



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: June 29, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-013959  
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, 42 CFR 431.230(b), 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). The record was closed at the conclusion of the hearing.

**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 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. [Dept. Exh. 1].
2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits. [Dept. Exh. 1, 4].
3. On [REDACTED], Respondent submitted an application for FAP benefits and indicated that her husband's employment with [REDACTED] ended on [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 24].
4. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department. [Dept. Exh. 47-58].
5. On [REDACTED], Respondent submitted a Semi-Annual Contact Report indicating that her daughter was employed at [REDACTED] beginning [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 35].
6. On [REDACTED], a Department representative contacted Respondent to review the changes reported in the Semi-Annual Contact Report dated [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Respondent reported that she and her husband had no income. [Dept. Exh. 36].
7. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in her group's employment to the Department. [Dept. Exh. 31, 35].
8. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. [Dept. Exh. 21].
9. On [REDACTED], the Department received information from the Work Number indicating Respondent's husband was again employed at [REDACTED] beginning [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 40-43].
10. On [REDACTED], the Department received verification of employment from [REDACTED] indicating Respondent's husband was employed from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 44-46].
11. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 4].
12. 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 only \$ [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period. [Dept. Exh. 4, 47].
13. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] [Dept. Exh. 4, 47].
14. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV. [Dept. Exh. 1, 4].

15. 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:

- 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 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, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016).

### **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 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 record evidence clearly shows that Respondent's husband was employed at [REDACTED] from [REDACTED], and had been working at [REDACTED] since [REDACTED]. The Department established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld and misrepresented information that her husband was not working for the purpose of maintaining FAP benefits. Therefore, the Department has established an Intentional Program Violation.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed an IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p 15. 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 17.

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 or FAP. BAM 720, p 13. 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 18.

Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application from [REDACTED], and the [REDACTED] Semi-Annual Contact Report, certifies that she was aware that fraudulent participation in FAP could result in criminal, civil or administrative claims. This Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the Department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed a first intentional violation of the FAP program, resulting in a 12-month disqualification.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p 1 (1/1/2016).

In the above captioned matter, the record evidence shows Respondent intentionally failed to report her husband's earned income to the Department. This resulted in an

overissuance of \$ [REDACTED] for the fraud period of [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] which the Department is entitled to recoup.

**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, concludes that:

1. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an overissuance of Food Assistance Program 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 personally disqualified from participation in the Food Assistance Program for 12 months.

VA for MJB/jaf

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**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]