

RICK SNYDER GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON DIRECTOR

. MI		
. MI		
,	, MI	

Date Mailed: November 8, 2018 MAHS Docket No.: 18-009088

Agency No.: Petitioner: OIG

Respondent:

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 23, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Dana Mikko, 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 acknowledged his 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 10-29.

- 2. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that his application form was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 29.
- 3. Respondent reported on his had been convicted of one felony involving controlled substances. Exhibit A, p 27.
- 4. Respondent was found guilty by jury on April 28, 1999, of Controlled Substance Possession of Marijuana. The judgement of sentence indicates that Respondent was sentenced to 365 days in jail with 270 days suspended upon payment of fines and costs. Exhibit A, p 30.
- Respondent pled guilty to Controlled Substance 2nd Offenses, Double Penalty (333.74132) on March 22, 2002. The judgement of sentence indicates that Respondent was sentenced to serve 16 months to two years in prison. Exhibit A, p 31.
- 6. Respondent was found guilty by a jury on February 20, 2002, of Delivery of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams (333.74012A4). The judgment of sentence indicates that Respondent was sentenced to serve 34 months to 30 years in prison. Exhibit A, pp 33-34.
- 7. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$1,143 from January 10, 2017, through December 31, 2017. Exhibit A, pp 32.
- 8. On September 12, 2018, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$1,143 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-8.
- 9. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on September 12, 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. 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 Ols 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.

<u>Overissuance</u>

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.

Respondent had acknowledged his duty to report his felony convictions involving controlled substance on an application for assistance dated 2017.

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 his penalties of perjury that his penalties of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Respondent reported on his penalties and 2017, application for assistance that he had been convicted of only one felony involving controlled substances.

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 February 20, 2002, Respondent was found guilty of Delivery of a Controlled Substance Less Than 50 Grams, Conspiracy, a Habitual Offender 3rd Offense. These three charges are considered one felony offenses for the purposes of determining eligibility for FAP benefits.

On April 28, 1999, Respondent was found guilty of Possession of a Controlled Substance. The Department's evidence does not clearly identify the charge code, but the conviction title is consistent with PAAC 333.74032D, a misdemeanor charge.

On March 22, 2002, Respondent was found guilty of Controlled Substance – 2nd or subsequent Offense. The judgment of sentence lists the charge code as 333.74132, which appears to be a felony charge involving controlled substances.

Based on the evidence and testimony available during the hearing, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Respondent was convicted of felonies involving controlled substances on February 20, 2002, and March 22, 2002. Respondent only report having one conviction, which would have allowed him to remain eligible for FAP benefits with the appointment of an authorized representative. Since Respondent failed to report having two felony convictions involving controlled substances, he was not eligible for any of the FAP benefits he received from the date of his application on January 10, 2017, through December 31, 2017. Therefore, Respondent received a \$1,143 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 his duties and responsibilities including his 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 2017, application form was examined by or read to him, and, to the best of his knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Respondent falsely reported that he had been convicted of only one felony involving controlled substances, 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 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 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 \$1,143.
- 3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$1,143 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

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 OIG

PO Box 30062

Lansing, MI 48909-7562

Shiawassee County, DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

M. Shumaker via electronic mail

DHHS Sharon Reuther

1720 East Main Street Owosso, MI 48867

Respondent

, MI