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 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 Regulations, particularly 7 CFR 273.16 and 45 CFR 235.110, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 10, 2017, from Lansing, Michigan.

The Department was represented by grant of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). See testified on behalf of the Department. The Department submitted 51 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 (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medicaid 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 FAP benefits for 10 years?

# **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 June 24, 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 Medicaid and FAP benefits issued by the Department.
- 4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in her residence to the Department as evidenced by her electronic signature on the April 20, 2015, FAP/Medicaid application. [Dept. Exh. 19].
- 5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairments that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. [Dept. Exh. 15, 38].
- 6. Respondent began using FAP benefits outside the State of Michigan beginning on June 9, 2015 through May 5, 2016. [Dept. Exh. 44-48].
- 7. During the alleged fraud period of January 1, 2016 through April 30, 2016, Respondent was issued in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.
- 8. During the alleged fraud period of January 1, 2016 through March 31, 2016, Respondent was issued in Medicaid benefits from the State of Michigan.
- 9. From November, 2014 through July, 2016, Respondent received in FAP benefits from the
- 10. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
- 11. 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 Ols 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, p 12-13 (1/1/2016).

# **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 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 record evidence clearly shows that Respondent received FAP benefits from the from November, 2014 through July, 2016. The Department has established that Respondent intentionally withheld the fact that she was receiving concurrent benefits from the states of Michigan and for the purpose of establishing and maintaining Michigan FAP and Medicaid benefits in Michigan. Therefore, the Department has established an Intentional Program Violation.

# **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p 15. 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.

Clients who commit an Intentional Program Violation are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the overissuance relates to Medicaid or the Food Assistance Program. BAM 720, p 13. Clients are disqualified for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p 18.

In this case, Respondent received concurrent FAP benefits from the state of Michigan and from January 1, 2016 through April 30, 2016. Because Respondent received concurrent FAP benefits from the states of and Michigan, Respondent is disqualified from receiving Michigan FAP benefits for 10-years.

#### Overissuance

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

In this case, Respondent received concurrent benefits from the and Michigan, from January, 2016 through April, 2016. Because of Respondent's failure to report that she was also receiving FAP benefits in while

receiving Michigan FAP benefits, she received a FAP overissuance of and a Medicaid overissuance of for which the Department is entitled to recoup.

## **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, concludes that:

- 1. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
- 2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of
- 3. Respondent did receive an OI of Medicaid benefits in the amount of

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

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the FAP program for 10 years.

Vicki Armstrong

Willi 2. 6

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

