



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: February 24, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-013413
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
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 January 26, 2017 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 (OI) 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's household included a living-together partner (LTP).

3. On [REDACTED] Respondent's LTP began receiving employment income from an employer (hereinafter "Employer").
4. Respondent's LTP's employment income from Employer continued through at least September 2014.
5. Respondent failed to report to MDHHS her LTP's employment income from Employer.
6. Respondent's failure to report income was clearly and convincingly purposeful.
7. Respondent received an OI of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from April 2014 through August 2014 as a result of unreported employment income.
8. On [REDACTED], MDHHS requested a hearing to establish Respondent committed an IPV and received an OI of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for the months from April 2014 through September 2014.

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 unsigned Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (Exhibit 1, pp. 4-5) dated [REDACTED]. The document alleged Respondent received an over-issuance of \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from April 2014 through September 2014. The document, along with MDHHS testimony, alleged the OI was based on Respondent's failure to timely report employment income.

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.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BAM 105 (April 2016), p. 11. Changes [in income] must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. *Id.*

MDHHS presented a Wage Match- Details (Exhibit 1, pp. 10-11). The document listed a "run date" of [REDACTED]. The document from the MDHHS database listed Respondent's LTP received earnings from Employer for the 4th quarter of 2015. MDHHS testimony indicated the document date reflects the first time MDHHS learned of Respondent's allegedly unreported employment.

MDHHS presented a Wage Match Client Notice (Exhibit 1, pp. 12-13) dated [REDACTED], [REDACTED]. The notice was signed by a staff person of Employer on [REDACTED]. The stated start date for Respondent's LTP with Employer was [REDACTED]. Attached earning statements (Exhibit 1, pp. 14-16) listed various weekly earnings from [REDACTED], [REDACTED] through [REDACTED], for Respondent's LTP.

MDHHS presented Respondent's FAP benefit issuance history from the State of Michigan (Exhibit 1, pp. 69-70). The history listed FAP issuances to Respondent from April 2014 through August 2014.

Presented evidence failed to verify a FAP benefit issuance to Respondent for September 2014. No explanation was provided for the omission. Unless it is verified that Respondent received FAP benefits for September 2014, an OI cannot be granted for that benefit month. It is found MDHHS failed to establish an OI for September 2014.

MDHHS presented an Issuance Summary (Exhibit 1, p. 29) and corresponding FAP overissuance budgets (Exhibit 1, pp. 17-28) covering April 2014 through September 2014. The budgets factored Respondent's income from Employer as stated on presented earning statements. A total OI of [REDACTED] was calculated. A total OI from April 2014 through August 2014 was \$ [REDACTED] was calculated.

MDHHS policy categorizes overissuances into 3 different types: client error, agency error, and intentional fraud (see BAM 700). Client and Agency errors are not pursued if the estimated amount is less than \$250 per program. BAM 700, p. 9.

The above policy allows MDHHS to pursue an OI no matter which party was at fault. The OI budgets, as presented, can only be found accurate if it is found Respondent is at fault for the OI.

The budgets factored Respondent's income with Employer as unreported. Factoring employment income as unreported deprives clients from receipt of a 20% employment income credit (see BEM 556). The analysis will proceed to determine if Respondent reported income from Employer.

MDHHS alleged Respondent failed to timely report employment income to MDHHS, in part, based on the absence of income budgeted from Employer as part of Respondent's original FAP benefit issuances during the alleged OI period. The allegation was also based on an absence of documentation of employment income within Respondent's case file. A regulation agent testified a search of Respondent's case file revealed no

indication of Respondent timely reporting employment income with Employer. The testimony is not definitive evidence that Respondent failed to timely report employment income, however, Respondent did not appear to rebut the testimony, nor was superior evidence available.

It is found that Respondent failed to report employment income. Thus, MDHHS properly deprived Respondent's LTP of a 20% employment income credit.

Presented evidence sufficiently verified Respondent's lack of reporting caused an OI of \$ [REDACTED] from April 2014 through August 2014. The analysis will proceed to determine if Respondent's non-reporting amounted to 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).

DHS regulations list the requirements for an IPV. 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 (1/2011), 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).

Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. BAM 105 (July 2015), p. 8. Respondent's written statements were indicative of a lack of truthfulness.

MDHHS presented Respondent's electronically submitted application (Exhibit 1, pp. 30-66) signed and dated by Respondent on [REDACTED]. The application stated

Respondent's signature was certification of an understanding of a responsibility to report changes to MDHHS within 10 days. Respondent reported no employment income (see Exhibit 1, p. 40) for any household members.

MDHHS verified Respondent failed to list her LTP's employment income on a reporting document when Respondent's LTP was employed. A written misreporting by a client is highly suggestive of a fraudulent intent.

MDHHS established that Respondent was aware of her reporting requirements. There was no evidence that Respondent failed to understand her reporting requirements. It is found MDHHS clearly and convincingly established Respondent committed an IPV by failing to report her LTP's employment income.

The standard disqualification period is used in all instances except when a court orders a different period. BAM 725 (January 2016), p. 16. [MDHHS is to] apply the following disqualification periods to recipients determined to have committed an IPV... one year for the first IPV... two years for the second IPV[, and] lifetime for the third IPV. *Id.*

MDHHS alleged no previous history of IPV's by Respondent. Thus, a 1 year disqualification period is justified.

DECISION AND ORDER

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS failed to establish that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits for September 2014. The MDHHS request to establish an OI is **PARTIALLY DENIED**.

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS established that Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in over-issued FAP benefits from April 2014 through August 2014. The MDHHS request to establish an overissuance against Respondent is **PARTIALLY APPROVED**.

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS established that Respondent committed an IPV. The MDHHS request to establish a 12 month IPV disqualification is **APPROVED**.

CG/hw



Christian Gardocki
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

DHHS

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]