

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

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

Reg. No.: 15-004765
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: May 28, 2015
County: WAYNE-17

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Robert J. Chavez

HEARING DECISION FOR 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 Regulation (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16 and 45 CFR 235.110; and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 28, 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 Respondent, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from the 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 March 30, 2015, 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. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is February 1, 2011 through October 31, 2011.
5. During the fraud period, 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.
6. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits totaling the amount of [REDACTED]
7. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
8. 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 (formerly the Department of Human Services) Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and 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-.3011.

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 (2014).

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 their reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (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 (2014).

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.

The federal Food Stamp regulations read in part:

(c) Definition of Intentional Program Violation. Intentional Program Violation shall consist of having intentionally:

- (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or
 - (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system (access device). 7 CFR 273.16(c).
- (6) Criteria for determining intentional program violation. The hearing authority shall base the determination of intentional program violation on clear and convincing evidence which demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, intentional program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section. 7 CFR 273.16(c)(6).

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases when:

- benefit overissuance are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
- prosecution of welfare fraud is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
- the total overissuance amount is \$500 or more, or
- the total overissuance amount is less than \$500, and
 - the group has a previous intentional program violation, or
 - the alleged IPV involves FAP trafficking, or
 - the alleged fraud involves concurrent receipt of assistance,
 - the alleged fraud is committed by a state/government employee.

BAM 720 (2014), p. 12.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. Other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 15.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the overissuance 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 (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 concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

Therefore, the undersigned may only find an IPV if there is clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally made a false or misleading statement, or intentionally withheld information with the intention to commit an IPV, with regard to the FAP program. Thus, the Department must not only prove that the Respondent committed an act, but that there was intent to commit the act.

In this case, the Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report all changes to the Department. Respondent has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. However, the undersigned is not convinced that the Department has met its burden of proof in providing clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intended to defraud the Department with regard to their FAP eligibility.

The prerequisite for an IPV, client error, or agency error is proof of an actual overissuance of benefits. Even if the Department presents clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intended to defraud the Department, without proof of an actual overissuance, there can be no Intentional Program Violation and recoupment of benefits. The same standard holds for agency error and client error; there can be no

error or recoupment without first proving, through clear and convincing evidence, the amount of that recoupment. As such, unless the Department first proves an overissuance, any evidence of intent to commit a program violation is irrelevant.

Therefore, the Department must first establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that an overissuance occurred and the amount of that overissuance. Where the Department is unable to or fails to prove the amount of overissuance, no overissuance can be said to have occurred.

If improper reporting or budgeting of income caused the overissuance, use actual income for the overissuance month for that income source. For FAP only, the Department may not convert the averaged monthly income reported on a wage match. BAM, 720, p. 10.

In the present case, the only evidence supplied by the Department in support of the overissuance amount that it seeks to recoup is an IG-001 Quarterly Wage Match report that breaks down Respondent's income by quarter. The Department did not supply any evidence showing the Respondent's actual monthly, as opposed to quarterly, income during the alleged fraud period.

A review of the FAP budgets supplied by the Department shows that the budget calculations were achieved by averaging out Respondent's quarterly income over the quarter. However, the actual income, or proof of the actual income, is not in the hearing record. Averaging quarterly income is not supported by policy. Policy requires that actual income be used. There is no evidence to show what Respondent made exactly during a month, and there is no evidence that shows that Respondent was actually ineligible for benefits during a month.

Averaging quarterly income is at most, a best guess by the Department as to what Respondent actually made, and is in no way evidence of Respondent's actual income. Without this crucial evidence that would show and confirm Respondent's actual monthly income during the alleged overissuance period, the Administrative Law Judge cannot accept as fact the income amounts in the provided FAP budgets. As such the Department supplied FAP budgets in support of the alleged overissuance amount are invalid, and cannot be used to show an overissuance amount.

For those reasons, the undersigned must hold that the Department has failed to prove through clear and convincing evidence the amount of the overissuance or whether recoupment is proper.

The Administrative Law Judge acknowledges that when there is unreported or unbudgeted income, there will probably be some degree of benefit overissuance; this is not always the case, however. The Department must provide clear and convincing evidence to establish the overissuance and the amount of overissuance that it seeks to recoup. Without an overissuance, there can be no IPV, client error, or agency error.

