

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 15-010312  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 27, 2015  
County: GENESEE-DISTRICT 6 (CLIO  
RD)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** [REDACTED]

**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 with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, telephone hearing was held on August 27, 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) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?
2. Did the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed 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 June 22, 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. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is February 13, 2014, through January 31, 2015.
4. On an application for assistance dated February 4, 2015, the Respondent acknowledged the duty to report any change of residency as well as the receipt of food assistance from another state.
5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. On June 22, 2015 the Department sent the Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$ [REDACTED] overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826).
7. The Respondent received food assistance benefits from the state of Georgia from September 29, 2014, through January 31, 2015.
8. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
9. 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), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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.

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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (October 1, 2014), pp 12-13.

### **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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (May 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.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15-16. 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 (July 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.

### **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.

Concurrent receipt of benefits means assistance received from multiple programs to cover a person's needs for the same time period. Benefit duplication means assistance received from the same (or same type of) program to cover a person's needs for the same month. Benefit duplication is prohibited except for MA and FAP in limited circumstances. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 222 (July 1, 2013), p 3.

To be eligible for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits, a person must be a Michigan resident. A person is considered a resident under the Food Assistance Program (FAP) while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if there is no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 220 (July 1, 2014), p 1.

A person cannot receive FAP in more than one state for any month. BEM 220.

On an application for assistance dated February 4, 2015, the Respondent acknowledged a duty to report any change of residency to the Department, and whether

he received any food assistance benefits from another state. On his application for benefits, the Respondent reported that he was a Michigan resident and intended to remain a Michigan resident.


However, the Respondent did not make use of his benefits in Michigan after his FAP application was approved. The Respondent used his FAP benefits exclusively in Georgia from February 13, 2014, through May 17, 2014.

On September 29, 2014, the Respondent submitted another FAP application but failed to report that he had applied for and was approved for food assistance issued by the state of Georgia. The Respondent received and used his Georgia food assistance benefits while concurrently receiving Michigan FAP benefits through January 31, 2015.

If the Respondent had reported that he was not a Michigan resident, he would not have been eligible for any of the benefits that he received. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally misrepresented that he was a Michigan resident from February 13, 2014, through May 31, 2014, for the purpose of receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that he was not entitled to receive. The Department established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally failed to disclose that he was receiving food assistance from the state of Georgia from February 13, 2014, through May 17, 2014 for the purposes of maintaining eligibility in the Food Assistance Program (FAP) while he was not eligible to receive those benefits.

**DECISION AND ORDER**

1. 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:
2. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
3. Respondent did receive an OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
4. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
5. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin Scully  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **9/14/2015**

Date Mailed: **9/14/2015**

**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).

KS/sb

cc: [REDACTED]  
OIG  
[REDACTED]  
Genesee-District 6 (Clio Rd)  
[REDACTED]  
Kevin Scully  
AH