

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



Reg. No.: 2014-3693  
Issue No(s): 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 10, 2014  
County: Wayne #57

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Dale Malewska

**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 March 10, 2014 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 over-issuance (OI) of  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)     State Disability Assistance (SDA)  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)     Child Development and Care (CDC)  
 Medicaid benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?
  
2. Did Respondent, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
  
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)?     State Disability Assistance (SDA)?  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)?     Child Development and Care (CDC)?

**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 October 9, 2013, to establish an OI and debt collection recoupment of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG  has requested that the Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent  was aware of the responsibility to not engage in unauthorized transactions.
5. Respondent had no 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 January 1, 2011 through May 31, 2012.
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits by the State of Michigan.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA 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 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 271.1 to 285.5. The

Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 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 \$ [REDACTED] or more, or
  - the total OI amount is less than \$ [REDACTED] 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 (7-1-2013), p. 12.

#### Intentional Program Violation

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- The Respondent intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination, and
- The Respondent was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (7-1-2013), p. 7; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a Respondent 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 Respondent 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; 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 established that the Respondent was aware of his responsibility to timely and accurately report to the Department any and all household changes – including *residency*. Department policy requires the beneficiary to report any change in circumstance that affects eligibility or benefit amount within 10 (ten) days. See BAM 105

The Respondent's threshold signature on his application for assistance certifies that he was aware that fraudulent participation in the FAP program could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims to be brought against him. Today's record contains an Electronic Benefit Transaction (EBT) history of FAP purchases during the time period in question which demonstrated the Respondent used his Michigan-issued EBT in [REDACTED].

The evidence brought today also establishes that the Respondent did not report this move to his Department eligibility specialist (ES) within the 10 (ten) day reporting period required under policy.

Furthermore, the Respondent did not produce a plan demonstrating a definite return date to Michigan. His exact location was unknown as evidenced by his recently returned mail rejecting his last known and reported address. Finally, the proofs<sup>1</sup> preponderated that his absence from Michigan had been longer than 30 days – irrespective of his recorded verification of intent to remain in Michigan captured one week before surrendering his residency in the State of Michigan. Exhibit #1, page 2, See also BEM 212 and 220 – throughout.

There was no evidence that the Respondent had any apparent physical or mental impairment that limited his understanding or ability to comply with these reporting requirements.

#### Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a Respondent committed IPV disqualifies that Respondent 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. 13.

Respondents 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>Serial EBT transactions in [REDACTED]. Furthermore, he secured employment in NC and gave his new employer a local address. Exhibit #1, pp. 17 - 21

BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the Respondent is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (7-1-2013), p. 2. Respondents 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 record demonstrates that Respondent is guilty of his first FAP IPV – which carries a 12-month period of disqualification.

Over-issuance

When a Respondent group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

In this case, the record also demonstrates that the Respondent received an OI of FAP in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] for the time period referenced above.

**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  did commit an intentional program violation (IPV).
2. Respondent  did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA.

The Department is ORDERED to  initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

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



---

Dale Malewska  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 4/22/14

Date Mailed: 4/22/14U

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of the above Decision and Order, the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives.

DM/tb

cc:

