



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
Christopher Seppanen  
Executive Director

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: May 8, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-013303  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Michael J. Bennane**

**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] [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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits?
3. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of FAP benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

**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.
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 (fraud period) is [REDACTED].
7. The Department alleges that during the fraud period Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan but 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).

Effective October 1, 2014, 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 (January 2016), p. 5.

#### **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 her or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits her 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.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV concerning her FAP benefits because she intentionally withheld information concerning her

employment income in order to receive or maintain FAP benefits from the State of Michigan. Employment income received by the client is considered in the calculation of a client's FAP eligibility and amount. BEM 556 (July 2013), pp. 2-6. FAP recipients who are not simplified reporters are required to report starting employment. BAM 105 (July 2015), pp. 10-11.

In support of its IPV case against Respondent, the Department presented (i) an application Respondent submitted to the Department on [REDACTED]; (ii) a Notice of Case Action sent to Respondent on [REDACTED], showing that she was approved for FAP benefits based on income of \$ [REDACTED] (iii) a wage match printout from the Department's system showing that Respondent earnings from [REDACTED] (Employer 1) in the third quarter of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (Employer 2) in the first quarter of [REDACTED] (iv) a printout from the Work Number, a Department-accessible database where employers voluntarily report employee employment information, concerning Respondent's employment with Employer 1; (v) a response from Employer 2 to a subpoena by the Department showing Respondent's gross weekly pay beginning [REDACTED]; (vi) a Benefit Summary Inquiry showing that Respondent received FAP benefits during the fraud period; and (vii) FAP OI budgets for each month during the fraud period showing the calculation of FAP benefits Respondent would have been eligible to receive if the alleged unreported income had been included in the determining her FAP eligibility and allotment at the time of issuance.

Respondent began receiving employment income from Employer 1 on [REDACTED], and received ongoing, consistent weekly pay until [REDACTED]. Respondent began receiving employment income from Employer 2 on [REDACTED], and received ongoing, consistent weekly pay which continued through [REDACTED]. Although Respondent accurately reported that she had no income in the [REDACTED] application and [REDACTED], redetermination she submitted to the Department, she failed to report to the Department her subsequent income with either Employer 1 or Employer 2. The Department presented evidence showing that Respondent was notified via the [REDACTED] Notice of Case Action that her FAP benefits were based on \$ [REDACTED] of income, and she was advised of her responsibility to timely report changes. The Department testified that Respondent never reported her employment with Employer 1 or Employer 2, and it was discovered by the Department through its wage match. A wage match is a computerized cross match of employment information clients provide to the Department with that in the database maintained by the Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency containing information provided by employers. BAM 802 (January 2016), p. 1. Because Respondent did not report her employment, the Department presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent withheld information for the purpose of maintaining or preventing reduction of her FAP benefits. Under these circumstances, the Department has established that Respondent committed an IPV concerning her FAP case.

### **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, p. 15. Clients are disqualified

for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FAP, 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.

As discussed above, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV. Because this was Respondent's first IPV, she is subject to a one-year disqualification from receipt of FAP benefits.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. The amount of a FAP OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8; BAM 715 (January 2016), p. 6; BAM 705 (January 2016), p. 6.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$[REDACTED] during the fraud period but was eligible for only \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits during this period once her income from Employer is budgeted. The Benefit Summary Inquiry establishes that Respondent was issued \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits during the fraud period.

To establish the FAP OI amount, the Department presented FAP OI budgets for each of the months of the fraud period to show the FAP benefits Respondent was eligible to receive if her unreported income had been included in the calculation of her FAP eligibility for each month. A review of the FAP OI budgets shows that the Department properly considered Respondent's actual income from employment. BAM 720, p. 10. Based on her one-person FAP group, Respondent was not eligible for FAP benefits if her gross income exceed the \$[REDACTED] gross income limit for FAP eligibility for a two-person group. RFT 250 (October 2015), p. 1. Respondent's actual income for each month during the fraud period, other than [REDACTED], exceeded the gross income limit. Therefore, Respondent was not eligible for any of the FAP benefits she received those months.

The Department alleges that Respondent was only eligible for \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits in [REDACTED] based on her net income. Because Respondent did not timely report her employment income, she was not eligible for the 20% earned income deduction in the calculation of the household's net income. BAM 720, p. 10. A review of the recalculated net income in the FAP OI budgets shows that, when Respondent's income from employment is taken into consideration, Respondent was eligible for [REDACTED] in FAP benefits for [REDACTED]. RFT 260 (October 2014), p. 19.

Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect from Respondent \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits issued to her, the difference in the \$[REDACTED] she received during the fraud period and the \$[REDACTED] she was eligible to receive during that 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** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP program for [REDACTED].

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with Department policy for an FAP OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] less any amounts already recouped and/or collected.

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



[REDACTED]  
**Michael J. Bennane**  
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

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**DHHS**

[REDACTED]  
  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]