

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

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

Reg. No.: 2014 47722  
Issue No(s): 3008  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: February 12, 2014  
County: Macomb County DHS 36

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Lynn M. Ferris

**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 February 12, 2014 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  
 Family Independence Program (FIP)     State Disability Assistance (SDA)  
 Food Assistance Program (FAP)     Child Development and Care (CDC)  
 Medical Assistance (MA)  
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 23, 2013, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG  has  has not requested that 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 report employment and earnings from employment.
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, 2012 through May 31, 2012 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$3265 in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC  MA benefits in the amount of \$3265.
9. This was Respondent's  first  second  third alleged IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and  was  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 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 \$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 (7/1/13), 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 (7/1/13), p. 6; 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.

In this case, the Department produced evidence that the Claimant late reported beginning employment. However the Claimant did report receipt of unemployment benefit income as part of a redetermination for July 2011. The Claimant also reported receipt of earned income from employment for Claimant and his son in June 2012 after employment had started. Based upon the this reporting and the completion of a verification of employment by both group members with earnings, it is determined that the failure to report is not in and of itself proof of an intent to commit fraud or to obtain FAP benefits by intentionally failing to report information. Therefor no IPV is established by the Department's proofs.

### **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. 13.

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 (7/1/13), 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.

In this case, because the Department did not establish an IPV, the Department is not entitled to a disqualification penalty.

### **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.

In this case, the Department seeks to recover \$3,265 in Food Assistance it alleged the Claimant was not entitled to receive due to having excess income. The Department sought overissuance for the period January 1, 2012 through May 31, 2012 because it asserted the Respondent's group gross income exceeded \$2836 gross income limit per month as established by RFT250 (11/1/11). The Department sought to recoup a total of \$3265. A review of the gross wage information for the 5 months of alleged overissuance indicates that the Respondent's combined group gross wages for January 2012 did not exceed the \$2836 gross income limit, as the total gross income for that

month for the group was \$1023; and thus the Department is not entitled to an overissuance in January 2012 as it did not demonstrate the amount of the overissuance was \$653.

The combined gross income for both the father and son who were the wage earners for the FAP group for February 2012 was \$2755; March 2012 was \$4462; April 2012 was \$2914 and May 2012 was \$2825. As can be seen, the only months where the combined income was over the gross income limit of \$2836 were March 2012 and April 2012. No budgets were submitted for February 2012 or May 2012 and thus the amount of the overissuance was not established. Therefore, based upon the evidence presented it is determined that the Department is only entitled to an overissuance for two months, for a total of \$1306. The Department did not provide budgets or a summary of the monthly gross income to establish its proof of overissuance and the undersigned determined the amount based upon the wage earnings provided as part of the proofs.

### **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 not commit an intentional program violation (IPV).
2. Respondent  did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$1306 from the following program(s) Food Assistance (FAP).

The Department is ORDERED to:

reduce the OI to \$1306 for the period March 2012 and April 2012, and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy.



---

**Lynn M. Ferris**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: March 27, 2014

Date Mailed: March 27, 2014

**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.

2014-7722/LMF

LMF/cl

cc:

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]