



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


**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-002890  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.:   
Hearing Date: July 10, 2014  
County: ST. CLAIR DHS

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: LYNN M. 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 July 10, 2014 from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by , Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: the Respondent.

**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 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  
 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 22, 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. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report income.
5. Respondent  had  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 March 1, 2012 through September 30, 2012 (fraud period).
7. 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 [REDACTED] such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
9. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
10. 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 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 \$1000 or more, **or**
  - the total OI amount is less than \$1000, **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 (May 2014), 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 (May 2014), 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 seeks an intentional program violation due to the Respondent's failure to report unemployment benefits so that a correct determination of FAP benefits could be made. Recipients of public benefits are required to report all income and all changes in income as they occur and within 10 days of an increase. The Department presented evidence that the Respondent began receiving unemployment compensation benefits on January 23, 2012 in the amount of \$614, and continued to receive unemployment benefits through September 17, 2012. During the period the Respondent was receiving unemployment benefits, two applications for State Emergency Relief (SER) were filed by the Respondent on January 30, 2012 and March 7, 2012. Exhibit 1 pp. 44 and 49. The applications did not report receipt of unemployment benefits on either application. At a redetermination completed August 28, 2012, the Respondent informed her caseworker that she was receiving unemployment, but did not indicate the date the benefits started. Because the unemployment income was not reported, Respondent did receive more FAP benefits than she was entitled to receive.

Based upon the record as a whole, it is determined that the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent did fail to report the income and gave inaccurate and incomplete information on two occasions when she was applying for SER and thus an intentional program violation was established. The Claimant received \$1228 in unemployment monthly for most of the months on average, and it is a large enough amount that it should not have been overlooked by the Respondent on her second SER application. Based upon the evidence presented, the Department has met its burden of proof and an IPV is established.

### **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. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 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 FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has been found to have established that an IPV, and thus its request for a disqualification has been demonstrated and is granted. This being the Respondent's first IPV, the disqualification is for one year.

### **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. In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits for the period between March 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012. The Department presented a benefit summary inquiry to support issuances during this period totaling [REDACTED]

Because the Department properly calculated the first month of the OI period to begin March 1, 2012 (see BAM 720, p. 7), and established the amount issued during the fraud period, the Department is entitled to recoup or collect [REDACTED] from Respondent for FAP benefits it issued to Respondent between March 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012.

In this case, the Department presented detailed budgets which were reviewed during the hearing and which were calculated to include the unemployment unearned income received monthly by the Respondent. The FAP budgets as presented are correct and establish an OI of [REDACTED] was made. Therefore, the Department has established that it is entitled to collect or recoup from Respondent [REDACTED] in FAP benefits issued to Respondent from March 1, 2012 and September 30, 2012.

### 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  has not established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
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 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.



**LYNN M. FERRIS**

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

Date Signed: **7/28/2014**

Date Mailed: **7/28/2014**

**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:

