GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

# STATE OF MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS DIRECTOR



Date Mailed: June 25, 2019 MOAHR Docket No.: 19-003717

Agency No.: Petitioner: OIG

Respondent:

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Aaron McClintic

# 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 May 29, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Julie Price, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Department Exhibit 1, pp. 1-53 was received and admitted.

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 Medical Assistance (MA) 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)?

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on April 4, 2019, 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 MA benefits issued by the Department.
- 4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in income.
- 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 2016 through December 31, 2016 (fraud period).
- 7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$4,404.03 in MA benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
- 8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in MA benefits in the amount of \$4404.03.
- 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 Service as undeliverable.
- 11. Respondent failed to report employment income from GD Leasing and Vensure Employer Services (Ex. 1, pp. 40-45)

# 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 Medical Assistance (MA) program is established by Title XIX of the Social Security Act, 42 USC 1396-1396w-5; 42 USC 1315; the Affordable Care Act of 2010, the collective term for the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, Pub. L. No. 111-148, as amended by the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-152; and 42 CFR 430.10-.25. The Department (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers the MA program pursuant to 42 CFR 435, MCL 400.10 and MCL 400.105-.112k.

Effective October 1, 2014, 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 \$500.00 or more, or
  - the total amount is less than \$500.00, 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 (1/1/16), p. 12-13.

## **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 (October 2017), p. 7; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. 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(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.

In this case, Respondent failed to report employment income from GD Leasing and Vensure Employer Services (Ex. 1, pp. 40-45) Failing to disclose employment income was an intentional program violation. BEM 203 BAM 720, 7 CFR 273.12(a)(1(i))

## Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

In this case, Respondent received \$4,404.03 in MA benefits and he was entitled to \$0 Therefore, the amount of the overissuance for MA is \$4,404.03.

## **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 program benefits in the amount of \$4,404.03 from the following program(s) MA.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$4,404.03 in accordance with Department policy.

AM/nr

Aaron McClintic

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 Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR 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. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules Reconsideration/Rehearing Request P.O. Box 30639 Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

**DHHS** Denise Croff

301 E. Louis Glick Hwy.

Jackson, MI

49201

Jackson County DHHS- via electronic mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

L. Bengel- via electronic mail

**Petitioner** OIG

PO Box 30062 Lansing, MI 48909-7562

Respondent

