

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-002423
Issue No.: 1005; 3005
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 10, 2014
County: MUSKEGON

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert 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 July 10, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: [REDACTED]

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
 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 May 6, 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 December 1, 2010 through January 31, 2011; February 1, 2013 through April 30, 2013, and; April 1, 2009 through January 31, 2010.
5. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] 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 [REDACTED].
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.

First, it should be noted that respondent signed a repayment agreement on April 3, 2014; in this agreement, respondent acknowledged and agreed that they had been overpaid FIP and FAP benefits in the amount of \$7,878, and agreed to pay back that amount (Department Exhibit 14). Therefore, there is no dispute as to whether respondent was overissued FIP and FAP benefits, and the undersigned will not be addressing that issue in this decision.

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 (2014); BAM 720.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720.

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:

- 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 (2014).

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.

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. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (2014). 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.

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. Furthermore, the undersigned is 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 and FAP eligibility.

The burden of proof that the Department must meet in order to prove Intentional Program Violation is very high. It is not enough to prove that the respondent was aware of the requirements to report at some point, nor is it enough to prove that the respondent did not report in a timely manner. The Department must prove in a clear and convincing manner, that, not only did the respondent withhold critical information, but that the respondent withheld this information with the intent to commit an IPV.

In other words, the Department must prove that the respondent did not simply forget to meet their obligations to report, but rather, actively sought to defraud the Department.

The Department has met that burden in the current case. On December 13, 2010, respondent filed a redetermination with regard to their FAP benefits (Department Exhibit 5). On this application, respondent reported to the Department that there was not employment income in the household.

This statement was false.

The Department submitted a verification of employment with wage information from Forge Industrial Staffing for one of the household members. (Department Exhibit 10) that showed that respondent had employment income in the household for several months prior, and during her filing her redetermination for FAP benefits.

Respondent affirmatively misrepresented her potential income on her FAP application, and this misrepresentation is evidence of malfeasance with regards to respondents reporting requirements.

As such, if respondent purposely failed to report her income to the Department, it must follow that respondent made this misrepresentation for the purpose of securing FAP benefits, and therefore has committed an Intentional Program Violation.

With regard to the FIP benefits, it appears from the evidence that respondent did not begin receiving FIP benefits until January, 2013. The Department has submitted no evidence detailing what information respondent gave the Department during that time period; therefore, the undersigned cannot make a determination as to whether the respondent misrepresented or misreported critical information to the Department.

As the undersigned cannot make a determination with regards whether the respondent made a misrepresentation with regards to her FIP benefits, the undersigned must decline to find an IPV in the matter.

As stated above, the respondent has already signed a repayment agreement on April 3, 2014, stipulating that there was an overissuance of [REDACTED] in FIP and FAP benefits; therefore, no finding into the legitimacy of that number is necessary.

This amount may be recouped in full.

Furthermore, evidence indicates that this is the first IPV for which the respondent has been found responsible, with regards to the Food Assistance program.

Per policy found at BAM 720, the proper penalty for a second Intentional Program Violation is a one year disqualification. Therefore, the Department's request to impose a one year sanction on the respondent with regards to the Food Assistance program is granted.

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 in the Food Assistance Program 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.

The Department is ORDERED to

initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] in FIP benefits and \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from
 FIP FAP SDA CDC for a period of
 12 months. 24 months. lifetime.



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

Date Signed: **10/2/2014**
Date Mailed: **10/2/2014**

RJC / 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:

[REDACTED]