RICK SNYDER GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON



## **ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki Armstrong**

# 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 18, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan.

The Department was represented by				, Regulation Agent of the Office of						
Inspector	General.		testified	on	behalf	of	the	Department.	The	
Department submitted exhibits which were admitted into evidence.										

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). The record was closed at the conclusion of the hearing.

## **ISSUES**

- 1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance of Food Assistance Program 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?
- 3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance Program benefits for 12 months?

## **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 Office of Inspector General filed a hearing request on August 19, 2016, to establish an overissuance of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an Intentional Program Violation.
- 2. The Office of Inspector General has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits for 12 months.
- 3. Respondent was a recipient of Food Assistance Program benefits issued by the Department.
- 4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes of address as indicated by his signature on the Food Assistance Program application dated October 21, 2013. [Dept. Exh. 11-29].
- 5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. [Dept. Exh. 17].
- 6. The FAP purchase history shows Petitioner used his Michigan Food Assistance Program benefits solely in except for once on September 30, 2014, from June 16, 2014 through June 16, 2015. [Dept. Exh. 37-43].
- 7. According to present, Petitioner moved to in August, 2014 and still resides at the address in the above captioned matter. [Dept. Exh. 46].
- 8. On September 2, 2014, Petitioner submitted a Food Assistance Program redetermination indicating he was still living in Michigan. [Dept. Exh. 34].
- 9. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is August 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015.
- 10. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued in Food Assistance Program benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was not entitled to any such benefits during this time period.
- 11. The Department alleges that Respondent received an overissuance in Food Assistance Program benefits in the amount of
- 12. This was Respondent's first alleged Intentional Program Violation.

13. 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 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, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016).

#### **Intentional Program Violation**

Suspected Intentional Program Violation means an overissuance 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 720, p 1.

An Intentional Program Violation 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 Respondent intentionally failed to report that he moved to was receiving FAP benefits from Michigan. Respondent's signature on the FAP redetermination dated September 2, 2014, certifies that he was aware that fraudulent participation in FAP could result in criminal or civil or administrative claims. Because of Respondent's failure to report that he was living in and using his Michigan FAP benefits solely outside the state of Michigan, he received an overissuance and the Department is entitled to recoup

#### Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed an Intentional Program Violation by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p 15. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a Food Assistance Program Intentional Program Violation involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other Intentional Program Violation cases involving Family Independence Program, Food Assistance Program or State Disability Assistance, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first Intentional Program Violation, two years for the second Intentional Program Violation, and lifetime for the third Intentional Program Violation or conviction of two felonies for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances in separate periods if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. BEM 203, p 2; BAM 720, p 18. 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, Respondent is disqualified for 12 months.

#### Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p 1 (1/1/2016).

In this case, Respondent received an overissuance of for the fraud period of August 1, 2014 through March 31, 2015 for failing to report his move to and using his Michigan Food Assistance Program benefits solely in the state of during the fraud period.

## **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 Intentional Program Violation.
- 2. Respondent did receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of from the Food Assistance Program.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program for 12 months.

Vicki Armstrong

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

