

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

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

Reg. No.: 15-006427  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: June 22, 2015  
County: ST. CLAIR

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman**

**HEARING DECISION FOR CONCURRENT BENEFITS**  
**INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and Human Services (Department or DHHS), 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 June 22, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, 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) 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 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 April 30, 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. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in residence.
5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is December 17, 2013 to June 30, 2014.
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued ██████ in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued FAP benefits from the State of North Carolina.
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 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 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 (October 2014), pp. 12-13; ASM 165 (May 2013), pp. 1-7.

### **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 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 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.

Concurrent receipt of benefits means assistance received from multiple programs to cover a person's needs for the same time period. BEM 222 (July 2013), p. 1. Benefit duplication means assistance received from the same (or same type of) program to cover a person's needs for the same month. BEM 222, p. 1. For example, FIP from Michigan and similar benefits from another state's cash assistance program. BEM 222, p. 1. As specified in the balance of BEM 222, benefit duplication is prohibited except for MA and FAP in limited circumstances. BEM 222, p. 1. A person cannot receive FAP in more than one state for any month. BEM 222, p. 3. Out-of-state benefit receipt or termination may be verified by one of the following: DHS-3782, Out-of-State Inquiry; Letter or document from other state; or Collateral contact with the state. BEM 222, p. 4.

A person is disqualified for a period of 10 years if found guilty through the Administrative Hearing Process, convicted in court or by signing a repayment and disqualification agreement (such as a DHS-826 or DHS-830) of having made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203 (July 2013), p. 1.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits because he failed to update residency information for the purpose of receiving FAP benefits from more than one state.

First, the Department presented Respondent's application dated December 17, 2013, to show that he acknowledged his responsibility to report changes as required. See Exhibit A, pp. 10-39. In this application, Respondent reported that that he has not moved or received assistance from another state. See Exhibit A, p. 14.

Second, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history. See Exhibit A, pp. 40-43. The FAP transaction history showed that from January 17, 2014 to June 24, 2014, Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan out-of-state in North Carolina. See Exhibit A, pp. 40-43.

Third, the Department presented out-of-state correspondence to show Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously in North Carolina. See Exhibit A, pp. 44-191. The documentation confirmed that Respondent received FAP benefits in North Carolina during the alleged fraud period. See Exhibit A, p. 45. Moreover, the Department presented Respondent's benefit summary inquiry, which showed that he received Michigan FAP benefits from December 17, 2013 to June 30, 2014. See Exhibit A, p. 196. As such, Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously from December 17, 2013 to June 30, 2014 (alleged fraud period).

Fourth, the OIG investigative report indicated that the agent spoke with Respondent's friend/lease holder of the apartment on June 11, 2014, who reported that Respondent returned to North Carolina around the first of January 2014 and she was unaware that Respondent was receiving public assistance using her address. See Exhibit A, p. 3.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

First, the evidence established that Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously (North Carolina and Michigan) from December 17, 2013 to June 30, 2014. See Exhibit A, pp. 44-49, 191, and 196.

Second, in Respondent's application dated December 17, 2013, Respondent reported that that he has not moved or received assistance from another state, even though the evidence established that he was an ongoing FAP recipient from North Carolina at the time he submitted the application. See Exhibit A, p. 14. In fact, the FAP transaction history showed that from January 17, 2014 to June 24, 2014, Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan out-of-state in North Carolina. See Exhibit A, pp. 40-43. Thus, this evidence is sufficient to show that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously from Michigan and North Carolina. See BEM 203, p. 1.

In summary, there was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of his responsibility to report changes in residence and that he intentionally withheld information for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. Therefore, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### **Disqualification**

A client who is found to have committed an IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, pp. 15-16; BEM 708 (April 2014), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. BAM 720, p. 16. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p. 1. 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.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is disqualified for ten years for a FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

### **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 amount of the OI is the

