



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: March 21, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-013776
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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 income from employment and starting employment.
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], through [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 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 (1/1/16), pp. 12-13.

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 (May 1, 2015), 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 Respondent applied for FAP benefits on [REDACTED], at which time he reported that he was not employed. Exhibit A, p. 11. This information was correct. However, the Respondent began employment a month later on [REDACTED], with the [REDACTED], Exhibit A, pp. 27-37. This employment continued until [REDACTED]. During the period, the Respondent was also employed with [REDACTED], which showed the Respondent began that employment on [REDACTED], through [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, p. 39. The Respondent did not report any of this employment to the Department. The employment is established by the Employment Verification of Respondent's employers during the period.

While recipients of FAP benefits are required to report changes in income and starting employment, Respondent failed to do so. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. BAM 105 (December 1, 2011), p. 5.

Clients must report changes in circumstances that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. BEM 105 (December 1, 2011), p. 7. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105, p. 11.

The evidence presented by the Department established that Respondent applied for FAP on [REDACTED], and was advised of reporting requirements responsibilities. The Respondent was advised again about reporting in the Notice of Case Action approving him for FAP sent to him on [REDACTED], advising him that he must report changes including employment, income etc.; and a Change Report advising that any change in income of \$ [REDACTED] or more must be reported. Based upon the evidence advising Respondent to report income and employment, it is determined that the Department has established an IPV was committed by the Respondent as he was told the reporting rules and did not report employment so he could continue to receive benefits and more benefits than he was otherwise eligible to receive. See Exhibit A, pp. 22-27.

Based upon the evidence presented, the Department has met its burden to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally misrepresented facts to the Department for the purpose of establishing or maintaining food assistance benefits, and thus, has established an IPV.

Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed a FAP IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, Clients are disqualified for ten years for an 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. 6.

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. 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. 1.

In this case, as stated above, the Department having established an FAP IPV by Respondent, the Department is entitled to a finding of a disqualification of Respondent from receipt of FAP benefits.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. An **overissuance (OI)** is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what it was eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). BAM 700, p. 7, (May 1, 2014), p. 1.

In this case, the Department presented OI FAP budgets for each month for the period [REDACTED] through [REDACTED] Exhibit A, pp. 42-55. The OI budgets included the Respondent's earned income from his employment for each pay period. When the earned income from employment is added to the FAP budget calculation, the income totals for each month's net income during the fraud period caused the Respondent to receive more FAP benefits than he was entitled to receive because the original FAP benefit amount was based upon the Respondent receiving no income. A review of the OI budgets at the hearing and further review by the undersigned found them to be correct. The Department also presented a Benefit Issuance Summary Inquiry to establish that Respondent received FAP benefits throughout the OI period. Exhibit A, p. 43.

Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup \$ [REDACTED] for the FAP benefit OI during the fraud period. It is also determined that the Department correctly found [REDACTED] to be the starting month as required by Department policy, having applied the [REDACTED], reporting and processing periods from [REDACTED], when the Respondent started his employment.

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** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of FAP 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.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from receipt of FAP benefits for a period of **12 months**.

LMF/jaf



Lynn M. Ferris

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]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]