



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: April 26, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-000661  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Amanda M. T. Marler**

**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 April 23, 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) 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 the 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 January 18, 2018, 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 all changes in circumstances to the Department.
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 May 2012 through September 2012 (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 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 2017), pp. 5, 12-13; ASM 165 (August 2016).

### **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), pp. 7-8; 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.

The Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV concerning her FAP benefits because she intentionally withheld information concerning her husband's employment income in order to receive, maintain, or increase her FAP benefits from the State of Michigan. Employment income received by the client is considered in the calculation of a client's FAP eligibility and amount of benefits. BEM 556 (October 2011), pp. 1-6. FAP recipients who are not simplified reporters are required to report starting or stopping employment and changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105 (December 2011), p. 7.

Respondent was informed of her responsibility to notify the Department of changes in circumstances through her Semi-Annual Contact Report submitted to the Department on February 9, 2012, and her Redetermination signed on August 20, 2012. (Exhibit A, pp. 10-15). Through information requests, the Department determined that Respondent's husband had worked with [REDACTED] (Employer 1) and [REDACTED] (Employer 2), but neither of these employers was reported to the Department. Her husband's employment with Employer 1 started sometime between February 13, 2012, through February 26, 2012, with his first paycheck issued on March 5, 2012. Employment with Employer 1 continued through his last paycheck on August 6, 2012. Employment with Employer 2 began sometime during the pay period ending August 5, 2012, with his first paycheck issued on August 10, 2012. Employment continued with Employer 2 through the pay period ending December 1, 2012, with his last check issued on December 7, 2012. Respondent did not report her husband's employment with Employer 1 or Employer 2.

Respondent was clearly informed of her obligation to report changes in circumstances to the Department on the Redetermination. Despite this knowledge, Respondent did not report her husband's employment even though he was working with Employer 2 at the time the Redetermination was completed. The Department's evidence established that Respondent did not report her husband's employment income as required, and she intentionally misrepresented her circumstances on the Redetermination from August 20, 2012. Therefore, the Department established by clear and convincing evidence that 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. 16. Clients are disqualified for 10 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. 17. 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.

As discussed above, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent has committed an IPV. This is Respondent's first IPV. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from receipt of FAP benefits.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. An **overissuance (OI)** is the amount of benefits issued to the client group or CDC provider in excess of what it was eligible to receive. For FAP benefits, an OI is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). BAM 700, (May 1, 2014), p. 7.

The Department alleges that the OI period is the same as the fraud period and alleges an OI of \$ [REDACTED]. The Department presented a Benefit Summary Inquiry supporting benefits issued in the amount alleged. (Exhibit A, p. 24). The Department provided benefit OI budgets for each month in which Respondent received benefits and the Department has alleged an OI. In reviewing the budgets, the Department improperly calculated Respondent's wages for each month of the OI period by reducing Respondent's husband's wages by \$ [REDACTED] and providing no explanation. The Department is required to use actual income received in processing a budget for a past month when that income source is the reason for the OI. BEM 505 (October 2010), p. 5. In addition, the Department missed a substantial amount of wages from the September 7, 2012, paycheck while making its calculations. Since the Department improperly calculated Respondent's husband's wages from each month, the total OI is incorrect. The Department has not met its burden of proof in establishing the total value of the OI.

### **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. The Department **has not** satisfied its burden of proof in establishing the total value of the OI, although it has established that an OI exists.

The Department is ORDERED to recalculate the correct OI amount in accordance with Department policy and send the Respondent a Notice of Overissuance; Respondent shall have the right to request a hearing regarding the OI amount in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance for a period of **12 months**.



AM/

---

**Amanda M. T. Marler**

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]  
[REDACTED]

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]