



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Christopher Seppanen
Executive Director

MIKE ZIMMER
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: April 4, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 15-015001
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Darryl Johnson

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 March 31, 2016, 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 Child Development and Care (CDC) 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 CDC?

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 August 13, 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 CDC benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to comply with program requirements as a condition of eligibility.
5. 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 fraud period is September 24, 2003 through July 20, 2005 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in CDC 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 CDC 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 Child Development and Care (CDC) program is established by Titles IV-A, IV-E and XX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 601-619, 670-679c, and 1397-1397m-5; the Child Care and Development Block Grant of 1990, PL 101-508, 42 USC 9858 to 9858q; and the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, PL 104-193. The program is implemented by 45 CFR 98.1-99.33. The Department administers the program pursuant to MCL 400.10 and provides services to adults and children pursuant to MCL 400.14(1) and Mich Admin Code, R 400.5001-.5020.

Effective January 1, 2016, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.
- 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 (1/1/16), 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 (1/1/16), p. 6; 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, Respondent is alleged to have engaged in actions to defraud the Department from 2003 to 2005. There are limits on how long the Department can wait to pursue an IPV. Policy is found in BEM and BAM, which were previously identified as PEM and PAM. In 2005, the applicable policy was found in PAM 720 (7/1/05) at page 6. The policy has remained relatively consistent over the years.

PAM 720 (7/1/05) p 6:

OI Begin Date FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP Only

The OI period begins the first month or pay period benefit issuance exceeds the amount allowed by policy or 72 months (6 years) before the discovery date, whichever is later.

Also, the instructions for pursuing an IPV are found at page 3 of PAM 720.

RECOUPMENT SPECIALIST ACTIONS FIP, SDA and FAP Only

All referrals must be logged into the RS Tracking System within 10 days of receipt. All referral dispositions must be entered on the RS Tracking System within 10 days of disposition.

Within **60** days of receiving the referral, the RS must:

- determine if an OI actually occurred, **and**
- determine the OI type.

Within **90** days of determining an OI occurred, the RS must:

- obtain all evidence needed to establish an OI, **and**
- refer all suspected IPV OIs to OIG for investigation, **and**
- enter the pending OI on ARS.

Thus, an OI cannot be pursued unless it has been discovered within the prior six years by the Recoupment Specialist (RS). When the RS discovers the OI, he has 60 days to determine if an OI occurred, and if he determines one occurred, he must refer it within 90 days to the OIG for investigation.

The OIG has time limits it must abide by also. See PAM 720 at page 9.

OIG RESPONSIBILITIES All Programs

Suspected IPV cases are investigated by OIG. Within 18 months, OIG will:

- refer suspected IPV cases that meet criteria for prosecution to the Prosecuting Attorney, **or**
- refer suspected IPV cases that meet criteria for administrative hearings to Administrative Hearings, **or**
- return non-IPV cases to the RS.

The consequence of that is that the OIG has 18 months to pursue an IPV once it has received the referral from the RS. Putting this all together, the maximum possible time that the Department can go back in time is 72 months plus 60 days plus 90 days plus 18 months. Essentially, the Department could go back no farther than 95 months prior to the hearing request. That is one month less than eight years.

Here, the hearing request is dated August 13, 2015. The Department could conceivably pursue an OI that occurred no earlier than September 13, 2007. Because the OI period is September 24, 2003 through July 20, 2005, the Department's request is barred by time.

Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed a CDC IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15; BEM 708 (4/1/14), p. 1. 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. 16. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p. 1. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he/she lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department's attempt to establish an IPV is barred by the passage of time. Without an IPV, there is no basis to disqualify Respondent from the CDC program.

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, as stated above, the Department's action is time-barred. Therefore, no OI is found.

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's hearing request is time-barred.

The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment action.



DJ/mc

Darryl Johnson
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

DHHS

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]