



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 19, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 16-009924
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric J. Feldman

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 November 28, 2016, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent was represented by [REDACTED], Respondent; and her spouse, [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] served as translator during the hearing.

ISSUES

1. Did the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

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 March 31, 2016.
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. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in income.
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 October 1, 2012 to July 31, 2013.
7. The Department already recouped Respondent's OI in FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED].
8. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
9. 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 (January 2016), pp. 12-13; ASM 165 (May 2013), pp. 1-2.

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 (January 2016), p. 7; 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, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her benefits because she failed to report her spouse's employment and/or the increase in their income, which resulted in them exceeded the simplified reporting limits.

Food assistance groups with countable earnings are assigned to the simplified reporting (SR) category. BAM 200 (December 2011), p. 1.

Simplified reporting (SR) groups are required to report **only** when the group's actual gross monthly income (**not** converted) exceeds the SR income limit for their group size. BAM 200, p. 1. **No** other change reporting is required. BAM 200, p. 1.

If the group has an increase in income, the group must determine their total gross income at the end of that month. BAM 200, p. 1. If the total gross income exceeds the group's SR income limit, the group must report this change to their specialist by the 10th day of the following month, or the next business day if the 10th day falls on a weekend or holiday. BAM 200, p. 1. Once assigned to SR, the group remains in SR throughout the current benefit period unless they report changes at their semi-annual contact or redetermination that make them ineligible for SR. BAM 200, p. 1.

The income limit is 130 percent of the poverty level based on group size. BAM 200, p. 1. To determine the group's SR income limit, all eligible members of the FAP group are counted. BAM 200, p. 1.

First, the Department presented Respondent's application dated January 18, 2011, and her redetermination received on July 6, 2012, to show that she acknowledged her responsibility to report changes as required. See Exhibit A, pp. 10-29.

Second, the Department presented Respondent's Notice of Case Action dated July 25, 2012, which notified her of the ongoing obligation to report to the Department if her household's monthly gross income exceeded the simplified reporting limit of [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, pp. 34-35.

Third, the Department presented Respondent's redetermination received on July 15, 2013, which was submitted during the alleged fraud period. Exhibit A, pp. 30-33. In the redetermination, the spouse's income was reported. Exhibit A, p. 31.

Fourth, the Department presented the spouse's employment verification, which showed that he received wages from [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, pp. 36-40.

At the hearing, Respondent and her spouse argued and/or asserted the following: (i) they did not intend commit an IPV of her FAP benefits; and (ii) they agreed that they failed to report the spouse's income increasing from [REDACTED] per hour, but not intentionally.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits. The Department's position is that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to report her spouse's employment and/or the increase in their income, which resulted in them exceeded the simplified reporting limits. However,

in order to establish that a client has committed an IPV, the Department must establish that the client “committed, and intended to commit, an IPV.” BAM 720, p. 1; 7 CFR 273.16(c); and 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). The spouse’s testimony credibly established that they did not intend to commit a violation of the FAP program. The spouse’s credibility is supported by the Respondent’s testimony that corroborated their claim that they only failed to report the increase in income, but not intentional. As such, the undersigned finds the spouse’s and Respondent’s testimony credible that they did not intend to commit a violation of the FAP program.

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, p. 15; 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 not satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is not subject to a 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 testified that the OI was ██████ for the period of October 1, 2012 to July 31, 2013. See Exhibit A, pp. 1 and 4. However, it was discovered during the hearing that the Department had already recouped the OI sought in this case when the Department established the OI claim as client error. As such, the Department acknowledged that it is not seeking an OI in this case, but only an IPV against Respondent.


Accordingly, there is nothing further for the undersigned to address in regards to the OI claim because it has already been recouped.

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 not** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent is **NOT** subject to a disqualification from the FAP program.

EF/tm



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

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

CC: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]