



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], CA [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: October 15, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-005725  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [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, a telephone hearing was held on September 18, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Amy Harrison, 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 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 an application for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2015, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of employment status and increases of earned income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Exhibit A, pp 11-45.

2. On January 15, 2016, Respondent reported to the Department that the father of her child had moved out of the household. Exhibit A, p 52.
3. On an application for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2016, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of employment status and increases in earned income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Exhibit A, pp 57-87.
4. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that her [REDACTED], 2016, application form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 69.
5. Respondent reported on her [REDACTED], 2016, application for assistance that she had started employment on August 22, 2016, and expected to work 15 hours per week at a rate of \$10 per hour. Exhibit A, p 64.
6. Department records indicate that during an eligibility interview, Respondent reported to the Department that she had started employment on August 22, 2016, and expected to work 15 hours per week at a rate of \$10 per hour. Exhibit A, p 92.
7. On a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form received by the Department on January 23, 2017, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including her duty to report increases of earned income. Exhibit A, pp 94-98.
8. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that her January 23, 2017, redetermination form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 98.
9. On her January 23, 2017, Redetermination form, Respondent reported that no one in her household had their income change by more than \$100. Exhibit A, p 96.
10. Respondent received earned income from employment in excess of \$2,000 in each month from March 1, 2017 through August 31, 2017. Exhibit A, pp 135-143.
11. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$2,094 from March 1, 2017, through August 31, 2017.
12. On September 25, 2017, the Department sent Respondent a Notice of Overissuance (DHS-4358-A) instructing her that she had received a \$2,094 overissuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Exhibit A, p 108.
13. The Department's representative testified that a \$2,094 overissuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits has been established.

14. On June 5, 2018, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$2,094 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 6-9.
15. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on June 5, 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 3.
16. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
17. 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 more benefits than it is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (January 1, 2018), p 1.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. Changes that must be reported include changes of employment status and increases of earned income. Department of Human Services Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 105 (January 1, 2018), pp 1-20.

On applications for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2015 and [REDACTED], 2016, Respondent acknowledged the duty to report changes of employment status and increases of income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent had reported that she was employed and expected to work 15 hours per week at a rate of \$10 per hour. Respondent's actual earned income exceeded \$2,000 per month in each month from March 1, 2017, through August 31, 2017. This unreported increase of earned income cause her to receive an overissuance of FAP benefits. The Department established an overissuance of FAP benefits after sending her a Notice of Overissuance (DHS-4358-A) on September 25, 2017.

### **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 the reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700, p 7, 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 273.16(e)(6).

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that 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.*

Respondent acknowledged that it was her duty to report significant increases of earned income on applications for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2015, and [REDACTED], 2016. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that both of her application forms were examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Respondent reported to the Department that she expected to work 15 hours per week at a rate of \$10 per hours. Respondent failed to report when her actual earned income exceeded \$2,000 per month, and amount significantly higher than the income she had reported, which resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally failed to report a significant increase of earned income for the purposes of maintaining her eligibility for FAP benefits that she 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.


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. It is ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**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) 763-0155; 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**

Barbara Hamilton  
1040 South Winter Street  
Ste. 3013  
Adrian, MI 49221

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

Lenawee County, DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

M. Shumaker via electronic mail

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], CA [REDACTED]