



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 28, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-015387
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jacquelyn A. McClinton

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 February 23, 2017, 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 FIP and 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) of FIP and FAP benefits?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FIP and FAP benefits for 12 months?

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 FIP and FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report any household felony drug convictions, occurring after August 22, 1996, to the Department within 10 days.
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] (FAP 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. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is [REDACTED] (FIP fraud period).
10. 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.
11. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
12. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV of FIP and FAP.
13. 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 Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233-260; MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b; and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101 to .3131.

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 October 1, 2014, 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;

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.

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 support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV of his FIP and FAP benefits, the Department presented three applications submitted by Respondent to the Department on [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], in which Respondent acknowledged that he had received the Information Booklet advising of regarding "Things You Must Do" which explained reporting requirements for criminal convictions, probation and/or parole violations Respondent also submitted a Redetermination on [REDACTED]. In each application or Redetermination, Respondent stated that either no one in the household had been convicted of a felony or that no one in the household have been convicted a felony more than once.

Additionally, the Department presented documentation which showed that Respondent's wife and household member had been convicted of drug-related felonies on [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. However, Respondent's wife's last name at the time of the convictions was [REDACTED]. As such, it appears that the convictions may have occurred prior to the marriage. There was no evidence provided that Respondent was

aware of his wife's convictions at the time he submitted the documents to the Department. Accordingly, it is found that the Department has failed to establish that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining FIP and 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 (October 2015), p. 15. 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.

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. 16.

In this case, the Department has not satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FIP and FAP benefits. Accordingly, Respondent is not subject to a 12 month disqualification under the FIP and FAP program.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. Individuals convicted of certain crimes, such as trafficking and drug-related felonies; probation or parole violators; and fugitive felons are not eligible for FAP or FIP assistance. BEM 203 (October 2015), p. 1.

In this case, the Department is seeking an overissuance related to FIP benefits issued from [REDACTED]. The Department provided a benefit issuance summary which revealed that Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FIP benefits during the FIP fraud period. Budgets submitted by the Department revealed that Respondent would have been entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in FIP benefits, if his wife had been properly disqualified from the group, creating an overissuance of \$ [REDACTED].

The Department is also seeking an overissuance related to FAP benefits issued from [REDACTED]. The Department provided a benefit issuance summary which revealed that Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits during the FAP fraud period. Budgets submitted by the Department revealed that Respondent would have been entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits if his wife had been properly disqualified from the group, creating an overissuance of \$ [REDACTED].

Additionally, an individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified from receiving FIP and FAP benefits if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. BEM 203, p. 2. Even the Department failed to establish that Respondent

intentionally provided misleading information, it did establish that Respondent's wife had been convicted of two drug related felonies occurring after August 22, 1996. As such, Respondent's wife should have been disqualified from the FIP and FAP group. Accordingly, the Department established that Respondent was not entitled to benefits and as such, received an OI of FIP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during the FIP fraud period and an overissuance in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during the FAP fraud period.

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 of FIP and FAP benefits.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FIP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
3. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the total amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent is not subject to a 12 month disqualification from FIP and FAP benefits as a result of an IPV.

JM/hw



Jacquelyn A. McClinton

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]