



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 13, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-018385
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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 with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, telephone hearing was held on February 22, 2017, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Participants on behalf of Respondent included: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

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 the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (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. On September 30, 2014, the Department received Respondent's completed Redetermination (DHS-1010) where he reported to the Department that he had not been convicted of any drug-related felonies occurring after August 22, 1996. Exhibit A, pp 10-15.

2. Respondent's signature acknowledged his duty to accurately report his circumstances to the Department on his September 30, 2014, Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, p 13.
3. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
4. On September 30, 2015, the Department received Respondent's completed Redetermination (DHS-1010) where he reported to the Department that he had not been convicted of any drug-related felonies occurring after August 22, 1996. Exhibit A, pp 16-21.
5. Respondent's signature acknowledged his duty to accurately report his circumstances to the Department on his September 30, 2015, Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, p 21.
6. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. Respondent failed to report to the Department that he had pled guilty on October 16, 2013, to Possession of a Controlled Substance Less Than 25 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 22-23.
8. Respondent failed to report to the Department that he had pled guilty on August 4, 1999, to Possession of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 24-25.
9. Respondent failed to report to the Department that he had pled guilty on June 28, 2001, to Delivery/manufacture of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 26-27.
10. Respondent failed to report to the Department that he had pled guilty on September 21, 2009, to Possession of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 28-29.
11. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$ [REDACTED] from October 1, 2014, through December 31, 2015. Exhibit A, pp 32-34.
12. On December 14, 2016, the Department sent the Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$ [REDACTED] overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-8.
13. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
14. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on December 14, 2016, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 2.

15. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the United States Postal Service 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), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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-.3011.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- FAP trafficking OIs 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 OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$500 or more, **or**
 - the total OI 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (January 1, 2016), pp 12-13.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (January 1, 2016), p 1.

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 if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (October 1, 2015), p 2.

On September 30, 2014, and on September 30, 2014, the Department received Redetermination (DHS-1010) forms signed by Respondent where he had acknowledged his duty to accurately report his circumstances to the Department. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent reported to the Department on each of these occasions that he had not been convicted of any drug-related felonies. This information was false because Respondent had plead guilty to drug-related felonies on October 16, 2103; August 4, 1999; June 28, 2001; and September 21, 2009.

Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$ [REDACTED] from October 1, 2014, through December 31, 2015. If Respondent had reported his drug-related felonies to the Department then he would not have been eligible for any of these FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] overissuance of FAP benefits.

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, 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).

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), reh den 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

Respondent acknowledged his duty to accurately report his circumstances to the Department. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent did not report that he had been convicted of more than one drug-related felony with each occurring after August 22, 1996, but instead reported that he had not been convicted of any drug-related felonies. Respondent would have been permanently disqualified from FAP if he had accurately reported his drug-related felonies to the Department.

Respondent testified that another person filled out his application for FAP benefits and it was a mistake that his drug-related felony convictions was not reported to the Department. Respondent testified that the Department should have been aware that he had a criminal record because he used his MDOC Id card as verification of his identity when he applied for benefits.

However, the hearing record does not indicate that Respondent had an Authorized Representative (AR) assisting with the management of his affairs. The evidence does not support a finding that Respondent was not capable of understanding the documents he signed under penalties of perjury and his duty to provide accurate information. Having been recently released from prison upon applying for benefits is not sufficient notice to the Department that he should have been permanently disqualified from FAP.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally failed to report his history of drug-related felonies to the Department for the purposes of becoming eligible for and maintaining his eligibility for FAP benefits that he would not have been eligible for otherwise.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15-16. 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.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the OI relates to MA. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 1, 2013), p. 2. 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. 16.

The record evidence indicates that this is Respondent's first alleged IPV violation.

The Department has established an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

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 Food Assistance Program (FAP) program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/nr



Kevin Scully
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]