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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 15-001786

Issue No.: 3005

Case No.: Hearing Date: April 16, 2015

County: Genesee (6) Clio Rd

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Aaron McClintic

HEARING DECISION FOR CONCURRENT BENEFITS INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and 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 Regulations, particularly 7 CFR 273.16 and 45 CFR 235.110, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on April 16, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by 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).

<u>ISSUES</u>

- 1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program 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 Food Assistance Program benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

- The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on February 11, 2015, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having received concurrent program benefits and, as such, 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. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on November 30, 2012, Respondent reported that she intended to stay in Michigan.
- 5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in her residence to the Department.
- 6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
- 7. Respondent began using FAP benefits outside of the State of Michigan beginning in May 2013.
- 8. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is May 25, 2013, through October 8, 2013.
- 9. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
- 10. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued FAP benefits from the State of
- 11. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
- 12. 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 Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, 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 Department of Human Services) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Effective October 1, 2014, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- FAP trafficking Ols 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 (October 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 (February 2014), p. 6; BAM 720.

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 (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, Respondent received FAP benefits in the State of Michigan concurrently between May 2013 and October 2013. In addition, Respondent received FAP benefits from the State of Michigan when she resided in Shown by Respondent's use of her Michigan BRIDGE card in during the time period in question.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720. 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.

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 or FAP. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (February 2013). 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.

In this case, Respondent received concurrent benefits in and Michigan; therefore, a 10-year disqualification is required.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (February 2013).

In this case, Respondent received \$ in FAP benefits that she was not entitled to; therefore, the Department will be able to recoup that amount.

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, 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 \$

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years.

Aaron McClintic

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

Am mileti

Date Signed: 4/22/2015

Date Mailed: 4/22/2015

AM/jaf

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. A copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

