



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: September 9, 2019
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-007889
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

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 September 5, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Nicole Heinz-Hosking, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] did not appear. The hearing was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4).

One exhibit was admitted into evidence during the hearing. A 45-page packet of documents provided by the Department was admitted collectively as the Department's Exhibit A.

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 [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2018, Respondent applied for assistance from the Department, including FAP benefits. In the application, Respondent asserted that he did not have any income from employment.
2. On April 11, 2018, the Department issued a notice of case action to Respondent which notified him that he was approved for FAP benefits based on his reported income of \$[REDACTED] per month. The Department instructed Respondent to report all changes which could affect his eligibility for assistance, including changes in employment income, to the Department within 10 days of the date of the change.
3. Respondent did not have any apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit his understanding or ability to fulfill his responsibilities to the Department.
4. On May 7, 2018, Respondent began employment at [REDACTED].
5. On May 18, 2018, Respondent received his first paycheck from [REDACTED].
6. Respondent did not report to the Department that he had a change in employment.
7. The Department continued to issue FAP benefits to Respondent without budgeting his income from employment.
8. The Department investigated Respondent's case and determined that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits due to unreported income.
9. The Department attempted to contact Respondent to obtain his explanation for the unreported income, but the Department was unable to obtain an explanation from Respondent.
10. On July 25, 2019, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent received an overissuance of benefits and that Respondent committed an IPV.
11. The OIG requested Respondent be disqualified from FAP for 12 months for a first IPV. The OIG requested recoupment of \$1,030.00 in FAP benefits issued from July 2018 through December 2018.
12. 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 (October 1, 2018), p. 1.

In this case, Respondent received more benefits than he was entitled to receive because he had unreported income. The Department determines a client's monthly FAP benefit amount by determining the client's group size and countable household income and then looking that information up in its applicable Food Issuance Table. BEM 212 (July 1, 2019), BEM 213 (January 1, 2019), BEM 550 (January 1, 2017), BEM 554 (April 1, 2019), BEM 556 (July 1, 2019), and RFT 260 (October 1, 2018). In general, an increase income causes a decrease in FAP benefits.

Respondent had an increase in income because he obtained employment and began earning income from his employment. Respondent did not report his change to the Department, which caused the Department to continue issuing him FAP benefits without budgeting his income. This caused the Department to issue Respondent more FAP benefits than what he was eligible to receive.

Although the Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that Respondent received an overissuance, the Department did not present sufficient evidence to establish the amount of the overissuance. The Department's only evidence of the amount of the overissuance was budgets prepared by a recoupment specialist who was not present to testify. The Department provided payroll records to support the budgets, but they were not legible and could not be used to support the income used by the Recoupment Specialist in the budgets.

For these reasons, I must find that Respondent received an overissuance, but there is insufficient evidence to establish the amount of the overissuance. The Department shall review its overissuance budget, determine its overissuance in accordance with this decision, and then issue a new notice of overissuance to Respondent pursuant to 7 CFR 273.18(a)(3)(iii).

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 circumstances 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, including changes in his income. Respondent failed to report that he obtained employment within 10 days of the date of the change. Respondent's failure to report the change in his income to the Department must be considered an intentional misrepresentation to obtain benefits from the Department since Respondent knew or should have known that he was required to report it to the Department and that doing so would have caused his benefits to be denied or reduced. 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.
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 shall initiate a review of its overissuance budget to determine the amount of the overissuance and then issue a new notice to Respondent. The Department shall begin to implement this order within 10 days.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months. The Department shall begin to implement this order within 10 days.

JK/nr



Jeffrey Kemm
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

Amber Gibson
5303 South Cedar
PO BOX 30088
Lansing, MI
48911

Ingham 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

[REDACTED]
MI