

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-003872  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: July 24, 2014  
County: WAYNE-DISTRICT (57)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman**

**HEARING DECISION FOR CONCURRENT BENEFITS  
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 Regulations, 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 24, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Department was also represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the 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  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)     Food Assistance Program (FAP)  
 Medical Assistance Program (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  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)     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 10, 2014, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having received concurrent program benefits and, as such, 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  FAP  FIP  MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on March 6, 2014, Respondent did not report if he intended to stay in Michigan nor if he is a resident of Michigan.
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in his residence to the Department.
6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is October 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014.
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,140 in  FAP  FIP  MA benefits from the State of Michigan.
9. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued  FAP  FIP  MA benefits from the State of Kentucky.
10. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
11. 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), pp. 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 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 Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits because he failed to update residency information for the purpose of receiving FAP benefits from more than one state.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105 (October 2013), p. 9. Other changes must be reported within 10 days after the client is aware of them. BAM 105, p. 9. These include, but are not limited to, changes in address and shelter cost changes that result from the move. BAM 105, p. 9.

Concurrent receipt of benefits means assistance received from multiple programs to cover a person's needs for the same time period. BEM 222 (July 2013), p. 1.

Benefit duplication means assistance received from the same (or same type of) program to cover a person's needs for the same month. BEM 222, p. 1. For example, FIP from Michigan and similar benefits from another state's cash assistance program. BEM 222, p. 1. As specified in the balance of BEM 222, benefit duplication is prohibited except for MA and FAP in limited circumstances. BEM 222, p. 1.

A person cannot receive FAP in more than one state for any month. BEM 222, p. 3. Out-of-state benefit receipt or termination may be verified by one of the following: DHS-3782, Out-of-State Inquiry; Letter or document from other state; or Collateral contact with the state. BEM 222, p. 4.

A person is disqualified for a period of 10 years if found guilty through the Administrative Hearing Process, convicted in court or by signing a repayment and disqualification agreement (such as a DHS-826 or DHS-830) of having made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203 (July 2013), p. 1.

The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is October 1, 2013 to April 30, 2014. At the hearing, the Department presented evidence to show why it believed the Respondent was aware of his responsibility to report changes in residence and that he made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously.

First, the Department presented Respondent's application dated March 6, 2014, which the Department argued misrepresented his circumstances of eligibility. See Exhibit 1, pp. 9-27. Also, the application was submitted during the alleged fraud period in which he indicated he was homeless, but reported a Michigan mailing address. See Exhibit 1, p. 11.

Second, the Department presented out-of-state correspondence dated April 22, 2014, to show Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously in Kentucky. See Exhibit 1, p. 40. The documentation confirmed that Respondent received FAP benefits in Kentucky from September 2013 to April 2014 (based on e-mail date). See Exhibit 1, p. 40. Moreover, the Department presented Respondent's benefit summary inquiry to show that he received Michigan FAP benefits from January 2013 to April 2014. See Exhibit 1, pp. 36-38. Thus, the evidence indicated that the FAP benefits were received simultaneously (Kentucky and Michigan) from September 2013 to April 2014 (alleged fraud period).

It should also be noted that the OIG Investigative Report indicated that the agent spoke with the Respondent on April 24, 2014. See Exhibit 1, p. 2. In the report, Respondent alleged that he was in Kentucky for 60 days (August 2013 to October 2013) for experimental cancer treatment. See Exhibit 1, p. 2. Moreover, Respondent alleged that he was staying at his brother's house (same address in hearing decision) and that he came back to Michigan when his treatment did not work. See Exhibit 1, p. 2. Finally, Respondent alleged that he notified Kentucky that he was leaving the state. See Exhibit 1, p. 2.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

First, it has to be established that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. See BEM 203, p. 1. Respondent submitted during the fraud period a FAP/Cash/Health Care Coverage application on March 6, 2014. See Exhibit 1, pp. 9-27. In the application, Respondent indicated that he was homeless, but reported a Michigan mailing address. See Exhibit 1, p. 11. Finally, at the time of the application, Respondent received benefits simultaneously in Kentucky. See Exhibit 1, p. 40. In fact, Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously (Kentucky and Michigan) from September 2013 to April 2014 (eight months). Even though the OIG report indicated

that Respondent stated he notified Kentucky of his departure to Michigan, he failed to be present at the hearing to rebut the Department's evidence. See Exhibit 1, p. 2. Respondent did not indicate in the application that he was and/or is currently receiving benefits from Kentucky. As such, the evidence presented that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously from Michigan and Kentucky. See BEM 203, p. 1.

Second, it also has to be established that Respondent received multiple FAP benefits simultaneously (Kentucky and Michigan) during the fraud period. As stated previously, the evidence indicated that the FAP benefits were received simultaneously (Kentucky and Michigan) from September 2013 to April 2014. See Exhibit 1, pp. 36-38 and 40.

In summary, the evidence is sufficient to establish that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203, p. 1. There was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of his responsibility to report changes in residence and that he intentionally withheld information for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. Therefore, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, pp. 15-16. 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. 16.

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. 16. 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 satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is disqualified for ten years for a FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

### **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 benefit amount the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8.

As previously stated, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits because he made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203, p. 1.

In establishing the OI amount, the Department presented a benefit summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan for October 2013 to April 2014, which totaled \$1,140. See Exhibit 1, pp. 36-38. Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup \$1,140 of FAP benefits it issued to Respondent for October 1, 2013, to April 30, 2014. BAM 715, pp. 4-6.

### **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  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 \$1,140 from the following program(s)  FAP  FIP  MA.

The Department is ORDERED to

initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1,140 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that

Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years.

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

Date Signed: **7/31/2014**

Date Mailed: **7/31/2014**

EJF/cl

**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:

A large black rectangular redaction covers the names and contact information of the recipients listed under the 'cc:' field.