

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████

Reg. No.: 201430298  
Issue No.: 1005; 3005  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: June 30, 2014  
County: Genesee County (25-02)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Robert J. Chavez

**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 June 30, 2014 from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: ██████████.

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)     State Disability Assistance (SDA)  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)         Child Development and Care (CDC)  
 Medical Assistance (MA)  
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 (FIP)?     State Disability Assistance (SDA)?  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)?         Child Development and Care (CDC)?

**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 March 8, 2014, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG  has  has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is March 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012.
5. 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 \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
6. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits in the amount of ██████
7. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
8. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and  was  was not 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 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 they are entitled to receive, DHS must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

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 their reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (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.

The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

(c) Definition of Intentional Program Violation. Intentional Program Violation shall consist of having intentionally:

- (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or
- (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of

using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system (access device). 7 CFR 273.16(c).

(6) Criteria for determining intentional program violation. The hearing authority shall base the determination of intentional program violation on clear and convincing evidence which demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, intentional program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section. 7 CFR 273.16(c)(6).

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases when:

- benefit overissuance are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
- prosecution of welfare fraud is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
- the total overissuance amount is \$1000 or more, or
- the total overissuance amount is less than \$1000, and
  - the group has a previous intentional program violation, or
  - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
  - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance,
  - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

BAM 720 (2013), p. 12.

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

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the overissuance 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 (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 concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

Therefore, the undersigned may only find an IPV if there is clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally made a false or misleading statement, or

intentionally withheld information with the intention to commit an IPV, with regard to the FAP program. Thus, the Department must not only prove that the respondent committed an act, but that there was intent to commit the act.

In this case, the Department has established that respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all changes to the Department. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. However, the undersigned is not convinced that the Department has met its burden of proof in providing clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intended to defraud the Department with regard to their FIP or FAP eligibility.

The prerequisite for an IPV, client error, or agency error is proof of an actual overissuance of benefits. Even if the Department presents clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intended to defraud the Department, without proof of an actual overissuance, there can be no Intentional Program Violation and recoupment of benefits. The same standard holds for agency error and client error; there can be no error or recoupment without first proving, through clear and convincing evidence, the amount of that recoupment. As such, unless the Department first proves an overissuance, any evidence of intent to commit a program violation is irrelevant.

Therefore, the Department must first establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that an overissuance occurred and the amount of that overissuance. Where the Department is unable to or fails to prove the amount of overissuance, no overissuance can be said to have occurred.

The Department presented FAP recoupment budgets that do not appear to match the actual income received by the respondent's household for the months in question. For instance, in September, 2012, the Department's budgets use an earned income amount of [REDACTED] for the household. (Department Exhibit 10, pg 74). However, income verifications provided by the Department (Department Exhibits 5 and 9), show actual earned income of [REDACTED] for that month. A review of several of the FAP budgets presented by the Department show other errors throughout the recoupment calculations; in all cases reviewed by the undersigned, the earned income alleged by the Department bears little to no relation to the earned income verified by the Department in their own evidence.

While the Department alleged that a household member held two jobs instead of the reported one, no clear and convincing evidence was submitted that this household member actually held two jobs. The undersigned cannot take into account speculated income; proven, verifiable income must be shown in order to properly calculate a recoupment budget.

It is the job of the Department to show, through clear and convincing evidence, the amount of the required recoupment, and submitting recoupment budgets that are incorrect on their face are unacceptable. If the Department believes a recoupment is

proper, the Department should submit budgets that explain exactly how a recoupment is proper, with correct and verifiable numbers.

Even a clear act of fraud cannot give rise to a recoupment and IPV if the Department did not issue any benefits that the respondent was not entitled to. As such, if there is no evidence submitted regarding the proper amount of recoupment, the Administrative Law Judge cannot sustain a recoupment and hold that an overissuance occurred.

For those reasons, the undersigned must hold that the Department has failed to prove through clear and convincing evidence the amount of the overissuance or whether recoupment is proper for the purposes of the FAP program.

The Administrative Law Judge acknowledges that when there is some attempted fraud, there could be some degree of benefit overissuance; this is not always the case, however. The Department must provide clear and convincing evidence to establish the overissuance and the amount of overissuance that it seeks to recoup. Without an overissuance, there can be no IPV, client error, or agency error.

Failure to fulfill this evidentiary requirement must therefore result in a finding of no error. Thus, the undersigned must hold that there is no clear and convincing evidence that the respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation, and the Department has failed to prove a proper recoupment amount for the FAP program.

With regard to the FIP benefits at issue, the Department alleged a [REDACTED] overissuance. While the FIP budget numbers are incorrect, the calculations are far more straight forward than for a FAP over issuance, and after a review, the undersigned holds that the revised numbers would not have made a difference with regards to the FIP overissuance. As such, the undersigned holds that the FIP benefits were show to be overissued and recoupment may proceed in the amount of \$[REDACTED].

However, the undersigned does not believe that there is clear and convincing evidence of an intentional program violation with regards to this overissuance; no evidence of a deliberate misstatement or falsehood was presented, and as such, the undersigned is hesitant to say that the overissuance was a result of an intentional misrepresentation in order to secure additional benefits. The overissuance in question appears to be a result of the respondent underreporting income of another household member; however, there is no evidence that this was intentional, and as such, appears to be, at most, a client error.

### **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:

1. Respondent  did  did not commit an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.

2. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA.
3. Respondent did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the Food Assistance Program.

The Department is ORDERED to

reduce the OI to [REDACTED] for the period March 1, 2011 through December 31, 2012, and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy



**Robert J. Chavez**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 15, 2014  
Date Mailed: August 15, 2014

**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.

RJC/tm

cc: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]