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

IN T	HE MATTER OF:		
		Reg. No.: Issue No.: Case No.: Hearing Date: County:	14-018305 3005 March 16, 2015 Oakland (04-North Saginaw)
ADN	INISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Ben	nane	
	HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTION	AL PROGRAM V	IOLATION
this and part Afte Mich	n the request for a hearing by the Department matter is before the undersigned Administrative in accordance with Titles 7, 42 and 45 of the icularly 7 CFR 273.16, and with Mich Admin reduce notice, a telephone hearing was held higan. The Department was represented by Participants on behalf of Respondent included: Respondent did not appear at the hearing and suant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Code Respondent.	re Law Judge purse Code of Federa Code, R 400.313 d on March 16,	suant to MCL 400.9, al Regulation (CFR), 30 and R 400.3178. 2015, from Detroit, espondent's absence
400.	ISSUES		
1.	Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI)  Family Independence Program (FIP)  Food Assistance Program (FAP)  Medical Assistance (MA)  benefits that the Department is entitled to receive	State Disability A Child Developme	ssistance (SDA) ent and Care (CDC)
2.	Did the Department establish, by clear and committed an Intentional Program Violation (I	•	ce, that Respondent
3.	Should Respondent be disqualified from receing Family Independence Program (FIP)?	State Disability A	ssistance (SDA)? ent 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 December 22, 2014, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2.	The OIG $\boxtimes$ has $\square$ has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3.	Respondent was a recipient of $\  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \  \ $
4.	Respondent $\boxtimes$ was $\square$ was not aware of the responsibility to notify the Department of changes affecting her benefits.
5.	Respondent $\square$ had $\boxtimes$ 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 fraud period is April 1, 2014, through October 31, 2014 (fraud period).
7.	During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,295.00 in $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ 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 $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA benefits in the amount of \$1,295.00.
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 $\square$ was $\boxtimes$ 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 \$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 (October, 2014), p. 4.

#### **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. 5; BAM 720, p. 12.

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 alleges that Respondent committed an IPV because she moved out of the State of Michigan and began using her Michigan FAP benefits out of State on February 19, 2014, and continued to use those benefits out of State until they were exhausted.

A review of the transactions made by Respondent does provide evidence that the Respondent failed to notify the Department of her use of food stamps provided through the State of Michigan almost exclusively outside of Michigan. It does not, however, provide evidence of Respondent's intent.

# **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. 9.

In this case, the Respondent received an FAP OI of \$1,295.00.

### **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:

	, and a second control of the contro
1.	The Department $\square$ has $\boxtimes$ has not established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2.	Respondent $\boxtimes$ did $\square$ did not receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$1,295.00 from the following program(s) $\square$ FIP $\boxtimes$ FAP $\square$ SDA $\square$ CDC $\square$ MA.
Th	e Department is ORDERED to

☐ delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.
 ☐ initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1,295.00 in accordance with Department policy.
 ☐ reduce the OI to \$ for the period , and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy.

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

Date Signed: 3/24/2015

Date Mailed: 3/24/2015

MJB / pf

**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.

