



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.: 17-005510
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Carmen G. Fahie

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 August 22, 2017, from [REDACTED] 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).

ISSUES

1. Did Respondent receive an over issuance (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 1 year?

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 FAP benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department. Department Exhibit 1, pg. 29.
4. On the Online Assistance Application, DHS 1171, submitted by Respondent on [REDACTED], the Respondent reported that she understood the responsibility to report changes in household income to the Department within 10 days, but she reported that she was not working. However, she failed to report her second employment at [REDACTED] on her State Emergency Relief application, DHS 1171, submitted on [REDACTED]. In addition, she failed to report that she was exceeding her Simplified Reporting Limit on her Semi-Annual Contact Report, DHS 1046 signed by Respondent on [REDACTED]. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 11-28, 43-59, and 60-61.
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in household income of her earned income from a second employment at [REDACTED] from [REDACTED], through [REDACTED]. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 30-37 and 43-59.
6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is [REDACTED], through [REDACTED] (fraud period).
8. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$ [REDACTED] in such benefits during this time period. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 62-73.
9. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED].
10. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
11. 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 Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Department of Human Services Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 271.1 to 285.5. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 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 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), p. 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; BAM 720.

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, (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.

DRUG RELATED FELONY

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.

Example: Matthew Doe was found to have convictions for the use of a controlled substance on April 1, 2012 and for the distribution of a controlled substance on April 1, 2012. This would count as one conviction since it is on the same day. Policy for the 1st offense for a drug-related felony will be followed.

Example: Mary Smith was found to have a conviction for the possession of a controlled substance on February 1, 2012. Later, she was then convicted for the use and possession of a controlled substance on July 8, 2012. This would count as two convictions because they happened on different dates. Policy for a 2nd offense will be followed.

BEM 203, p. 2-3.

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; BEM 708. 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. 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. 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.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700.

In this case, Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department. Department Exhibit 1, pg. 29. Respondent failed to report changes in household income of her earned income from a second employment at Resident Advancement from [REDACTED], through [REDACTED]. Department Exhibit 1, pgs. 30-37 and 43-59. As a result, Respondent received an over issuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] that the Department is required 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, if any, concludes that:

1. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent did commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy. Since Respondent had an open FAP case, the Department has already started recoupment from the \$ [REDACTED] balance in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] with a balance of \$ [REDACTED] as of the hearing date.

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

Carmen G. Fahie

CF/hb

Carmen G. Fahie
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]