, 2013 through at least October 8, 2013. (Department Exhibit 3, p. 14)

3. Due to Respondent's failure to timely and accurate report his incarceration, Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of $[redacted]

for the period of September 1, 2013 through October 31, 2013. (Department Exhibit 2, p. 15)

4. On October 25, 2013, the Department mailed Respondent a written notice (DHS-4358-A) that he received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of $[redacted] for the period of September 1, 2013 through October 31, 2013 as a result of client error. (Department Exhibit 1, pp. 16-20)

5. On October 25, 2013, Respondent 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 contest a department decision affecting eligibility or benefit levels whenever it is believed that the decision is incorrect. The department will provide an administrative hearing to review the decision and determine the appropriateness of that decision. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 600 (2011), p. 1. The regulations governing 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 Assistance Program (FAP) (formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) program) is established by the Food Stamp 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).

Generally, a client is responsible for reporting any change in circumstances that may affect eligibility or benefit level, including one's incarceration, within ten days of the change. BAM 105, p 7.

An over issuance is the amount of benefits issued to the client 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 to 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. Client errors occur when the customer gave incorrect or incomplete information to the Department. Client errors are not established if the over issuance is less than $125 unless the client group is active for the over issuance program, or the over issuance is a result of a quality control audit finding. BAM 700.

In this case, at the March 20, 2014 hearing, the Department's representative, recoupment specialist, Trevor Kelly, provided sufficient and undisputed testimony and documentary evidence establishing that, Respondent failed to timely and accurately report to the Department his incarceration from July 23, 2013 through at least October 8, 2013i, which incarceration resulted in Respondent's receipt of an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of $[redacted] for the period of September 1, 2013 through October 31, 2013.

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). Moreover, 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).

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 presented during the March 20, 2014 hearing, the department properly determined that Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of $[redacted] for the period of September 1, 2013 through October 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 $[redacted] for the period of September 1, 2013 through October 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 $[redacted] is **UPHELD** and the Department is ORDERED to initiate collection procedures in this amount in accordance with Department policy.

It is **SO ORDERED.**

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

Date Signed: March 27, 2014

Date Mailed: March 27, 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

SDS/hj

cc: [redacted]