

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

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

Reg. No.: 14-013115  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: March 25, 2015  
County: WAYNE-DISTRICT 57  
(CONNER)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman**

**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 25, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████ 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 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 October 9, 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 changes in residence.
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 March 1, 2013 to August 31, 2013, and April 1, 2014 to June 30, 2014 (fraud periods).
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 \$0.00 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 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 \$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.

BAM 720 (October 2014), pp. 12-13.

In this case, the Department alleged that Respondent committed an IPV. Subsequent to the scheduling of the current hearing, the Notice of Hearing and accompanying documents were mailed to Respondent via first class mail at the address identified by the Department as the last known address. After the mailing of the hearing packet, it was returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable. When notice of a FAP IPV hearing is sent using first class mail and is returned as undeliverable, the hearing may still be held. 7 CFR 273.16((e)(3); BAM 720, p. 12. Thus, the hearing properly proceeded with respect to the alleged FAP IPV.

### **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 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.

To be eligible, a person must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (March 2013 and February 2014), p. 1. For FAP cases, a person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if there is no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. BEM 220, p. 1. Eligible persons may include persons who entered the state with a job commitment or to seek employment; and students (for FAP only, this includes students living at home during a school break). BEM 220, p. 1. For FAP cases, a person who is temporarily absent from the group is considered living with the group. BEM 212 (November 2012 and February 2014) p. 3. However, a person's absence is not temporary if it has lasted more than thirty days. BEM 212, p. 3.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department that she no longer resided in Michigan but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while out-of-state.

First, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history. See Exhibit 1, pp. 10-23. The FAP transaction history showed that from January 5, 2013 to August 11, 2013, Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan out-of-state. See Exhibit 1, pp. 17-19. Then, the FAP transaction history showed usage mostly in the State of Michigan from September 3, 2013 to January 16, 2014. See Exhibit 1, pp. 19-21. Next, the FAP transaction history showed that from February 19, 2014 to June 24, 2014, Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan out-of-state. See Exhibit 1, pp. 21-23. Finally, the FAP transaction history showed usage in the State of Michigan from July 3, 2014 to September 4, 2014. See Exhibit 1, p. 23.

Second, the Department presented Respondent's online redetermination dated May 27, 2014, which was submitted during the alleged fraud period. See Exhibit 1, pp. 24-30. In the redetermination, Respondent did not indicate any change in her address or contact information even though the transaction history showed out-of-state usage at the time. See Exhibit 1, pp. 21-27.

Third, the Department presented Respondent's LexisNexis Report. See Exhibit 1, pp. 31-51.

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 during the IPV usage. The Department presented Respondent's redetermination, which was submitted during the fraud period. In the redetermination, Respondent did not indicate any change in her address or contact information even though the transaction history showed out-of-state usage at the time. See Exhibit 1, pp. 21-27. This showed by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of her responsibility to report changes in residence and that she intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. The Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, pp. 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. 16. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 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.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a disqualification under the FAP program. BAM 720, p. 16.

### **Overissuance**

As previously stated, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits. Thus, she was was not eligible for FAP benefits and was overissued FAP benefits for any period she was ineligible to receive FAP benefits.

As to the first OI period, applying the OI begin date policy and in consideration of the out-of-state use that began on January 5, 2013, the Department determined that the OI period began on March 1, 2013. See Exhibit 1, pp. 4 and 17. It is found that the Department applied the appropriate OI begin date. See BAM 720, p. 7.

As to the second OI period, applying the OI begin date policy and in consideration of the out-of-state use that began on February 19, 2014, the Department determined that the OI period began on April 1, 2014. See Exhibit 1, pp. 4 and 21. It is found that the Department applied the appropriate OI begin date. See BAM 720, p. 7.

Additionally, 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.

In establishing the first OI amount, the Department presented a benefit summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan from March 2013 to August 2013, which totaled \$ [REDACTED]. See Exhibit 1, pp. 52-53. In establishing the second OI amount, the Department presented a benefit summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan from April 2014 to June 2014, which totaled [REDACTED]. See Exhibit 1, pp. 52-53. Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup [REDACTED] of FAP benefits it issued to Respondent from March 1, 2013 to August 31, 2013, and April 1, 2014 to June 30, 2014.


### **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 program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] from the FAP program.

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 FAP for a period of 12 months.

  
**Eric Feldman**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Interim Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **3/25/2015**

Date Mailed: **3/25/2015**

EJF / tm

