



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

██████████  
██████████  
██████████ MI ██████████

Date Mailed: December 17, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-009609  
Agency No.: ██████████  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: ██████████ ██████████

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Jeffrey Kemm

**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 Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on December 6, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Kelli Owens, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent, ██████████ ██████████ did not appear. The hearing was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4).

**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 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 May ██████████ 2015, Respondent applied for FAP benefits from the Department. In Respondent's application, Respondent represented that he was not employed and did not have any income. The Department instructed Respondent to report any changes in his employment status or income to the Department within 10 days of the date of the change. Respondent signed his application.

2. Respondent did not have any apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit her understanding or ability to fulfill her responsibilities to the Department.
3. On June █ 2015, Respondent began employment at Payne Pulliam School. Respondent did not report a change in his employment status to the Department.
4. The Department issued FAP benefits to Respondent without taking into consideration his income from employment.
5. The Department investigated Respondent's case and discovered that he had unreported income which caused the Department to overissue him FAP benefits.
6. The Department scheduled an interview with Respondent for June █ 2017. Respondent appeared at the interview and denied that he had unreported income while he was receiving FAP benefits.
7. The Department issued a subpoena to Payne Pulliam School and verified that Respondent had income while he was receiving FAP benefits.
8. On █ █ █ the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits and that Respondent committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p. 1.
9. The OIG requested recoupment of \$ █ of FAP benefits overissued from August 2015 through December 2015. The OIG requested that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for 12 months for a first IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at his last known address and it was not returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a federal food assistance program designed to promote general welfare and to safeguard well-being by increasing food purchasing power. 7 USC 2011 and 7 CFR 271.1. The Department administers its Food Assistance Program (FAP) pursuant to MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b; and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015. Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

### **Overissuance**

A recipient claim is an amount owed because of benefits that were overpaid or benefits that were trafficked. 7 CFR 273.18(a)(1). When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700 (January 1, 2018), p. 1. In this case, Respondent received more benefits than he was entitled to receive. Respondent failed to report his income from employment to the Department, so the Department did not budget his income when it calculated the FAP benefits he was eligible for. This resulted in the Department issuing more FAP benefits to Respondent than he was entitled to receive. The Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that Respondent was overissued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from August 2015 through December 2015.

### **Intentional Program Violation**

An intentional program violation (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 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. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence which is so clear, direct, weighty, and convincing that it enables a firm belief as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established. *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995) (citing *In re Jobes*, 108 NJ 394 (1987)).

In this case, I find that the Department has met its burden. Respondent was required to report changes in his employment status and income to the Department within 10 days of the change. 7 CFR 273.12(a)(2). The Department clearly and correctly instructed Respondent to report changes to the Department within 10 days. Respondent failed to report that he obtained employment within 10 days of the date he received his first payroll remittance. Respondent did not provide any explanation for his inaction. Respondent’s failure to report this change to the Department must be considered an intentional misrepresentation to maintain or obtain benefits from the Department since Respondent knew or should have known that he was required to report the change to the Department and that reporting the change to the Department would have caused his benefits to decrease. Respondent did not have any apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit his understanding or ability to fulfill his reporting requirement.

## **Disqualification**

In general, individuals found to have committed an intentional program violation through an administrative disqualification hearing shall be ineligible to participate in FAP: (i) for a period of 12 months for the first violation, (ii) for a period of 24 months for the second violation, and (iii) permanently for a third violation. 7 CFR 273.16(b). Only the individual who committed the violation shall be disqualified – not the entire household. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(11).

In this case, there is no evidence that Respondent has ever been found to have committed an IPV related to FAP benefits. Thus, this is Respondent's first IPV related to FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from FAP.

## **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. Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] that the Department is entitled to recoup.
2. The Department has established, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an IPV.
3. Respondent should be disqualified from FAP.

IT IS ORDERED THAT the Department may initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.

JK/nr



---

Jeffrey Kemm  
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 49 County DHHS- via electronic mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

M. Shumaker- via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI  
48909-7562

**Respondent**

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