



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: December 20, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: [REDACTED]
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION AND
OVERISSUANCE**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), 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 [REDACTED], from Detroit, Michigan. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by [REDACTED], regulation agent, with the Office of Inspector General. Respondent did not appear.

ISSUES

The first issue is whether MDHHS established Respondent received an overissuance of benefits.

The second issue is whether MDHHS established that Respondent committed an intentional program violation (IPV).

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Respondent was an ongoing recipient of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits from the State of Michigan.
2. Respondent was convicted of multiple drug-related felonies between [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3. In [REDACTED] and multiple times thereafter, Respondent intentionally misreported to MDHHS having no history of drug-related felonies.
4. From [REDACTED], Respondent received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.
5. From [REDACTED], Respondent would have received [REDACTED] in FAP benefits if Respondent's drug-related felony history was factored.
6. On [REDACTED], MDHHS requested a hearing to establish Respondent received an OI of [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from [REDACTED] due to an IPV.
7. Respondent had no previous history of IPV.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

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. MDHHS (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-.3011. MDHHS policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

MDHHS requested a hearing, in part, to establish Respondent received an overissuance of benefits. MDHHS presented an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement dated [REDACTED] (Exhibit 1, pp. 5-6). The repay agreement (unsigned by Respondent) alleged Respondent received [REDACTED] in over-issued FAP benefits from [REDACTED]. MDHHS alleged the OI was based on Respondent's failure to report multiple drug-related felonies.

When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, MDHHS must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700 (January 2016), p. 1. An overissuance [bold lettering removed] is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what it was eligible to receive. *Id.* Recoupment [bold lettering removed] is a MDHHS action to identify and recover a benefit overissuance. *Id.*, p. 2.

[For FAP benefits,] people convicted of certain crimes and probation or parole violators are not eligible for assistance. BEM 203 (July 2013), p. 1. An individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified if both offenses occurred after [REDACTED]. *Id.*, p. 2.

MDHHS presented a portion of Respondent's FAP issuance history (Exhibit 1, pp. 30-

31). The history ranged from [REDACTED]. Respondent's FAP issuances totaled [REDACTED] from [REDACTED].

MDHHS presented a Case Register of Actions (Exhibit 1, pp. 32-35). The documents summarized Respondent's previous encounter with a Genesee County court. It was noted Petitioner agreed to a plea to "CONTRL SUB POSSESS < 25 GRM" on [REDACTED]. The charge was based on MCL 333.7403(2)(A)(5). An offense date of [REDACTED] was stated.

MDHHS presented a Case Register of Actions (Exhibit 1, pp. 36-40). The documents summarized Respondent's previous encounter with a [REDACTED] County court. It was noted Petitioner agreed to a plea to "CONTR SUB DEL LESS 50GRAM" on [REDACTED]. The charge was based on MCL 333.7401(2)(A)(4). An offense date of [REDACTED], was stated.

MDHHS testimony indicated Respondent was the only member of the FAP benefit group throughout the alleged OI benefit period. The testimony was consistent with Respondent's reporting to MDHHS (see Exhibit 1, pp. 41-79). As the only FAP benefit group member, a criminal justice disqualification of Respondent would justify a total disqualification of FAP benefit eligibility.

Based on presented evidence, it is found Respondent was ineligible for FAP benefits based on previous drug-related felony convictions. It is further found that Respondent received an OI of [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] in FAP benefits. The analysis will proceed to determine if the OI was caused by an IPV.

The Code of Federal Regulations defines an IPV. Intentional program violations shall consist of having intentionally: (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system. 7 CFR 273.16 (c).

[An IPV is a] benefit overissuance resulting from the willful withholding of information or other violation of law or regulation by the client or his authorized representative. Bridges Program Glossary (October 2015), p. 36. A 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 their reporting responsibilities.

BAM 720 (January 2016), p. 1; see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6).

IPV is suspected when there is **clear and convincing** [emphasis added] evidence that the client or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. *Id.* 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. It is a standard which requires reasonable certainty of the truth; something that is highly probable. Black's Law Dictionary 888 (6th ed. 1990).

MDHHS presented Respondent's handwritten FAP benefit application (Exhibit 1, pp. 11-29). Respondent's signature was undated, though a witness signature date of April 5, 2011 was noted. The application also had an MDHHS office date stamp (typically used when MDHHS receives the application) of [REDACTED]. The "No" box was checked in response to the question, "Has anyone ever been convicted of a drug-related felony occurring after [REDACTED]?" Respondent did not answer the follow-up question asking "Convicted more than once?" A follow-up question of "If yes, who?" was also unanswered.

MDHHS presented Respondent's electronically-submitted FAP redetermination documents (Exhibit 1, pp. 41-47). A signature and submission date of [REDACTED], was noted. "No" was the response to the question, "Has anyone ever been convicted of a drug-related felony occurring after [REDACTED]?"

MDHHS presented Respondent's electronically-submitted FAP redetermination documents (Exhibit 1, pp. 48-53). A signature and submission date of [REDACTED], was noted. "No" was the response to the question, "Has anyone ever been convicted of a drug-related felony occurring after [REDACTED]?"

MDHHS presented Respondent's electronically-submitted FAP application (Exhibit 1, pp. 54-66). A signature and submission date of [REDACTED], was noted. "No" was the response to the questions, "Convicted of a Drug felony?" and "Convicted of a Drug Felony more than once?"

MDHHS presented Respondent's electronically-submitted FAP application (Exhibit 1, pp. 67-79). A signature and submission date of [REDACTED], was noted. "No" was the response to the questions, "Convicted of a Drug felony?" and "Convicted of a Drug Felony more than once?"

Each of the presented applications and redeterminations stated Respondent's signature was certification, subject to perjury, that all information on the form was true. Presented evidence was not indicative that Respondent did not understand the reporting requirements.

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]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]