



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: September 22, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 17-003570  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

**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 with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, telephone hearing was held on August 23, 2017, from Lansing, 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 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 the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (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. On July 13, 2011, Respondent was an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient as a household of one when the Department sent him a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, pp 12-15.

2. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill his duties and responsibilities as a Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient.
3. Respondent was approved for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a household of one from December 2, 2011, through December 31, 2011, with a \$ [REDACTED] monthly allotment, which is apparently prorated benefits for that month. Exhibit A, p 16.
4. On October 16, 2012, Respondent was an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient as a household of three when the Department sent him a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, pp 25-29.
5. On March 12, 2013, Respondent was an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient as a household of three when the Department sent him a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, pp 30-33.
6. On April 15, 2014, Respondent was an ongoing Food Assistance Program (FAP) recipient as a household of three when the Department sent him a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form. Exhibit A, pp 34-39.
7. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that a redetermination form received by the Department on December 1, 2014, was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, pp 40-45.
8. On December 1, 2014, Respondent was receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a household of three consisting of himself and two sons. Exhibit A, p 41.
9. On his December 1, 2014, Redetermination form, Respondent reported to the Department that he had been convicted of a drug-related felony occurring after August 22, 1996, but denied having been convicted more than once. Exhibit A, p 44.
10. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that a redetermination form received by the Department on May 27, 2015, was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, pp 46-
11. On May 27, 2015, Respondent was receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a household of three consisting of himself and two sons. Exhibit A, p 47.
12. On his May 27, 2015, Redetermination form, Respondent reported to the Department that he had been convicted of a drug-related felony occurring after August 22, 1996, but denied having been convicted more than once. Exhibit A, p 50.

13. On January 7, 2014, Respondent pled guilty to Delivery/Manufacture of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams with an offense date of December 26, 2013. Exhibit A, pp 52-55.
14. On April 9, 2008, Respondent pled guilty to Delivery/Manufacture of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams with an offense date of April 1, 2008. Exhibit A, pp 56-59.
15. On January 18, 2008, Respondent pled guilty to Delivery/Manufacture of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams with an offense date of December 8, 2007. Exhibit A, pp 60-63.
16. On February 22, 2005, Respondent pled guilty to Possession of a Controlled Substance Less Than 25 Grams with an offense date of February 13, 2005. Exhibit A, pp 64-67.
17. Respondent was approved for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits with a \$200 monthly allotment effective January 1, 2012, and ongoing. Exhibit A, p 16.
18. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$ [REDACTED] from December 2, 2011, through October 31, 2015.
19. On March 7, 2017, the Department sent the Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$6,893 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-8.
20. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on March 7, 2017, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 2.
21. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
22. 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), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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-.3011.

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 OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$500 or more, or
  - the total OI 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (January 1, 2016), pp 12-13.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (October 1, 2016), p 1.

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. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (October 1, 2015), p 2.

Respondent was an ongoing FAP recipient as a household of one on December 2, 2011. In order to become eligible for FAP benefits, Respondent was required to participate in an eligibility interview where his duties and responsibilities would have been explained to him. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill his duties and responsibilities. On October 1, 2011, the Department enacted a policy required

permanent disqualification from FAP of anyone having been convicted of more than one drug-related felony with each offense occurring after August 22, 1996. BEM 203.

Respondent received FAP benefits as a group of one from December 2, 2011, through May 31, 2012.

Respondent received FAP benefits as a group of three from June 1, 2012, through October 31, 2015, as a group of three consisting of himself and two sons. As the caretaker of two minor children, Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill his duty to report circumstances affecting his eligibility to receive FAP benefits.

On December 1, 2014, and May 27, 2015, Respondent reported to the Department that he had been convicted of one drug-related felony occurring after August 22, 1996, on Redetermination forms where he had acknowledged under penalties of perjury that the information on those forms was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete.

Respondent failed to report that he had pled guilty to separate drug-related felony offenses on February 22, 2005, January 18, 2008, April 9, 2008, January 7, 2014. If Respondent truthfully reported his history of drug-related felony convictions to the Department as required by BEM 203, he would have been permanently disqualified from FAP. As a group of one, Respondent would not have been eligible for any FAP benefits. As a group of three, Respondent's sons would have remained eligible for FAP benefits while he would have been disqualified and the group would have been eligible for a reduced allotment of FAP benefits as a group of two.

Because Respondent received FAP benefits that he was not eligible to receive due to his history of drug-related felony convictions occurring after August 22, 1996, Respondent received a \$6,893.

### **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, 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).

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), reh den 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

As a FAP recipient, Respondent acknowledged his duties and responsibilities including his duty to report any drug-related felony convictions to the Department. Respondent failed to report having more than one drug-related felony conviction with each offense occurring after August 22, 1996. If Respondent had truthfully reported having more than one drug-related felony conviction the he would have been permanently disqualified from FAP, although other eligible group members would have continued to receive benefits.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally failed to disclose having more than one drug-related felony conviction with each offenses occurring after August 22, 1996, for the purposes of maintaining his eligibility for FAP benefits that he would not have been eligible for otherwise.

### **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15-16. 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.

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. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 1, 2013), p. 2. 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. 16.

The record evidence indicates that this is Respondent's first established IPV violation.

The Department has established an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

**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 Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/nr

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kevin Scully  
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]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]