



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

██████████  
██████████  
████████████████████

██████ Mailed: June 16, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-018885  
Agency No.: ██████████  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: ██████████

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Alice C. Elkin**

**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 792.10111 and R 792.11003. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 8, 2017, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████ ██████████ 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) and Mich Admin Code, R 792.10134.

**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 December 15, 2016, 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 FAP program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report his felony drug convictions.
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 April 12, 2013 to August 31, 2015.
7. The Department alleges that during the fraud period Respondent was issued ██████ in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan but was entitled to \$0 in such benefits.
8. The Department alleges that during the fraud period Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of ██████.
9. This was Respondent's first alleged FAP IPV.
10. 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 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), 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 his or his reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or his understanding or ability to fulfill reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (October 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 because he failed to disclose that he had two drug-related felony convictions. People convicted of certain crimes and probation or parole violators are not eligible for assistance. BEM 203 (October 2012 and October 2015), p. 1. Effective October 1, 2011, an individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances will be permanently disqualified from receipt of FAP if (i) the terms of probation or parole are violated and the qualifying conviction occurred after August 22, 1996 or (ii) the individual was convicted two or more times and both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. BEM 203, p. 2.

In support of its contention that Respondent failed to report his felony-drug convictions, the Department presented (i) an application Respondent submitted to the Department on April 12, 2013, (ii) redeterminations Respondent submitted to the Department on July 13, 2016 and July 29, 2015; (iii) a mid-certification contact notice Respondent submitted to the Department on June 11, 2014; (iv) a judgment of sentence showing that Respondent pleaded guilty on August 2, 2004 of possession-controlled substance, under 25 grams, MCL 333.7403 2A5; (v) a judgment of sentence showing that Respondent pleaded guilty on October 23, 2012 of possession-controlled substance, under 25 grams, MCL 333.7403 2A5; and (vi) a benefits summary inquiry showing that Respondent received FAP benefits during the fraud period.

The cited statutory grounds for the convictions in the judgments establish that Respondent had two felony drug convictions. Because his felony drug convictions were after August 22, 1996, Respondent was permanently disqualified from receipt of FAP benefits following his second felony drug conviction. Although Respondent had two felony drug convictions at the time he completed his April 12, 2013 application, he denied having more than one (Exhibit A, p. 30). He denied having any felony drug convictions in either of his redeterminations (Exhibit A, pp. 36-44). In his application and redeterminations, Respondent certified that the information he provided was true and acknowledged understanding that he could be prosecuted for fraud and be required to repay any benefits wrongfully received by him based on the information he provided (Exhibit A, pp. 32, 36, 45). Respondent's failure to disclose both felony drug convictions in his application and redeterminations was sufficient to establish that he intentionally withheld information that, if properly disclosed, would have made him ineligible for FAP benefits. Under these circumstances, the Department established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV in connection with his 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 FAP IPV, he is subject to a one-year disqualification from his receipt of FAP benefits on the basis of IPV.

### **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 alleged that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits totaling █████ during the fraud period. The Department presented a benefits summary inquiry showing that Respondent was issued more than █████ in FAP benefits during the fraud period. Because of his felony drug convictions, as described above, Respondent was a disqualified member of his FAP group during the fraud period. BEM 212 (July 2014), pp. 8-9. Because he was the only member of his FAP group, he was not eligible for any of the FAP benefits issued to him during the fraud period.

Thus, the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect █████ from Respondent for overissued FAP benefits 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** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of FAP program benefits in the amount of █████.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with Department policy for a FAP OI in the amount of █████, less any amounts already recouped/collected, for the period April 12, 2013 to August 31, 2015.

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



AE/tm

---

**Alice C. Elkin**  
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]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

CC: [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]