

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 15-002724  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: April 28, 2015  
County: Wayne (57) Conner

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Colleen Lack

**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 April 28, 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 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 February 27, 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. It is unknown whether Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report any household changes that will affect eligibility or benefit amount, including changes with residence, to the Department.
5. It is unknown whether Respondent had 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 November 1, 2011, through May 31, 2013, (fraud period).
7. 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.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
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), 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:

- 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 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.

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.

Department policy requires clients cooperate with the local office in determining initial and ongoing eligibility. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. Department policy also requires clients to report any change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, (June 1, 2011), pp. 5-7.

In this case, the Department has not provided sufficient evidence to establish that Respondent was aware of her responsibilities as a recipient of Michigan issued FAP benefits. For example, the Department did not provide a copy of an Assistance Application signed by Respondent certifying that she was aware of the reporting responsibilities. Accordingly, the Department has not established that the Respondent committed an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.

### **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, p. 15; BEM 708 (April 1, 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 FAP, 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. 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 evidence of record did not establish that Respondent committed an IPV; therefore, she is not subject to disqualification.

### **Overissuance**

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

In this case, Department alleges the IPV resulting in the OI was based upon Respondent living in and receiving FAP benefits in the State of ██████████ while also receiving FAP benefits from the State of Michigan, from November 1, 2011, through May 31, 2013. As noted above, the Department did not provide sufficient evidence to establish the IPV.

Regarding the OI, the Department did not provide sufficient evidence to establish the concurrent receipt of FAP benefits from the State of ██████████ Department Exhibit A, pp. 1-96 did not contain the documentation of the phone contact with the State of ██████████ Social and Health Program Consultant as noted on the included Evidence List as Item 5. Copies of multiple State of ██████████ Assistance Applications were provided, but these do not establish that FAP benefits were actually issued to Respondent during the fraud period by the State of ██████████ Additionally, the OIG Regulation Agent's statement in the investigation report that "through contact with the State of ██████████ it has also been determined that the subject has been receiving assistance in the State of ██████████ from November 1, 2011 through October 31, 2014" cannot be found fully credible. Another statement made in the investigation report was not accurate based upon review of the evidence. Specifically, the statement that "the subject used their benefits in the State of ██████████ exclusively from November 1, 2011 through May 31, 2013" is not accurate based on the EBT report. The EBT report documents that during the month of December 2011, the only transactions were on December 16-17, 2011, and they occurred in Michigan. Similarly,

during the entire month of July 2012 and most of August 2012, transactions again occurred in Michigan.

The OI has been re-calculated based on the EBT report and in consideration of the periods that Respondent used the Michigan-issued EBT card out of state for 30 (thirty) days or more. The adjusted fraud period was considers the time periods Respondent would have to report changes in residence and for the Department to act on those changes. The evidence supports a fraud period of the months of November 2011, February 2012 through June 2012, and October 2012 through May 2013, during which Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

### **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 receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP program.

The Department is ORDERED to reduce the OI to \$ [REDACTED] for the period November 1-30, 2011; February 1, 2012, through June 30, 2012; and October 1, 2012 through May 31, 2013; and initiate recoupment/collection procedures in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Department delete and cease any disqualification period related to this OI.



---

**Colleen Lack**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Signed: **5/5/2015**

Date Mailed: **5/5/2015**

CL/jaf

**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:

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the names and contact information of the recipients listed under the 'cc:' field.