

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-009736  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: June 03, 2015  
County: Kent-District 1

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and 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, telephone hearing was held on June 03, 2015, from Lansing, 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 the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should 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 27, 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. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is May 1, 2011, through October 31, 2012.

4. On an application for assistance dated July 15, 2008, the Respondent acknowledged the duty to accurately report any changes to the size and composition of her benefit group 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 alleges that from May 1, 2011, to October 31, 2012, the Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits but was eligible for only \$ [REDACTED] and therefore received an overissuance of \$ [REDACTED].
7. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
8. 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 Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, 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 Department of Human Services) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001-.3011.

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 \$500 or more, **or**
  - the total OI amount is less than \$500, **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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (October 1, 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (May 1, 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.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 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. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 1, 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.

### **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.

When a child spends time with multiple caretakers who do not live together such as joint physical custody, parent/grandparent, etc., determine a primary caretaker. Only one person can be the primary caretaker and the other caretaker(s) is considered the absent care-taker(s). The child is always in the FAP group of the primary care-taker. If the child's parent(s) is living in the home, he/she must be included in the FAP group. Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 212 (July 1, 2014), p 3.

On an application for assistance dated July 15, 2008, the Respondent acknowledged the duty to accurately report to the Department any changes to the size and composition of her benefit group. The Respondent was a FAP recipient from May 1, 2011, through October 31, 2012. On the Respondent's application for assistance, a daughter (██████) was listed as being in her home 30 days each month. On July 22, 2011, and July 10, 2012, the Respondent reported that ██████ was still in her home on Redetermination (DHS-1010) forms.

On April 15, 2011, an Order For Extended Parenting Time Pending Evidentiary Hearing was issued by the Kent County Circuit Court that the child ██████ would be in the exclusive care of a person not living in the Respondent's household and that the Respondent would be granted parenting time on alternate Sunday's from noon to 5:00 p.m., and each Wednesday from 5:00 p.m., to 7:00 p.m., at a public place. No evidence was presented on the record that the Respondent reported that the child ██████ would not be sleeping in her home each night, or that her absence was considered temporary. The Circuit Court would later make its order permanent. During the period of alleged fraud, the Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$██████ but if the Respondent had reported that the child JMB was not living in her home, she would have been eligible for only \$██████ The Respondent received a \$██████ FAP overissuance.


The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally failed to report that the child ██████ was no longer living in her home for the purposes of receiving and maintaining Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that she would not have been eligible to receive otherwise.

### **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 established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) program benefits in the amount of \$██████

3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **6/4/2015**

Date Mailed: **6/4/2015**

KS/las

**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. A copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

cc:

[REDACTED]