



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: October 18, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 18-006891
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED] h

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 25, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Ryan Sevenski, 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], 2012, Respondent acknowledged his duties and responsibilities including the duty to report all household 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 13-28.

2. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that his [REDACTED], 2012, was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 27.
3. Respondent reported on his [REDACTED], 2012, application for assistance that his employment had ended. Exhibit A, p 22.
4. On December 10, 2012, the Department notified Respondent that he was approved for Food Assistance Program (FAP) as a group of two receiving no income. Exhibit A, pp 29-39.
5. Respondent's daughter received Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) in the gross monthly amount of \$[REDACTED] at times relevant to this hearing. Exhibit A, pp 92-95.
6. Respondent received unemployment benefits from January 7, 2013, through April 15, 2013. Exhibit A, pp 53-55.
7. Department records indicate that Respondent failed to report his unemployment benefits or his daughter's Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) benefits to the Department. Exhibit A, pp 92-95.
8. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$734 from March 1, 2013, through April 30, 2013. Exhibit A, p 96.
9. Respondent was employed and received earned income from April 19, 2013, through October 25, 2013. Exhibit A, pp 57-69.
10. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$1,835 from June 1, 2013, through October 31, 2013. Exhibit A, p 108.
11. On October 1, 2013, the Department received Respondent's Redetermination (DHS-1010) form where he acknowledged his duty to report changes in household income. Exhibit A, pp 40-43.
12. Respondent reported on his October 1, 2013, Redetermination form, Respondent reported that he had been employed since April of 2013, but that his employment was ending. Exhibit A, p 41.
13. On October 11, 2013, the Department notified Respondent that he was approved for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a group of two receiving unearned income in the gross monthly amount of \$[REDACTED] Exhibit A, pp 44-52.
14. Respondent was employed and received earned income from April 4, 2014, through October 10, 2014. Exhibit A, pp 70-84.

15. Respondent was married on July 10, 2014, and his marriage license indicates that he and his spouse shared the same residence. Exhibit A, p 52.
16. Respondent's spouse was employed and received earned income from December 10, 2009, through January 8, 2016. Exhibit A, pp 85-90.
17. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$1,056 from June 1, 2014, through October 31, 2014. Exhibit A, p 120.
18. On June 21, 2018, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$3,125 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 6-10.
19. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on June 21, 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 3.
20. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
21. 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 earned and unearned income received by members of the household. Department of Human Services Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 105 (January 1, 2018), pp 1-20.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (January 1, 2018), p 12. The Department will act on a change reported by means other than a tape match within 15 workdays after becoming aware of the change, except that the Department will act on a change other than a tape match within 10 days of becoming aware of the change. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 220 (January 1, 2018), p 7. A pended negative action occurs when a negative action requires timely notice based on the eligibility rules in this item. Timely notice means that the action taken by the department is effective at least 12 calendar days following the date of the department's action. BAM 220, p 12.

On an application for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2012, Respondent acknowledged the duty to report any earned or unearned income received by members of the household. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. On December 10, 2012

the Department notified Respondent that he was approved for FAP benefits as a group of two receiving no income.

Respondent failed to report that he was receiving unemployment benefits from January 7, 2013, through April 5, 2013. Respondent's daughter, a mandatory FAP group member, received RSDI benefits during that same period. If Respondent had reported receiving unemployment benefits in a timely manner, the Department would have redetermined his eligibility for ongoing FAP benefits by March 1, 2013. Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$734 from March 1, 2013, through April 30, 2013. Respondent would have been eligible for FAP benefits totaling \$372 if he had reported his income in a timely manner. Therefore, Respondent received a \$362 overissuance of FAP benefits during that period.

Respondent failed to report that his employment resumed on April 19, 2013, and continued through October 25, 2013. Respondent's daughter continued to receive RSDI benefits. Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$1,835 from June 1, 2013, through October 31, 2013. If Respondent had reported his employment in a timely manner, he would have been eligible for only \$80 of those benefits. Therefore, Respondent received a \$1,755 overissuance of FAP benefits.

Respondent reported on October 1, 2013, that he was not employed, and he received FAP benefits as a group of two receiving no income. Respondent failed to report when his employment resumed on April 4, 2014, and continued through October 10, 2014. Respondent's daughter continued to receive RSDI benefits. In addition, Respondent failed to report his marriage on July 10, 2014. The record evidence supports a finding that Respondent's spouse moved into his household, making her another mandatory group member, but Respondent failed to report this change of circumstances to the Department. Respondent failed to report that his spouse was employed from December 10, 2009, through January 8, 2016. If Respondent had reported returning to work on April 4, 2014, the Department would have redetermined his eligibility for ongoing FAP benefits by June 1, 2014. Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$1,056 from June 1, 2014, through October 31, 2014. If Respondent had reported the income being received in his household, then he would have been eligible for only \$48 of those benefits. Therefore, Respondent received a \$1,008 overissuance of FAP benefits.

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 his duties and responsibilities including his duty to report earned and unearned income when he signed an application for assistance on [REDACTED], 2012, and submitted a signed Redetermination (DHS-1010) form to the Department on October 1, 2013. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent failed to report to the Department in a timely manner when his seasonal employment resumed. Respondent failed to report when he began receiving unemployment benefits. Respondent failed to report that his daughter was a RSDI recipient. Respondent failed to report being married or that his spouse, a mandatory FAP group member, was employed and living in his household. As a result of the changes to his circumstances that Respondent failed to report to the Department, he received 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 his employment, his unemployment benefits, his daughter's RSDI benefits, and his spouses earned income for the purposes of maintaining his eligibility for FAP benefits that he 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. Respondent did receive an OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$ 3,125.
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$3,125 in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER 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

Jessica Kirchmeier
1050 Independence Blvd
Charlotte, MI 48813

Eaton County, DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

M. Shumaker via electronic mail

Petitioner

OIG
PO Box 30062
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]