

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

IN THE MATTER OF:



Reg. No.: 15-007002
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 23, 2015
County: WAYNE-DISTRICT 57

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric Feldman

HEARING DECISION FOR 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 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 July 23, 2015, from Detroit, 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) 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 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 [REDACTED], 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 changes in group composition.
5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is [REDACTED] (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,028 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$344 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$684.
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), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Adult Services Manual (ASM), 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 to .3015.

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

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.

- FAP trafficking overissuances 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.

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 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.

Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. BAM 105 (April 2014), p. 6. Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105, p. 9. Other changes must be reported within 10 days after the client is aware of them. BAM 105, p. 9. These include, but are not limited to, changes in persons in the home. BAM 105, p. 9.

Additionally, the Department will help determine who must be included in the FAP group prior to evaluating the non financial and financial eligibility of everyone in the group. BEM 212 (February 2014), p. 1. FAP group composition is established by determining all of the following:

1. Who lives together.
2. The relationship(s) of the people who live together.
3. Whether the people living together purchase and prepare food together or separately.
4. Whether the person(s) resides in an eligible living situation

BEM 212, p. 1.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department that her son (who was listed as part of her FAP group) was no longer in the household due to him moving in with his great-aunt. As such, the Department presented evidence to show why it believed the Respondent was aware of her responsibility to report changes in group composition and that she intentionally withheld or misrepresented the group composition information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of her FAP program benefits or eligibility.

Moreover, the Department alleges that Respondent received an OI amount of \$684 during the alleged fraud period. See Exhibit A, p. 4. 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 benefit amount the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8.

In establishing the OI amount, the Department presented two different FAP budgets for the period of May 2014 to August 2014. See Exhibit A, pp. 115-132. The first budgets that the Department presented showed the amount of benefits Respondent actually received (hereinafter referred to as "original FAP budgets"). The second budgets the Department presented showed the amount Respondent was eligible to receive (hereinafter referred to as "OI budgets"). The purpose of the OI budgets it to show how the Department calculated the overpayment amount. See BAM 720, p. 8.

In regards to the original FAP budgets, these budgets indicated the following: (i) the certified group size was four; (ii) Respondent was not a certified group member because she was a disqualified adult; (iii) the total gross earned income budgeted was \$1,905; and (iv) the benefit issuance per month was \$257. See Exhibit A, pp. 115-117. In regards to the OI FAP budgets, these budgets indicated the following: (i) certified group size of four; (ii) Respondent was now a certified group member; (iii) Respondent's child was excluded from the household; (iv) the total gross earned income budgeted increased to \$2,382; and (v) the benefit issuance should have been \$86. See Exhibit A, pp. 118-120.

The local office and client or Authorized Hearing Representative (AHR) will each present their position to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ), who will determine whether the actions taken by the local office are correct according to fact, law, policy and procedure. BAM 600 (April 2015), p. 35. Both the local office and the client or AHR must have adequate opportunity to present the case, bring witnesses, establish all pertinent facts, argue the case, refute any evidence, cross-examine adverse witnesses, and cross-examine the author of a document offered in evidence. BAM 600, pp. 35-36. The ALJ determines the facts based only on evidence introduced at the hearing, draws a conclusion of law, and determines whether DHS policy was appropriately applied. BAM 600, pp. 37-38.

Based on the foregoing information, the Department did not satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it failed to establish an OI amount for FAP benefits. BAM 600, pp. 35-38. A review of the FAP OI budgets found them to be inaccurate. For example, the Department was unable to explain why Respondent was now included in the certified group size for the OI budgets or why did the gross earned income increase in the OI budgets. The Department did not argue in this case a failure to report income; instead, the Department argued that Respondent failed to report a group member leaving the household. There is evidence to show an OI is present, however, the Department also needs to establish how it calculated the OI amount. Because the Department failed to establish that it properly calculated the OI budgets, the Department did not satisfy its burden of showing that Respondent received an OI for FAP benefits. BAM 600, pp. 35-38; BAM 700, p. 1; and BAM 720, p. 8

Furthermore, an IPV requires that an OI exist. Department policy states that suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist as stated above. See BAM 700, p. 7; BAM 720, p. 1. Moreover, the Bridges Policy Glossary (BPG) defines IPV as a benefit overissuance resulting from the willful withholding of information or other violation of law or regulation by the client or his authorized representative. BPG 2015-005 (April 2015), p. 36. Department policy clearly states that a suspected IPV means an OI has to exist. See BAM 700, p. 7; BAM 720, p. 1; and BPG 2015-005, p. 36. Because the Department cannot establish an OI in this case, it cannot establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP program. Thus, Respondent is not subject to a disqualification from the FAP program. See BAM 720, pp. 12 and 16.

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 not** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did not** receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$684 from the FAP benefits.

The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.



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

Date Signed: **7/28/2015**

Date Mailed: **7/28/2015**

EF / hw

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).

cc:

