

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-003440
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: September 11, 2014
County: CALHOUN (DISTRICT 21)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn Ferris

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 September 11, 2014, from Battle Creek, 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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

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 2, 104, 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 if the FAP group income exceeded the simplified reporting limit.
5. Respondent did not have an 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 the months of August 1, 2012, September 2012, and November 2012 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
9. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and 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 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 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to

MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b; 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 \$500 or more, **or**
 - the total OI amount is less than \$500, **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 (8/1/12), p. 12-13.

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 (12/1/11), p. 7; 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.

In this case, the Department alleges that the Respondent committed an IPV when she failed to report that the earnings of the FAP group exceeded the simplified reporting limits for August, September, November and December 2012. The Respondent was provided with a notice a Notice of Case Action in August 2012, advising her that the then reporting limit was \$[REDACTED]. The Department presented budgets for the months of August, September and November 2012. Only two of the budgets provided demonstrated that the simplified reporting limit was exceeded for August and November. The budget for September 2012 demonstrated income in the amount of [REDACTED], which did **not** exceed the simplified reporting limit and thus cannot be part of the overissuance. The simplified reporting limit for November 2012 changed to \$[REDACTED]. The Department did not demonstrate that the Respondent was notified of the new simplified reporting limit by notice of case action. Based upon these facts, it is determined that the Department did not presented sufficient evidence to meet the clear and convincing evidence standard required to demonstrate an intention to withhold information so as to receive more benefits than the Respondent was entitled to receive. While the Department did demonstrate that the reporting limit was exceeded for August and November 2012, it did not establish that the Respondent failed to report intentionally. A review of the budgets presented shows that the Respondent's income fluctuated significantly during the period for each of the months considered, and none of the reporting appeared to be grossly inaccurate or obviously trying to hide the income increases. Therefore it is determined that the Department has not shown an intentional program violation.

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. 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, because the Department has failed to establish an IPV the Department is not entitled to a disqualification of the Respondent from receiving FAP benefits.

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. The amount of the OI is the amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive.

In this case, the Department did establish that for the months of August 2012 and November 2012 the Respondent did receive an OI of FAP due to exceeding the monthly simplified reporting limit of [REDACTED] for August and [REDACTED] for November. A review of the budgets prepared show that the earned income for these months exceeded the simplified reporting limit, and thus the Respondent was not entitled to FAP benefits for those months. The Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP for August 2012, and [REDACTED] for November 2012, for a total OI of [REDACTED].

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. The Department has not established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the FAP program.

The Department is ORDERED to:

1. Initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
2. Reduce the OI to [REDACTED] for the period August and November 2012 only, and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy.



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

Date Signed: **9/16/2014**

Date Mailed: **9/16/2014**

LMF/tm

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:

