


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-008696  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: December 04, 2014  
County: HILLSDALE

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jacquelyn A. McClinton**

**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 December 4, 2014, from Detroit, 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 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 August 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 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 changes in her residence to the Department.
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 March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013 (fraud period).
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$3,517.00 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0.00 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$3,517.00.
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 \$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 (February 2013), p. 10.

### **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 (February 2013), p. 6; 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 her FAP benefits because she completed several documents in which she failed to report that her husband was living in the home. In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented the following documents submitted by Respondent:

- May 24, 2012 Redetermination;
- November 6, 2012 Semi-Annual Contact Report;
- February 27, 2013 Redetermination; and
- June 1, 2013 Redetermination.

When completing each of the documents, Respondent did not list her husband as a household member. The Department presented correspondence from Respondent's husband's employer which showed that he began on January 7, 2013 and had the same address as Respondent. Further, the Department submitted a Michigan Secretary of State document showing that Respondent's husband renewed his driver's license on December 28, 2011 and listed Respondent's address as his address. There was no evidence that Respondent's husband changed his address with the Michigan Secretary of State after December 28, 2011. The February 2013 and the June 1, 2013 Redeterminations were submitted after Respondent's husband began working while reporting the same address as Respondent. Further, the Department provided evidence that had Respondent's husband's income been properly reported, Respondent would have been ineligible for FAP benefits from March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013. Accordingly, it is therefore found that Respondent committed an IPV of the FAP program between March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013.

### **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. 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 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. 13.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits by failing to report her husband as a

household member from March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013. Accordingly, Respondent is subject to a twelve month disqualification under the FAP program.

**Overissuance**

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. BAM 720, p. 13.


In support of its contention that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits, the Department presented pay information relating to Respondent's husband's employment. Further, the Department presented a benefit issuance summary which showed that during the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$3,517.00 in FAP benefits. The Department also presented FAP budgets for each month during the fraud period which showed that Respondent would have been entitled to \$0.00 if her husband's income had been timely reported. Therefore, the Department has established that an overissuance occurred in the amount of \$3,517.00 and it is therefore entitled to recoup that amount for FAP benefits it issued to Respondent from March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

1. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an intentional program violation (IPV).
2. The Department has established that Respondent received an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$3,517.00 from the FAP program for the period of March 1, 2013 through September 30, 2013.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$3,517.00 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.



**Jacquelyn A. McClinton**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **12/22/2014**

Date Mailed: **12/22/2014**

JAM / 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:

