

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████	MAHS Reg. No.:	15-001594
██	Issue Nos.:	1005, 3005
██████████	Agency Case No.:	██████████
	Hearing Date:	August 10, 2015
	County:	Kent (01-Franklin)

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane

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 August 10, 2015, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████
██

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), and Family Independence Program (FIP) 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 FIP benefits for 12 months and FAP benefits for 10 years?

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 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 FIP and FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on November 13, 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 January 7, 2013.
8. The OIG indicates that the time periods they are considering the fraud periods are November 13, 2012, through November 30, 2012, and March 1, 2013, through June 30, 2013, for FAP; and December 1, 2012, through December 31, 2012, and March 1, 2013, through June 30, 2013, for FIP.
9. During the alleged fraud periods, Respondent was issued \$1,688 in FAP benefits and \$2,015 in FIP benefits from the State of Michigan for an OI total of \$3,703.
10. During the alleged fraud periods, Respondent was issued FAP benefits from the [REDACTED]
11. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
12. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and **was** 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), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-193,

and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233-260, MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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), p. 12.

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. 6; BAM 720, p. 2.

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.

In this case, Respondent applied for benefits in Michigan while she still received benefits from [REDACTED] during the months of November and December 2012.

Respondent received FAP benefits from [REDACTED] through November 30, 2012, and began receiving Michigan FAP benefits on November 13, 2012. Respondent also received FIP benefits from [REDACTED] through December 31, 2012, and began receiving Michigan FIP benefits on December 1, 2012.

The receipt of concurrent benefits for FAP lasted 17 days and for FIP lasted 31 days. This fact alone would not cause this Administrative Law Judge to impose a penalty of 10 years for FAP except for the false statement on her Michigan application where she answered “no” to the question as to whether she “moved or received benefits from another state.”

The Department has met the burden of showing that Respondent “made a fraudulent statement or representation” regarding her identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203 (October 2012).

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15. 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. 1.

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 (October, 2009), p. 1. 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.

The OIG is requesting a disqualification period of 10 years and has met the burden of showing that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding her residence.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (May 2014), p. 1.

In this case, the OIG has adequately provided evidence of an FIP and FAP OI in the amount of \$3,703.

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 FIP benefits in the amount of \$2,015 and an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,688.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$3,703 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from participation in the FIP program for 12 months FAP program for 10 years.



Michael J. Bennane
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **10/27/2015**

Date Mailed: **10/27/2015**

MJB / pf

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Hearing Decision in the circuit court in the county in which he/she resides, or the circuit court in Ingham County, within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the claim or application for appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

CC:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]