

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

██████████  
██████████████████  
██████████████████████████████

Reg. No.: 14-017728  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: June 15, 2015  
County: MONROE

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman**

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and Human Services (Department or DHHS), 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 45 CFR 235.110; and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 15, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, 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 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 December 16, 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 her criminal disqualification 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 FAP fraud period is December 1, 2009 to December 31, 2013 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED]
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 Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Adult Services Manual (ASM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 to .3015.

Effective October 1, 2014, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.

- FAP trafficking overissuances 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 amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$500 or more, or
  - the total 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.

BAM 720 (October 2014), pp. 12-13; ASM 165 (May 2013), pp. 1-7.

### **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 or CDC provider 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.

People convicted of certain crimes, fugitive felons, and probation or parole violators are not eligible for assistance. BEM 203 (January 2009), p. 1. For FAP cases, a person who is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under a federal or state law is disqualified. BEM 203, p. 2. The person is disqualified as long as the violation occurs. BEM 203, p. 2. A disqualified person is one who is ineligible for FAP because the person refuses or fails to cooperate in meeting an eligibility factor. BEM 212 (October 2008), p. 6. Individuals are disqualified for being a parole and probation violator. BEM 212, pp. 6-7.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department of her probation violation and therefore, was ineligible during the alleged IPV period.

First, the Department presented Respondent's application dated July 14, 2009, to show that she acknowledged her responsibility to report changes as required. See Exhibit A, pp. 11-26.

Second, the Department presented evidence that Respondent was considered an absconder from probation on or around November 19, 2009 to December 2013. See Exhibit A, pp. 48-55.

Third, the Department presented Respondent's multiple redeterminations throughout the alleged fraud period in which Respondent marked "no" the question if anyone is in violation of probation or parole. See Exhibit A, pp. 27-47.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits. The Department presented evidence to establish Respondent's intent for the IPV committed. The Department presented several of Respondent's redeterminations, to show that she committed an IPV during the fraud period. See Exhibit A, pp. 27-47. In the redeterminations, Respondent indicated that she is not currently in violation of a probation or parole, even though the evidence indicated that she was in violation of her probation at that time. See Exhibit A, pp. 27-55. As such, Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits when she intentionally withheld her criminal justice disqualification information, which would have resulted in the Respondent being disqualified from her FAP benefits. See BEM 203, p. 2. In summary, there was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of her responsibility to report her criminal justice disqualification and that she intentionally withheld the information for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. The Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### **Disqualification**

A client who is found to have committed an IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, pp. 15-16; BEM 708 (April 2014), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. BAM 720, p. 16. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p. 1. 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.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is disqualified from FAP benefits for 12 months. 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, Respondent should have been disqualified from her FAP benefits due to her criminal justice disqualification. See BEM 203, p. 2. The evidence indicated that the group size was two (Respondent plus additional group member) during the OI period. Thus, Respondent was overissued FAP benefits for any period that she was disqualified (i.e., FAP group size should be one after disqualifying the Respondent).

Applying OI period begin date policy, it is found that the appropriate OI begin date is January 1, 2010 (not December 1, 2009, as indicated by the Department). See BAM 720, p. 7.

In establishing the OI amount, the Department presented FAP budgets for the period of January 2010 to December 2013. See Exhibit A, pp. 65-140. After excluding Respondent as a group member, the undersigned found the OI budgets to be fair and accurate. Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup [REDACTED] of FAP benefits for the period of January 1, 2010 to December 31, 2013.

