


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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 14-008967  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: February 11, 2015  
County: OTTAWA (DISTRICT 70)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

**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 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 February 11, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in the 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 the 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 the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should the Respondent be disqualified from receiving 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 11, 2014 to establish an OI of benefits received by the Respondent as a result of the Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG has requested that the Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.

3. The Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by the Respondent on February 9, 2010, the Respondent reported that he intended to stay in Michigan.
5. The Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in his residence within 10 days to the Department.
6. The Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. The Respondent began using benefits outside of the State of Michigan beginning in February 2010.
8. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is April of 2010 to August of 2011 and August of 2013 to December of 2013.
9. During the alleged fraud periods, the Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
10. This was the Respondent's first alleged IPV.
11. 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 (2009), 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 720 (2009), 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 has met its burden of proving, by a clear and convincing standard, that the Respondent deliberately failed to report a change in residence to Illinois and continued to use his FAP benefits after he moved to Illinois. As such, the Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department has met its burden of proof, by clear and convincing standard, of establishing that the Claimant committed an IPV.

### **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 alleges and the evidence establishes that this is the Respondent's first IPV. As such, the Administrative Law Judge determines that the appropriate disqualification period is 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 (2009), p. 1.

In this case, the Department has established, by a clear and convincing standard, that the Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during the OI period, as the Respondent was completely ineligible for benefits because he was not a resident of the state of Michigan.

## **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 established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. The Respondent did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP program.

The Department is ordered to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$2431 in accordance with Department policy. It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Respondent be disqualified from FAP for 12 months.

*Susanne E. Harris*

---

Susanne E. Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services


Date Signed: **2/18/2015**

Date Mailed: **2/18/2015**

SEH/hj

**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 box covering several lines of text in the 'cc:' field.