



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: February 26, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 17-011853
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ellen McLemore

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 February 12, 2018, from Detroit, 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 overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and Medical Assistance (MA) 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 12 months?

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 July 25, 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's child was a recipient of MA benefits issued by the Department.
5. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in group size to the Department within 10 days.
6. Respondent did not have an 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 for FAP benefits is January 1, 2016 through July 31, 2016 (FAP fraud period) and January 1, 2016 through July 31, 2016 for MA benefits (MA fraud period).
8. During the FAP fraud period, Respondent was issued ██████ in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to ██████ in such benefits during this time period.
9. During the MA fraud period, the Department contributed ██████ in funds to provide Respondent's daughter's MA benefits, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to ██████ in such benefits during this time period.
10. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of ██████ and MA benefits in the amount of ██████.
11. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
12. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the United States Postal Services 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 \$500.00 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 (October 2016), pp. 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), 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 her FAP and MA benefits because she failed to notify the Department of her daughter's relocation to Tennessee. While this evidence may be sufficient to establish that Respondent may have been overissued benefits, to establish an IPV, the Department must present clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining benefits.

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented an application for FAP and MA benefits submitted by Respondent on August 5, 2015, in which she acknowledged that she received the Information Booklet advising of "Things You Must Do" (which explained reporting change circumstances, including changes in group size). In the application, Respondent indicated that her household consisted of herself and three children. The Department also presented a redetermination that was submitted by Respondent on July 11, 2016. In the redetermination, the Department listed Respondent and her three children as members of her household. The redetermination advised Respondent to cross out any members no longer residing in the home. Respondent did not reduce her group size at that time.

Additionally, the Department provided information from the [REDACTED]. The Department of Human Services with the [REDACTED] sent an out of state inquiry showing one of Respondent's children, and group member, collected FAP benefits from January 19, 2016 through December 31, 2016. The Department also presented Respondent's child's FAP application that was submitted January 19, 2016, with a [REDACTED] address. Lastly, the Department presented a Work Number report showing Respondent's child, and group member, obtained employment in [REDACTED] as of April 26, 2016.

The Department presented sufficient evidence that Respondent's child, and group member, was no longer residing in [REDACTED] as of January 2016. Given that Respondent submitted a redetermination in July 2016 and did not notify the Department of that individual's relocation, the Department has established by clear and convincing

evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining FAP and MA benefits. Therefore, Respondent committed an IPV.

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/she 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 concerning FAP benefits. Accordingly, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification under the FAP program, as it is her first IPV related to FAP.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

FAP OI

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. At the hearing, the Department established that the State of Michigan issued a total of ██████ in FAP benefits to Respondent during the fraud period. The Department alleges that Respondent was eligible for ██████ in FAP benefits during this period.

As previously stated, the Department presented evidence from the State of ██████, which revealed that Respondent's child, and group member, received FAP benefits in the State of ██████ from January 2016 through December 2016. The Department also presented the benefits issuance summary, which revealed that Respondent received Michigan FAP benefits based on a group size that included that child during the period of January 2016 through July 2016. Respondent's child was not eligible for FAP benefits issued by the State of ██████ during any period she was issued food assistance benefits by the State of ██████. BEM 222, p. 3. The evidence provided at the hearing clearly demonstrates that Respondent's child simultaneously received benefits from ██████ and ██████ from January 2016 through July 2016. The Department presented overissuance budgets showing the amount of FAP benefits

Respondent received (based on a group size of four) and the amount of FAP benefits she should have received (based on a group size of three). Therefore, the Department has established it is entitled to recoup the [REDACTED] in FAP benefits it issued to Respondent during the fraud period.

MA OI

The Department also alleges a MA overissuance during the MA fraud period due to client error. The Department's right to seek an MA OI is only available if the OI is due to client error or IPV, not when due to agency error. BAM 710 (October 2015 and October 2016), p. 1. As stated above, the Department established an MA IPV, and therefore, the Department could seek a recoupment of a MA overissuance based on an IPV if an overissuance is established.

For a MA OI due to any reason other than unreported income or a change affecting the need allowances, the MA OI amount is the amount of the MA payments. BAM 710, p. 2. In this case, the Department presented an expenditure summary showing the total MA payments made by the Department on Respondent's daughter's behalf during the MA fraud period. The sum of these expenses is [REDACTED]. Therefore, the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect from Respondent a MA OI of [REDACTED] during the MA 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 concerning FAP and MA.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP program benefits in the amount of [REDACTED] during the FAP fraud period.
3. The Department has established an OI of MA program benefits of [REDACTED] during the MA fraud period.

The Department is ORDERED to do the following in accordance with Department policy:

1. initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures for the FAP OI amount of [REDACTED], less any amounts that have already been recouped and/or collected; and
2. initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures for the MA OI amount of [REDACTED], less any amounts that have already been recouped and/or collected.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent is subject to a one-year disqualification from FAP benefits.

EM/cg



Ellen McLemore
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

Via Email:

[REDACTED]

Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:

[REDACTED]