

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-012364  
Issue No.: FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 01, 2015  
County: SAGINAW

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Colleen Lack

**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 April 1, 2015, 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 overissuance (OI) 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 2, 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 any household changes, including changes with residence, to the Department.
5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is October 1, 2012, through November 30, 2013, (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, the Department alleges that 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 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 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 (10-1-2014), pp. 12-13.

### **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 (5-1-2014), 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 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 has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to timely and accurately report to the Department all household changes, including changes with residence. Department policy requires clients to report any

change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 (ten) days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, 6-1-2011, p. 7. Respondent's signature on the October 17, 2011, and October 1, 2013, Assistance Applications in this record certifies that he was aware of the change reporting responsibilities and that fraudulent participation in benefits could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims.

The record contained an Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) History of FAP purchases during the time period in question which demonstrated that Respondent used the Michigan-issued EBT card out of state for 30 (thirty) days or more. From August 13, 2012, through November 19, 2013, almost all transactions occurred in Georgia. There were only transactions in Michigan on May 17, 2013, July 4-5, 2013, and August 11, 2013. These few isolated transactions in Michigan are more indicative of Respondent visiting Michigan on those dates because all the other transactions before and after occurred in Georgia. There is no evidence showing that Respondent timely and accurately reported the change in residency to the Department within 10 days as required per policy. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. Accordingly, the Department has established that the Respondent committed an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15. 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. BAM 720, p. 16. 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 evidence of record shows that Respondent committed his first FAP IPV, which carries a 12 month disqualification.

### **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 evidence of record shows that the fraud period was actually October 15, 2012, though November 30, 2013. There is no evidence FAP benefits were issued for the first half of October 2012. The Bridges Eligibility Summary shows that FAP was only issued for a partial month in October 2012. Specifically, \$ [REDACTED] in FAP was issued for October 15, 2012, through October 31, 2012. Then, \$ [REDACTED] in FAP was issued each month from November 1, 2012, through October 31, 2013. Lastly, \$ [REDACTED] in FAP was

issued for November 1, 2013, through November 30, 2013. Accordingly, Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during a fraud period of October 15, 2012, through November 30, 2013.

### **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 reduce the OI to \$ [REDACTED] for the period October 15, 2012, through November 30, 2013, and initiate recoupment procedures in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP in accordance with Department policy.



---

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

Date Signed: **4/2/2015**

Date Mailed: **4/2/2015**

CL/hj

**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.

cc:

