



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: October 26, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 18-007986
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 October 10, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Kelli Owens, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent represented herself.

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 the drug-related felony convictions of group members. 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. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that her [REDACTED], 2015, application for assistance was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 28.
3. Respondent reported on her [REDACTED], 2015, application for assistance that she had not been convicted of any felonies involving controlled substances. Exhibit A, p 19.
4. On January 22, 2016, the Department received Respondent's Redetermination (DHS-1010) where she admitted that a member of her household had been convicted of two or more felonies involving controlled substances. Exhibit A, pp 46-51.
5. Respondent failed to report to the Department that on July 14, 2005, a mandatory group member of her household had been convicted of Delivery/Manufacture of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 52-54.
6. Respondent failed to report to the Department that on December 13, 2005, a mandatory group member of her household had been convicted of Possession of a Controlled Substance Less Than 25 Grams. Exhibit A, pp 55-56.
7. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$9,734 from February 5, 2015, through December 31, 2015. Exhibit A, pp 57-58.
8. On July 26, 2018, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$1,608 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 6-9.
9. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on July 26, 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 3.
10. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
11. 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.

An individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified if both convictions were for conduct which occurred after August 22, 1996. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (May 1, 2018), p 2.

A person who is violating a condition of probation or parole imposed under a federal or state law is disqualified. The person is disqualified as long as the violation occurs. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (May 1, 2018), p 2.

On an application for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2015 Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including her duty to report any convictions for felony offenses involving controlled substances where the offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. 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 her [REDACTED], 2015, application form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Respondent reported on her [REDACTED] 2015, application for assistance that no one in her household had been convicted of any felonies involving controlled substances.

Respondent failed to report to the Department that a mandatory member of her FAP benefit group had been convicted of two or more felonies involving controlled substances.

Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$9,734 from February 5, 2015, through December 31, 2005. If Respondent had truthfully reported that a member of her FAP benefit group had a history of convictions for conduct involving controlled substances where the offenses occurred after August 22, 1996, then the Department would have permanently disqualified that person from FAP. If that group member had been permanently disqualified Respondent from FAP then Respondent would have been eligible for \$8,126 of the FAP benefits she received. Respondent did not dispute the history of felony convictions for this member of her household. Therefore, Respondent received a \$1,608 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 the 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.*

On an application for assistance dated [REDACTED], 2015, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including her duty to report any convictions for offenses involving controlled substances where the offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. 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 her [REDACTED], 2015, application form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Respondent falsely reported that no one in her household had been convicted of a felony involving controlled substances, which resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits.

Respondent does not dispute the criminal history of the mandatory group member but argued that she mistakenly denied the felony convictions when she completed the [REDACTED], 2015, application for assistance.

Respondent's signature on her application for assistance acknowledged her duty to review the information used to determine her eligibility for FAP benefits. Respondent now recants her acknowledgement that she had carefully reviewed the information she had reported to the Department, which resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). Moreover, the weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). In evaluating the credibility and weight to be given the testimony of a witness, the fact-finder may consider the demeanor of the witness, the reasonableness of the witness's testimony, and the interest, if any, the witness may have in the outcome of the matter. *People v Wade*, 303 Mich 303 (1942), cert den, 318 US 783 (1943).

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the hearing record supports a finding that Respondent intentionally concealed the criminal history of a mandatory member of her FAP benefit group from the Department.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally failed to report having two or more

convictions for conduct involving controlled substances where the offenses occurred after August 22, 1996, for the purposes of becoming eligible 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. Respondent did receive an OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$1,608.
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1,608 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

Deborah Little
5131 Grand River Ave.
Detroit, MI 48208

Wayne County (District 49), 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]