



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: October 27, 2016  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-006982  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Darryl Johnson

**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 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 25, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] [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) and Medical Assistance (MA) 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 22, 2016, 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 and MA benefits issued by the Department.
4. On the Assistance Application signed by Respondent on November 10, 2014, (Exhibit 1 Page 11) Respondent reported that he was not getting food stamps.
5. Respondent had applied for FAP and MA in Wisconsin on October 31, 2014, (Page 42) and said he was a Wisconsin resident (Page 43).
6. On May 6, 2015, Respondent renewed his Wisconsin FAP and MA (Page 45).
7. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in his address and his state of residence.
8. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
9. Respondent was issued Wisconsin FAP benefits in Wisconsin on November 18, 2014, (Page 67) and began purchasing food in Wisconsin on December 5, 2014.
10. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is February 1, 2015, through May 31, 2015, for FAP and MA (fraud period).
11. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits and \$ [REDACTED] in MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
12. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP and MA benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
13. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
14. 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.

The Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department of Health and Human Services (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10, and MCL 400.105-.112k.

Effective January 1, 2016, 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 (1/1/16), p. 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 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 applied for benefits in Wisconsin on October 31, 2014, and then ten days later he applied for comparable benefits in Michigan. He was granted FAP and MA by both states. On May 6, 2015, he renewed his benefits in Wisconsin by certifying he was a Wisconsin resident. Meanwhile, he was using both his Wisconsin benefits and his Michigan benefits in Wisconsin. See Exhibit 1 Pages 67-71 and 75-76.

BEM 203 (10/1/15) p. 1 states:

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, Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing, or DHS-830, Disqualification Consent Agreement,) of having made a fraudulent statement or representation regarding his identity or residence in order to receive multiple FAP benefits simultaneously.

In a concurrent benefits case, the Department has the burden of proving that (a) the Respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation about (1) identity or (2) residence, (b) for the purpose of receiving FAP benefits in two or more cases. It is not enough to prove that the Respondent was receiving benefits in two or more FAP cases. In this case, the Respondent received FAP in Michigan while he was receiving FAP in Wisconsin. The evidence is clear that Respondent made misrepresentations about his residence to Michigan in order to receive those benefits.

BEM 220 (1/1/16) p 1 says a person must be a Michigan resident to receive FIP, RCA, SDA, CDC, MA, or FAP. For FAP, "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."

Respondent had an obligation to truthfully answer questions about existing benefits and about his state of residence when applied in Michigan. He provided false information. He used his Michigan benefits for more than six months after he applied, even though he was not residing in Michigan and was receiving benefits from Wisconsin, and that is persuasive evidence that he left Michigan with no intention to return. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.

### **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; BEM 708 (4/1/16), 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. 17.

In this case, this is Respondent's first IPV, but the Department has established that he was concurrently receiving benefits in both Michigan and Wisconsin. Consequently, he is disqualified from receiving FAP for 10 years. There is no disqualification in the MA 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, Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FAP (Page 77) and \$ [REDACTED] in MA (Pages 78-79) during the OI period. The total OI in the two programs is \$ [REDACTED] and that must be recouped by the Department.

### **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 established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent received an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP and MA programs.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 10 years.

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]