



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 3, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 16-010025
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
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 [REDACTED], from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [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) 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 [REDACTED], to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having 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. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in his incarceration and residence.
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 [REDACTED] fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan; and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
9. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the U.S. 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.

In this case, the Department alleged that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits. Subsequent to the scheduling of the current hearing, the Notice of Hearing and accompanying documents were mailed to Respondent via first class mail at the address identified by the Department as the last known address. After the mailing of the accompanying documents, they were returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable. When notice of a FAP IPV hearing is sent using first class mail and is returned as undeliverable, the hearing may still be held. 7 CFR 273.16((e)(3); BAM 720, p. 12. Thus, the hearing properly proceeded with respect to the alleged FAP IPV.

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 his FAP benefits because (i) for the time period of [REDACTED], he failed to report his incarceration and that he intentionally withheld the information for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility; and (ii) for the time period of [REDACTED], 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 in a federal, state or local correctional facility for more than 30 days is not eligible to receive FAP benefits. BAM 804 (July 2014), p. 1.

Additionally, to be eligible, a person must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (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, p. 1. For FAP cases, a person who is temporarily absent from the group is considered living with the group. BEM 212 (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], to show that he acknowledged his responsibility to report changes as required. See Exhibit A, pp. 11-30.

Second, the Department presented verification that Respondent was incarcerated in [REDACTED] County Jail, [REDACTED] from on or around [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, pp. 31-35. Then, on [REDACTED], Respondent was released to the State of [REDACTED] authority because he had an out-of-state hold. Exhibit A, pp 31-35. However, there was no evidence presented from the State of [REDACTED] showing whether he was incarcerated after [REDACTED]. Thus, the evidence is persuasive to

conclude that he was only incarcerated from on or around [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Exhibit A, pp. 31-35.

Third, the Department presented Respondent's FAP transaction history that showed Respondent's Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) card was being used while he was incarcerated from [REDACTED] and all of the transactions took place out-of-state in [REDACTED]. See Exhibit A, pp. 36-39. Moreover, the FAP transaction history showed that after his release on [REDACTED] his FAP benefits continued to be used out-of-state in [REDACTED] until [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, pp. 36-39. The Department further testified that Respondent's FAP group size was one during the alleged fraud period; and there were no other authorized users, which meant Respondent was the only eligible group member to use his EBT card.

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.

First, the evidence record did indicate that Respondent's EBT card was used out-of-state during his incarceration and there were no other authorized users on his account. The evidence is persuasive that an OI is present due to Respondent's failure to report his incarceration. Nonetheless, in order to impose a disqualification, the Department must show by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally committed an IPV violation. BAM 720, p. 1; 7 CFR 273.16(c)(1) and (2); and 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). In the present case, there was no evidence to show that Respondent, during the alleged fraud period, represented that he intentionally withheld his incarceration. The Department presented Respondent's application/FAP transaction history/incarceration information. However, this failed to show by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld incarceration for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. Therefore, in the absence of any clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented his incarceration for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of his FAP program benefits or eligibility, the Department has failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

Second, there was no evidence to show that Respondent, during the alleged fraud period, purposely failed to report a change in residency in order to continue receiving FAP benefits from Michigan. The Department did not present evidence to establish Respondent's intent during the alleged IPV usage, other than the FAP transaction history/incarceration records. However, this failed to show by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move during the alleged fraud period for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. In summary, in the absence of any clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld information concerning an out-of-state move for the purpose of maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility, the Department has failed to establish 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, 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

The evidence established that no IPV was committed. However, the Department can still proceed with recoupment of the OI when there is client error.

A client/provider error overissuance is when the client received more benefits than he/she was entitled to because the client/CDC provider gave incorrect or incomplete information to the Department. BAM 715 (January 2016), p. 1.

A client error is present because the Respondent failed to notify the Department of his incarceration and his failure to report that he was no longer a Michigan resident. See BAM 715, p. 1. First, for the OI period of [REDACTED], the evidence established that Respondent was incarcerated during this period; therefore, he was not eligible for FAP benefits during this time period. See BAM 804, p. 1. Second, for the OI period of [REDACTED], it was persuasive evidence that Respondent was not a Michigan resident. See BEM 220, p. 1. The evidence shows that the most probable explanation is that Respondent lived outside of Michigan. Moreover, the FAP transaction history shows that Respondent was using benefits out-of-state for more than thirty days. See BEM 212, p. 3. This established that Respondent is not temporarily absent from his group and he was not eligible for FAP benefits due to his change in residency from [REDACTED].

Applying the overissuance period standards, the Department properly determined that the OI period began on [REDACTED]. See BAM 715, pp. 4-5 and Exhibit A, pp. 4 and 31.

Additionally, 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 715, p. 6.

In establishing the OI amount, the Department presented a benefit summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan from [REDACTED], which totaled \$ [REDACTED] Exhibit A, pp. 42 and 44. Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup \$ [REDACTED] of FAP benefits it issued to Respondent from [REDACTED].

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 **did** receive an OI of FAP program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

The Department is **ORDERED** to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy, less any amount already recouped and/or collected.

EJF/jaf



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]

DHHS

[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]

Via email

[REDACTED]