



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: June 7, 2016  
MAHS Docket No.: 15-016505  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric J. Feldman**

**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 May 23, 2016, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by James Hall, 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 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 [REDACTED], 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 FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on [REDACTED] Respondent reported that he intended to stay in Michigan.
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in his 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 in February 2014.
8. The OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud periods are [REDACTED]; April [REDACTED]; and [REDACTED].
9. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,872 in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
10. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued FAP benefits from the State of [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 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), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Health and Human Services 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 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), 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 2014), p. 7; 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 alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP for the period of July 2013 to December 2013 because he failed to update residency information for the purpose of receiving FAP benefits from more than one state. Also, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP for the period of April 2014 to June 2014, and September 2014 to October 2014 because he failed to notify the Department that he no longer resided in Michigan but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while out-of- state.

A person cannot receive FAP in more than one state for any month. BEM 222 (July 2013), p. 3. Out-of-state benefit receipt or termination may be verified by one of the following: DHS-3782, Out-of-State Inquiry; Letter or document from other state; or Collateral contact with the state. BEM 222, p. 4.

A person is disqualified for a period of 10 years if found guilty through the Administrative Hearing Process, convicted in court or by signing a repayment and disqualification agreement (such as a DHS-826 or DHS-830) of having made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously. BEM 203 (July 2013), p. 1.

Additionally, to be eligible, a person must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (February 2014 and July 2014), p. 1. For FAP cases, a person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if there is no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. BEM 220, p. 1. Eligible persons may include persons who entered the state with a job commitment or to seek employment; and students (for FAP only, this includes students living at home during a school break). BEM 220, pp. 1-2. For FAP cases, a person who is temporarily absent from the group is considered living with the group. BEM 212 (February 2014 and July 2014) p. 3. However, a person's absence is not temporary if it has lasted more than thirty days. BEM 212, p. 3.

First, the Department presented Respondent's application dated [REDACTED] in which Respondent marked "no" to the question if he had moved from, or received assistance from another state any time after August 1996, even though the Department argued that he did receive FAP benefits from the State of [REDACTED] at the time. See Exhibit A, pp. 12 and 35.

Second, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history. See Exhibit A, pp. 36-46. The FAP transaction history showed that Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan out-of-state in [REDACTED] from [REDACTED]

█ See Exhibit A, pp. 36-38. Then, the FAP transaction history showed that Respondent used FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan in Michigan and out-of-state in █ and █ from █. See Exhibit A, pp. 38-46.

Third, the Department presented evidence to show that Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously from the States of █ and Michigan from July 2013 to December 2013. See Exhibit A, pp. 35 and 49.

Fourth, the Department presented evidence from the Social Security Administration (SSA) office to show that Respondent changed his address from February 2014 to November 2014 to a █ address. See Exhibit A, pp. 47-48.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

As to the fraud period of July 2013 to December 2013, the evidence indicated that Respondent received FAP benefits simultaneously (Michigan and █ from July 2013 to December 2013. See Exhibit A, pp. 35 and 49. This represents approximately six months of benefits Respondent received concurrently. Moreover, Department presented Respondent's application dated █, which was submitted during the fraud period. See Exhibit A, pp. 11-34. In the application, Respondent failed to report that he was receiving benefits in Louisiana, even though the evidence established that he was receiving FAP assistance from the State of █ at the time. See Exhibit A, pp. 12 and 35. This evidence established that Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously from Michigan and █. See BEM 203, p. 1.

As to the fraud period of April 2014 to June 2014, and September 2014 to October 2014, the evidence established that Respondent failed to notify the Department that he no longer resided in Michigan but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while out-of-state. The Department presented evidence to establish Respondent's intent during the IPV usage. The Department presented Respondent's SSA documentation to show that he had an out-of-state address in █ during the fraud period. See Exhibit A, pp. 47-48. Moreover, the FAP transaction history showed that Respondent used the benefits out-of-state in █ during the fraud period. See Exhibit A, pp. 36-38. This evidence showed that Respondent no longer resided in Michigan and he intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move during the fraud period in order to maintain his Michigan FAP eligibility.

In summary, there was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of his responsibility to report changes in residence and that he intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. The Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### 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, pp. 15-16; BEM 708 (April 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 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 lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a ten-year disqualification under the FAP program. BAM 720, p. 16.

### Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8.

In the present case, the Department is entitled to recoup \$1,872 of FAP benefits it issued to Respondent from [REDACTED]; [REDACTED]; and [REDACTED]. See Exhibit A, pp. 49-50.

### 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 FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,872.

The Department is **ORDERED** to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$1,872 in accordance with Department policy.

It is **FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years.

EF/hw



---

**Eric J. Feldman**

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]