



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: May 16, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 17-003552
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab A. Baydoun

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 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 1, 2017, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Dale [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 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 or around March 7, 2017, 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 her circumstances to the Department, such as changes in address and residency.
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 December 1, 2015, to October 31, 2016 (fraud period).
7. The Department alleges that, during the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$2,399 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan; and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$2,399.
9. This was Respondent's second alleged IPV.
10. 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:

- Willful overpayments of \$500 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), pp. 5, 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 (January 2016), pp. 7-8; 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 her FAP benefits because she failed to report to the Department that her address changed and that she no longer resided in Michigan, but continued to receive and use Michigan-issued FAP benefits while living out of state, causing an OI of FAP benefits. Clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. Clients must report changes, such as changes in address to the Department within 10 days after the client is aware of them. BAM 105 (July 2015), pp. 8-11. To be eligible for FAP benefits issued by the Department, an individual must be a Michigan resident. BEM 220 (January 2016), p. 1. A person is considered a resident while living in Michigan for any purpose other than a vacation, even if he has no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely. BEM 220, p. 1. A client who resides outside the State of Michigan for more than 30 days is not eligible for FAP benefits issued by the State of Michigan. BEM 212 (October 2015), pp. 2-3.

The Department presented Respondent's IG-311 FAP transaction history which showed that from October 14, 2015, to April 13, 2016, and again from August 16, 2016, to October 22, 2016, Respondent used FAP benefits issued to her by the State of Michigan exclusively out of state. (Exhibit A, pp. 44-52). The Department also presented the Work Number which shows that Respondent gained employment outside the State of Michigan on two separate occasions and reported a Georgia mailing address for employment purposes. (Exhibit A, pp. 84-87). While this evidence may be sufficient to establish that Respondent no longer resided in Michigan and was no longer eligible for FAP benefits, to establish an IPV, the Department must present clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing or maintaining benefit eligibility.

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented an assistance application that Respondent submitted to the Department on [REDACTED], 2015, and an [REDACTED] 2015 redetermination, both of which were prior to the alleged fraud period and prior to the period of out-of-state use. (Exhibit A, pp. 11-43). The Department also presented an assistance application that Respondent submitted to the Department on [REDACTED], 2016, during the alleged fraud period and during the period. While Respondent's FAP benefits were not being used out of state at this time, the evidence established that in the months prior to July 2016 and just two weeks later, Respondent resumed using her Michigan-issued FAP benefits exclusively out of state (Exhibit A, pp. 53-83). This is sufficient to establish that Respondent was advised of the responsibility to accurately report her circumstances and the responsibility to report changes in her circumstances, as well as the penalties for failure to do so.

Based on the foregoing information, there was clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was aware of her responsibility to accurately report her circumstances and to report changes in address and residence and that she intentionally withheld information

for the purpose of establishing or maintaining Michigan FAP eligibility. Therefore, the Department has established 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. Clients are disqualified for ten years for an 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 lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV. The Department alleged that this was Respondent's second IPV and asserted that she should be subject to a two-year disqualification. However, upon review of the evidence presented by the Department in support of the second IPV disqualification, the Department has failed to sufficiently establish that Respondent was previously subject to a one-year disqualification based on IPV. The IPV Sanction Summary presented by the Department indicates that Respondent had an FAP IPV sanction for only one day, beginning and ending on October 1, 2004. (Exhibit A, p. 93). Therefore, because the Department did not establish that this was Respondent's second IPV, she is only subject to a one-year disqualification under the FAP.

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 an 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.

Clients are not eligible for FAP benefits if they do not reside in Michigan. BEM 220, p. 1. At the hearing, the Department presented a FAP transaction history that established that Respondent began using Michigan-issued FAP benefits out of state on October 14, 2015, and continuing through October 22, 2016. Respondent also gained employment and was working out of state in Georgia. In the absence of any contrary evidence, this established that Respondent did not reside in Michigan and was not eligible for any FAP benefits issued by the Department during the fraud period.

The Department presented a Benefit Summary Inquiry which shows that Respondent was issued monthly FAP benefits from the State of Michigan during the fraud period in the total amount of \$2,399. (Exhibit A, pp. 91-92). Additionally, based on out-of-state use that began on October 14, 2015, the Department properly determined that the first month of the OI period would be December 2015. (See BAM 720, p. 7). Because the Department established that Respondent was entitled to \$0 during the overissuance/fraud period, the Department is entitled to recoup or collect the \$2,399 issued in FAP benefits to Respondent during the period between December 2015 and October 2016.

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 program benefits in the amount of \$2,399 from the FAP.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$2,399 in accordance with Department policy, less any amount already recouped or collected.

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



ZB/jaf

Zainab A. Baydoun
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

OIG
PO Box 30062
Lansing MI 48909-7562

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

DHHS

Washtenaw

M Shumaker
Policy Recoupment
Z A Baydoun
MAHS