



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: February 26, 2019  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-011134  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Lain

**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, 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 held on February 12, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Brian Siegfried, 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 receiving benefits for 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. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on October 22, 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG **has** requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of Food Assistance Program benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent **was** aware of the responsibility to report all income and household members.
5. Respondent **did not have** an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is November 1, 2017-November 30, 2017 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$4,080.00 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$3,291.00 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$789.00.
9. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and **was not** returned by the United States Postal Services as undeliverable.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Adult Services Manual (ASM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

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 to .3015.

Effective January 1, 2016, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.
- FAP trafficking overissuances 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 amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$500 or more, or
  - the total 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. BAM 720, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016)(Emphasis added).

### **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 his or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill reporting responsibilities. BAM 700, p 7 (1/1/2016; BAM 720, p 1 (1/1/2016).

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; see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true. See M Civ JI 8.01.

### **Disqualification**

A client who is found to have committed an IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p 2. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. BAM 720, p 16. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p 1 (4/1/2016). A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he/she lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p 16.

This was Respondent's first instance of an IPV. Therefore, a 12-month disqualification is required.

### **Overissuance**

**When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p 1 (1/1/2016).**

**Clear and convincing** proof means that the **evidence** presented by a party during the trial must be highly and substantially more probable to be true than not and the trier of fact must have a firm belief or conviction in its factuality.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that a FEE referral was requested in October 2017 and it was determined [REDACTED], father of the client's daughter [REDACTED] was living in the household.

When the FEE investigation was completed it was recommended by OIG to add [REDACTED] to the client's case because it was determined he was in the household and he is also a mandatory group member.

The alleged FAP fraud period is January 1, 2017 – November 30, 2017 and the FAP overpayment totals \$789.00. October 23, 2017-Bridges case information was reviewed showing that the client has active FAP and Medicaid cases and pending FIP and CDC cases.

The client has a residential address of [REDACTED], MI [REDACTED] October 25, 2017-information obtained from the [REDACTED] Friend of

the Court indicates that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were residing together at [REDACTED], MI [REDACTED] since at least August of 2017. They have not reported to the [REDACTED] Friend of the Court that they have separated or moved. October 30, 2017- Per SOS, [REDACTED] address on record was updated on December 7, 2016, and his address on record is [REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

This is the same address that the client reported to DHHS she was living at on Assistance Applications dated [REDACTED] 2016, [REDACTED] 2017, and [REDACTED] 2017. October 30, 2017- Infoview shows [REDACTED] had earnings in the second quarter of 2017 at [REDACTED].

August 15, 2018-verification obtained from the work number shows [REDACTED] was employed with [REDACTED] from December 12, 2016 - April 27, 2017. [REDACTED] address on record with [REDACTED] was [REDACTED] MI [REDACTED] October 27, 2017- A home call was conducted at [REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

A man answered the door and identified himself as [REDACTED]. He appeared to just have gotten out of bed. He stated that [REDACTED] was not home and may be with her mother, but he wasn't really sure. He stated that he was there caring for the children. He indicated he has been staying with [REDACTED] on and off for the past 2 and a half weeks, but he stays with his grandmother. I attempted to get additional information concerning his grandmother such as her address but all he would only give me was her first name, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] would not give me any other information and then the interview became hostile. I gave [REDACTED] one of my business cards to give to the [REDACTED] so she could contact me. I drove away and then attempted to contact the client by telephone few moments later. I called the telephone number on record, [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] answered the phone saying this is the only phone they have and that [REDACTED] was not there.

July 26, 2018 - [REDACTED] was interviewed at the [REDACTED] County DHHS office. She stated she used to live with [REDACTED] grandmother and then moved to the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] address sometime in September of 2017. She went on to say [REDACTED] didn't live with her while she lived at the [REDACTED] [REDACTED] address, but he does live with her now.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, substantial and material evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with Department policy when it determined that Respondent failed to notify the Department of his earned income and when it determined that Respondent committed and Intentional Program Violation.

**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, concludes that:

1. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$789.00.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$789.00 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for the requested twelve months in accordance with Department policy.

LL/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Landis Lain**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Robert Gordon, 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**

Michelle Morley  
715 S Loxley Rd  
Houghton Lake, MI 48629

Roscommon County, DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

L. Bengel via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]