



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: November 21, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-007885  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki**

**HEARING DECISION FOR  
INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), 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 scheduled for November 7, 2018, from Detroit, Michigan. The hearing was held on the scheduled hearing date and at least 30 minutes after the scheduled hearing time. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by Joseph Gregurek, regulation agent with the Office of Inspector General. Respondent did not appear for the hearing.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether MDHHS established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an intentional program violation (IPV) which justifies imposing a disqualification against Respondent.

**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 July 11, 2014, Respondent submitted to MDHHS a Redetermination for FAP benefits. Respondent reported a household which included his spouse (hereinafter, "Spouse"). Boilerplate language advised clients to report changes in income to MDHHS within 10 days. (Exhibit A, pp. 11-34)

2. From July 24, 2014, through November 20, 2014, Spouse received ongoing biweekly employment income from an employer. (Exhibit A, pp. 44-46.)
3. On August 11, 2014, MDHHS mailed Respondent a Notice of Case Action informing Respondent of an approval of FAP benefits beginning July 2014. A budget summary stated that Respondent's eligibility was based on \$0 employment income. Boilerplate language stated that clients are to report changes in income within 10 days. A Change Report form mailed with the Notice of Case Action also included boilerplate language that clients are to report changes to MDHHS within 10 days. (Exhibit A, pp. 38-43.)
4. On April 5, 2017, MDHHS established that Respondent received an overissuance of \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits from September 2014 through February 2015 due to unreported employment income. (Exhibit A, pp. 47-66.)
5. On July 23, 2018, MDHHS requested a hearing to establish that the \$[REDACTED] overissuance was caused by an IPV justifying imposing a 1-year disqualification period. (Exhibit A, p. 1.)
6. As of the date of hearing, Respondent had no known previous IPV disqualifications.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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. MDHHS (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. MDHHS policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

MDHHS previously established an OI of \$[REDACTED] against Respondent based on unreported employment income. MDHHS requested a hearing to establish that Respondent's failure to report employment income was an IPV which justified imposing a disqualification period.

The types of recipient claims (i.e. overissuances) are those caused by agency error, unintentional recipient claims, and IPV. 7 CFR 273.18(b). An IPV shall consist of having intentionally:

- (1) Made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or
- (2) Committed any act that constitutes a violation of SNAP, SNAP regulations, or any state statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring,

receiving, possessing or trafficking of SNAP benefits or EBT cards. 7 CFR 273.16(c).

An IPV requires clear and convincing evidence which demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, an IPV. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence must be strong enough to cause a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true; it is more than proving that the proposition is probably true. M Civ JI 8.01. It is a standard which requires reasonable certainty of the truth; something that is highly probable. Black's Law Dictionary 888 (6th ed. 1990).

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. 7 CFR 273.12(a)(2). Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. *Id.*

The evidence established that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits due to unreported income. For an IPV to be established, MDHHS must clearly and convincingly establish that Respondent intentionally failed to report employment income.

MDHHS presented an application and Notice of Case Action which included boilerplate language stating that clients are to report changes of income to MDHHS within 10 days. The inclusion of reporting language in the documents completed and/or mailed to Respondent is supportive that Respondent was aware of the need to report changes in income. Boilerplate language within an application or a notice of benefits does not guarantee that Respondent read the boilerplate information, absorbed the information, retained the information, and/or purposely chose to ignore the information.

MDHHS contended that Respondent should have been aware of a need to report income because Respondent's FAP eligibility from the OI period was based on \$0 earnings. MDHHS cited the FAP budget summary from the Notice of Case Action as proof that Respondent was aware that \$0 earnings were being factored in Respondent's FAP eligibility. Inclusion of a budget summary on the second page of a Notice of Case Action does not guarantee that Respondent read the notice beyond the first page which stated that FAP benefits were approved.

MDHHS did not present verification of a written misreporting by Respondent. Generally, MDHHS will have difficulty in establishing a client's purposeful failure to report information without evidence of a written misreporting; the evidence was not persuasive in overcoming the generality.

Based on the evidence, MDHHS did not clearly and convincingly establish that Respondent intentionally failed to report employment income. Thus, it is found that Respondent did not commit an IPV.

The standard disqualification period is used in all instances except when a court orders a different period. MDHHS is to apply the following disqualification periods to recipients determined to have committed an IPV: one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. 7 CFR 253.8 (b) and BAM 725 (January 2016), p. 16.

Without a finding that Respondent committed an IPV, an IPV disqualification cannot follow. Thus, MDHHS is denied their request to establish a 1-year disqualification against Respondent.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV justifying a 1-year period of disqualification. The MDHHS request to establish an IPV disqualification against Respondent is **DENIED**.

CG/



**Christian Gardocki**

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

**Petitioner**

MDHHS-OIG-Hearings

**DHHS**

Rose Ward  
MDHHS-Newaygo-Hearings

**Respondent**

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

M Shumaker  
Policy Recoupment  
C Gardocki  
MAHS