

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**



MAHS Reg. No.: 15-012389  
Issue No.: 3005  
Agency Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: October 28, 2015  
County: SAGINAW

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Susanne E. Harris

**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 October 28, 2015, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in the 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**

Did the Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) and thereby receive an over issuance (OI) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

**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 July 9, 2015, to establish an OI of benefits received by the Respondent as a result of the Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG has requested that the Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. The Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.

4. The Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in circumstances to the Department within 10 days.
5. The 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 OI period is May 1, 2014 to July 31, 2014.
7. During the OI period, the Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that the Respondent was entitled to [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that the Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED].
9. This was the Respondent's first alleged IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to the 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.

Prior to October 1, 2014, Bridges Administration Manual (BAM) 720 Intentional Program Violation (IPV) stated that the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

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 \$1,000 or more, **or**

The total OI amount is less than \$1,000, **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.

The alleged over-issuance period in this case is May 1, 2014 to July 31, 2014. The alleged over-issuance amount is [REDACTED]. There is nowhere in BAM 720 or any other policy that directs the reduced threshold is to be applied retroactively. The current [REDACTED] threshold of BAM 720 is not applicable to any IPV over-issuance period prior to October 1, 2014. Therefore, the Department has not met its burden of proving, by a clear and convincing standard, that the Respondent committed an IPV.

### **Disqualification**

A client who is found to have committed a IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 12. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, 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. 12. 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. 13.

In this case, this Administrative Law Judge has concluded that the Department has not met its burden of proving that the Respondent has committed an IPV. As such, no disqualification penalty is appropriate.

### **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, though the Department has not burden of proving that the Respondent committed an IPV, the Department has met its burden of proving that the Respondent received and OI of [REDACTED] that the Department is entitled to recoup/collect.

**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 the Department has not established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV. The Department has established that the Respondent received an OI of the FAP and the Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

*Susanne E. Harris*

---

Susanne E. Harris  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Nick Lyon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

Date Mailed: **11/3/2015**

SEH/sw

**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]