

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

MAHS Reg. No.: 15-007418
Issue No.: 3005
DHHS Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: July 15, 2015
County: Calhoun (21)

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 July 15, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Participants on behalf of Respondent included: [REDACTED], the Respondent, and [REDACTED], husband.

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 May 18, 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. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to timely report any household changes, including changes with income, to the Department.
5. 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 July 1, 2013, through November 30, 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. 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:

- 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.

In this case, the Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibility to timely and accurately report to the Department household changes, including changes with income. Department policy 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 (March 1, 2013), pp. 7-8. Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application in this record certifies that she was aware of the reporting responsibilities and that fraudulent participation in benefits could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims. Further, the May 9, 2013, Notice of Case Action noted that no earned income was included in the FAP budget and reminded Respondent of the responsibility to report changes. (Department Exhibit A, pp. 11-34, and 36-43)

However, Respondent had an apparent physical or mental impairment that limits understanding or ability to fulfill the reporting responsibilities. The Respondent and her husband provided credible testimony regarding Respondent's history of a learning disability and need for assistance with completing and understanding paperwork. For example, this testimony is supported by the many portions of the Assistance Application that were not completed. (Department Exhibit A, pp. 11-34)

Respondent's husband also described difficulties working with the local Department office and providing information to them. This included the repeated loss of paperwork and verifications they submitted to the Department, like paycheck stubs. Further, the local Department office often would not talk with Respondent's husband because the case was in Respondent's name. Respondent's husband testified that the local Department office did not let them know Respondent could provide a written statement authorizing the Department to talk with him about the case. This is particularly concerning in light of Respondent's impairments with understanding paperwork and complying with her responsibilities as a recipient of Department benefits. Respondent's husband explained that when they contacted the local Department office to try to find out why the FAP benefit did not decrease, they were told no additional paperwork was needed. Additionally, Respondent's husband testified that at one point when they were trying to get off of Department benefits, a named Department worker told them that if they did not do anything, the case would cancel.

Overall, the Department has not established that Respondent committed an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.

Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed a FAP IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15. Clients are disqualified for 10 years for an FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for 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 does not show that Respondent committed an FAP 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, the evidence of record shows that during the above-mentioned fraud period Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits. As noted above, the evidence was not sufficient to establish the OI was due to an IPV. However, the evidence still establishes that the OI occurred. Therefore, the Department must still attempt to recoup the OI.

The verified income from employment was utilized to re-determine FAP eligibility during the fraud period. (Department Exhibit A, pp. 45-61) The evidence of record shows that

during the above-mentioned fraud period 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 initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] 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 Mailed: **7/27/2015**

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:

