



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: July 21, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 17-007489  
Agency No.: ██████████  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: ██████████

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Eric J. Feldman**

**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 three-way telephone hearing was held on ██████████, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent was present for the hearing and represented himself.

**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 ██████████, 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 changes in criminal justice disqualifications.
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 is [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 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), 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 \$500.00 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 \$500.00 or more, or
  - the total amount is less than \$500.00, 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), pp. 12-13; ASM 166 (January 2017), pp. 1-8.

### **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 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 of his FAP benefits because he failed to notify the Department of his prior drug-felony convictions in which both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996.

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 2015), p. 2.

First, the Department argued that Respondent was convicted of a felony on or about [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods and in which both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. [Exhibit A, pp. 32-34.]

Second, the Department presented Respondent's application dated [REDACTED], in which he signed this application stating that he understood his duty to report all information truthfully to the Department. [Exhibit A, pp. 10 and 11-30.] In the application, Respondent marked "yes" to the question that asked if he had been convicted of a drug felony; and he wrote his name as to the person who had been convicted of a drug felony. [Exhibit A, p. 26.] However, the Department argued that Respondent failed to answer the follow-up question that asked if he had been convicted of a drug felony more than once, even though the Department argued that he had two drug-related felonies at the time. [Exhibit A, pp. 26 and 32-34.]

Additionally, in the section of the application where Respondent answered the drug-related felony questions, the caseworker marked/printed "only one drug felony per [REDACTED]." [Exhibit A, pp. 4 and 26.] However, in regards to this statement printed on the application by the caseworker, the OIG agent indicated that the agent never had any record of ever telling the caseworker what the caseworker wrote down. [Exhibit A, pp. 4 and 26.]

Third, the Department presented the "Case Comments – Summary" document (case comments), in which the caseworker documented the phone interview with Respondent where he only reported one drug felony. [Exhibit A, pp. 10 and 31.]

At the hearing, Respondent argued that he did not intend to commit an IPV of his FAP benefits. He testified that he has a learning disability. He testified that he was released from prison and sometime after went to the local office to apply for benefits. He testified that the worker at the front desk of the local office assisted him in filling out the application. He testified that he never met his caseworker. He testified he informed the worker at the front desk that he had two drug felonies, but was informed that he could still apply as long as his grandmother was his authorized representative. See BEM 203, p. 2 (for a 1<sup>st</sup> offense drug-related felony, a recipient of FAP benefits requires an authorized representative).

On cross-examination, the OIG agent asked Respondent if he remembered filling out the application, especially the part where he did not answer the question if he had been convicted of more than one drug-related felony. Respondent indicated that he could not remember exactly how he completed the application, but that he completed it with his grandmother and the worker at the front desk.

Based on the foregoing information and evidence, the Department has failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

First, evidence established that Respondent was convicted of a felony on or about [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods and in which both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. [Exhibit A, pp. 32-34.]

Second, although the evidence established that Respondent had been convicted of two or more drug felonies, the undersigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) finds that he did not intentionally commit a violation of the FAP program. The Department's position is that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented his prior drug-felony convictions from the Department. However, in order to establish that a client has committed an IPV, the Department must establish that the client "committed, and intended to commit an IPV." BAM 720, p. 1; 7 CFR 273.16(c); and 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). The undersigned finds Respondent's testimony credible that he did not intentionally withhold or misrepresent his prior drug-felony convictions from the Department. Respondent's credibility is supported by his application, which corroborated the statements he had provided during the hearing. For example, the application indicated that he had been released from his prison and his grandmother was his authorized representative. [Exhibit A, pp. 12-13.] Respondent made these same statements during the hearing, which shows to the undersigned that his testimony is credible because the application corroborates his testimony. As such, the undersigned finds that Respondent's testimony credibly established that he did not intend to commit a violation of FAP benefits. Therefore, in the absence of any clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented his criminal justice disqualification for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of his FAP benefits or eligibility, the Department has failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP benefits.

### **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; BEM 708 (October 2016), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a 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. BEM 708, p. 1. 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.

In this case, the Department has not satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is not subject to a disqualification under the FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

### **Overissuance**

As stated above, there was no IPV committed in this case. However, the evidence established that Respondent failed to answer the follow-up question in the application that asked if he had been convicted of a drug felony more than once, even though the he had two drug-related felonies at the time. [Exhibit A, pp. 26 and 32-34.] Therefore, the Department can still proceed with recoupment of the OI when there is client error.

A client/provider error overissuance is when the client received more benefits than he/she was entitled to because the client/CDC provider gave incorrect or incomplete information to the department. BAM 715 (January 2016), p. 1.

A client error overissuance is present in this situation because Respondent failed to notify the Department of his two or more drug-related felonies that would have permanently disqualified him from FAP eligibility. See BEM 203, p. 2. Consequently, Respondent was not eligible for FAP benefits and was overissued FAP benefits for any period he was ineligible to receive FAP benefits.

In establishing the OI, the Department presented Respondent's eligibility summary showing that he was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan from [REDACTED], which totaled \$ [REDACTED] [Exhibit A, p. 35.] As such, the Department can recoup \$ [REDACTED] of FAP benefits it issued to Respondent.

### **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 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, less any amount already recouped and/or collected.

EJF/jaf



---

**Eric J. Feldman**  
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]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]