

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-015221  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: March 26, 2015  
County: Branch

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Vicki Armstrong

**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 26, 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) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medicaid (MA) 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 November 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 and MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent signed an Assistance Application (DHS-1171) on October 11, 2011, indicating he would be receiving unemployment income and acknowledging that he understood his failure to give timely, truthful, complete and accurate information could result in a civil or criminal action or an administrative claim against him. (Dept. Ex A, pp 12-35).
5. On October 13, 2011, the Department mailed Respondent a Notice of Case Action indicating his FAP had been opened with a budgeted income of \$0 and reminding him to report all changes of household income to the Department within 10 days. (Dept. Ex A, pp 36-43).
6. On September 4, 2012, Respondent signed a Redetermination and indicated he was receiving Unemployment Compensation Benefits (UCB) in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] every two weeks. (Dept. Ex A, pp 49-52).
7. Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan during the alleged fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. If Respondent had properly reported that he was receiving unemployment benefits, Respondent would have been entitled to receive \$1,205 in FAP benefits. (Dept. Ex A, pp 4, 53).
8. Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in MA benefits from the State of Michigan during the alleged fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. If Respondent had timely reported he was receiving unemployment benefits, he would have been entitled to \$0 in MA. (Dept. Ex A, p 4).
9. Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan during the alleged fraud period of March 1, 2013, to June 30, 2013. If Respondent had properly reported his employment income, he would have been entitled to \$0 in FAP benefits. (Dept. Ex A, p 4).
10. Respondent failed to report his unemployment compensation benefits in a timely manner, resulting in a FAP overissuance of \$ [REDACTED] and an MA overissuance of \$2,084.46 for the fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. Respondent also received an overissuance of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for the fraud period of March 1, 2013, to June 30, 2013.
11. Respondent was clearly instructed and fully aware of the responsibility to report all changes to the Department within 10 days.
12. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
13. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
14. 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, p 12 (10/1/2014).

### **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 (10/1/2014), 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.

On December 18, 2012, the Department ran an unemployment compensation search discovering Respondent began receiving unemployment compensation benefits on March 17, 2012. Respondent did not report the receipt of these benefits until his September, 2012, Redetermination. By signing the October 11, 2011, application, Respondent acknowledged he was aware he could be prosecuted for fraud and be required to repay the amount wrongfully received and that he must report all changes within 10 days of the change.

On November 8, 2013, the Department discovered Respondent was working at [REDACTED] through Wage Match. Verification of employment dated December 20, 2013, showed Respondent worked at [REDACTED] from January 3, 2013, through September 6, 2013. There is no record Respondent notified the Department of this income. (Dept. Ex A, pp 111-114).

On January 14, 2014, the Department inquired into the use of Respondent's MA benefits for the fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012. Records show Respondent's wife received MA benefits in the amount of \$2,084.46, during this fraud period. (Dept. Ex A, pp 69-106).

By signing the October 11, 2011, application, and September 4, 2012, Redetermination, Respondent acknowledged he was aware he could be prosecuted for fraud and be required to repay the amount wrongfully received and that he must report all changes within 10 days of the change.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an 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, 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 (7/1/2013), 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, this is Respondent's first IPV.

### **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.

The FAP Bridges Issuance Summary for the fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012, shows Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] a month in FAP benefits. The issuance summary shows Respondent was paid a total of \$ [REDACTED]. If Respondent had properly reported his unemployment income, he would only have been eligible to receive \$ [REDACTED]. Hence, he received a \$ [REDACTED] FAP overissuance. (Dept. Ex A, pp 53-68). A summary of MA benefits paid by the Department during this same fraud period shows a total of \$ [REDACTED]. Had Respondent properly reported his unemployment income he would have been eligible for \$0 MA benefits. Therefore, Respondent received an overissuance of MA benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] (Dept. Ex A, p 70).

A Bridges FAP Issuance Summary from March, 2013, through June, 2013, showed Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] a month in FAP benefits. (Dept. Ex A, p 115-124). The summary supports Respondent was paid \$ [REDACTED]. Had Respondent properly reported his income he would only have been eligible to receive \$0 in FAP benefits. As a result, he received an overissuance of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for that fraud period.

In this case, the Department has shown by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent received an OI of FAP and MA benefits. The OI was due to Respondent failing to timely report his unemployment benefits for the fraud period of February 1, 2012, through September 30, 2012, and his employment income from March, 2013, through June, 2013. According to BAM 700, the Department may recoup this OI.


### **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 FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] and \$ [REDACTED] and an OI of MA in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] for a total of \$ [REDACTED].

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.

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

Date Signed: **3/31/2015**

Date Mailed: **3/31/2015**

VLA/las

**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:

