



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 1, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-016608  
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). The Respondent was represented by himself.

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 not aware of the responsibility to report drug felonies because he was ill with mental and physical problems.
5. Respondent had an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. The Petitioner has multiple disabilities and was hospitalized for mental problems, drug addiction and was terminally ill during the period and is disabled.
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 (October 1, 2016), p. 6; 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.

BEM 203 provides as that recipients of FAP are disqualified from receiving benefits after two drug-related felony convictions:

## **FIP and FAP**

### **1st Offense**

A person who has been convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances is disqualified if:

- Terms of probation or parole are violated, **and**
- The qualifying conviction occurred after August 22, 1996.

If an individual is not in violation of the terms of probation or parole:

- FIP benefits must be paid in the form of restricted payments.
- Receipt of FAP benefits requires an authorized representative.

### **2nd Offense**

**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.** BEM 203(October 1, 2015), p. 2. Originally effective October 11, 2011.

In this case, in support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented an application for FAP benefits where the Respondent answered “no” to the question “Convicted of a Drug Felony?” and “Convicted of a Drug Felony more than once?” on an application for assistance dated [REDACTED]. [Exhibit A, p. 28.] Thereafter, the Respondent also completed a Redetermination on [REDACTED], where he also answered “no” to the question regarding conviction of a drug-related felony. During the hearing, the Respondent credibly testified that he was suffering from mental illness, drug addiction and was hospitalized during the period for these conditions and was and is terminally ill with many physical disabilities as well. Respondent further testified that at no time did he knowingly intend to defraud the Department when seeking FAP benefits. Thus, notwithstanding the answers to the applications presented, it is determined for the reasons stated above that Petitioner had physical or mental impairments that would limited the understanding or ability to fulfill the requirement to complete his applications accurately and properly; thus, no IPV is established.

Accordingly it is found that the Department has not established an IPV that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining FAP benefits by clear and convincing evidence.

### **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 1, 2015) p. 15. Clients are disqualified for 10 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. 16. 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. 16.

In this case, because the Department has not satisfied its burden of showing by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits, the Department is not entitled to a finding of disqualification of the Respondent under the 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 SDA assistance. BEM 203 (October 2015), p. 1.

The Department provided evidence which demonstrated that Respondent had been convicted of two drug-related felonies after [REDACTED]. The Department presented a Court Documents from [REDACTED] County Circuit Court indicating that Respondent was convicted of a drug-related felony on [REDACTED], in [REDACTED] County. [Exhibit A, p. 36.] The Respondent was also convicted of a drug-related felony on [REDACTED], in [REDACTED] County. [Exhibit A, p. 37-38] and a third felony on [REDACTED]. Based upon the evidence presented, the Respondent was ineligible for FAP Benefits after the second felony drug-related conviction on [REDACTED].

In this case, the Department is seeking an OI related to benefits issued from [REDACTED] through [REDACTED]. The Department alleged that the OI amount is \$[REDACTED]. The Department presented Respondent's Benefit Summary Inquiry, which showed that Respondent was issued FAP benefits in the amount of \$[REDACTED] during the fraud period. [See Exhibit A, pp. 41-46.]

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 if both offenses occurred after [REDACTED]. BEM 203, p. 2. Had the Department been aware of Respondent's two drug-related felonies at the time of

application, the application for FAP benefits would have been denied. Accordingly, the Department established that Respondent was not entitled to benefits and as such, received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] during the 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.
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.

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

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**DHHS**

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