

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-003727  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: July 22, 2014  
County: CALHOUN (DISTRICT 21)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Darryl Johnson

**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 July 22, 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 overissuance (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 Family Independence Program Food Assistance Program (FAP) 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. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on June 4, 2014, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.

2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report to the Department changes in her circumstances that would affect her eligibility for the benefits she was receiving.
5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. Respondent began using FAP benefits outside of the State of Michigan beginning August 7, 2013.
7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is October 1, 2012, through October 31, 2013, (fraud period).
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
9. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED].
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.

### **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 \$1,000 or more, **or**
  - The total OI amount is less than \$1,000, **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 (7/1/13), p. 12.

### **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 (7/1/13), 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.

In this case, Respondent was using her FAP in Michigan until May 23, 2012, when she began using them in Indiana. She returned to using them in Michigan in June 2012,

through August 5, 2012, but resumed using her FAP in Indiana from August 5, 2012, through August 15, 2013, with just a very brief period in Michigan (June 21 – 23, 2013).

The Department alleges in its Hearing Summary (Exhibit 1 Page 1) that there was a [REDACTED] OI during the fraud period. On page 2 it alleges there was a [REDACTED] OI during the fraud period. The Department did not provide any report showing the amount of FAP that was provided to Respondent during the fraud period. The report of FAP transactions provides evidence that Respondent was receiving [REDACTED] per month; and with a 13-month fraud period, there would have been [REDACTED] in OI. Because the Department only identified a [REDACTED] OI in the Hearing Summary, that is the limit that will be found.

Per BAM 105, p. 7 (12/1/11) Respondents are required to report their change of address within 10 days of a move. Respondent did not do that. By failing to report her correct address she received benefits that she would not have otherwise received. BEM 220 (4/1/14) states, "To be eligible, a person must be a Michigan resident." For FAP, "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." Because Respondent was not living in Michigan, she was not eligible to receive FAP benefits.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15. 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. 15.

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 (7/1/13), 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, Respondent had no prior IPV's. She committed an IPV in this case by accepting FAP benefits for which she was not eligible.

### **Overissuance**

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.

In this case, Respondent was overissued [REDACTED] in FAP. Those benefits are to be recouped.


**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 committed an intentional program violation (IPV).
2. Respondent received an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the FAP programs.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for 12 months.



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

Date Signed: **7/23/2014**

Date Mailed: **7/23/2014**

DJ / jf

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of the above Hearing Decision, the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives or the circuit court in Ingham County.

cc:

[REDACTED]