



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Christopher Seppanen
Executive Director

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: March 30, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 17-000670
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab A. Baydoun

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 45 CFR 235.110; and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 15, 2017, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], 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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits?
3. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of FAP benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

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 or around January 11, 2017, 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 FAP benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in her circumstances to the Department, such as changes in employment and income for herself and her group 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 July 1, 2015, to February 29, 2016 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, the Department alleges that Respondent was issued \$2856 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$1108 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$1748.
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 US Post Office 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 (January 2016), pp. 5,12-13.

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 (January 2016), pp.7-8; 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, the Department alleged that Respondent committed an IPV of the FAP because she failed to report that she had gained employment and was earning income, causing an OI of FAP benefits. Clients must report changes in circumstances that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes such as starting or stopping employment, earning income, and starting or stopping a source of unearned income must be reported within ten days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105 (July 2015), pp.10-11.

The Department contended that Respondent's failure to report the employment and earned income caused an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$1748 from July 2015 to February 2016. The Department provided a Verification of Employment which indicates that Respondent began employment on May 11, 2015, received her first paycheck on or around May 29, 2015, and that she continued to be employed and earning income through the fraud period. (Exhibit A, pp. 39-41).

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented an assistance application completed by Respondent on [REDACTED] 2015, prior to the alleged fraud period and prior to her employment. The Department also presented a Notice of Case Action dated March 23, 2015, which advises Respondent of her reporting responsibilities. (Exhibit A, pp. 11-36). While this was sufficient to establish that Respondent was advised of her responsibility to report changes in circumstances, it does not establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.

After a thorough review of the evidence presented, the Department has failed to establish that Respondent intentionally withheld information for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. As such, the Department has failed to establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent had the intent to commit an IPV.

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. 15. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FAP, 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. 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.

In this case, the Department failed to establish that that Respondent committed a FAP IPV. Therefore, Respondent is **not** subject to a disqualification from the FAP based on an IPV.

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, the Department presented a Department and Client Error Information and Repayment Agreement (DHS-4358-C) that was signed by Respondent on or around [REDACTED], 2016, for Claim ID No. 100006106242. (Exhibit A, pp. 3, 68). A review of the Agreement establishes that Respondent acknowledged that she was overissued FAP benefits in the amount of \$1748 and in signing the Agreement, Respondent agreed to repay the overissued FAP benefits to the Department. Accordingly, the Department is entitled to collect and/or recoup \$1748 from Respondent for overissued FAP benefits.

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 not** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$1748 from the FAP.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$1748 in accordance with Department policy, less any amounts already recouped/collected.

ZB/tlf



Zainab A. Baydoun

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) 335-6088; 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

Via Email:

DHHS Hearings Coordinator – Delta
OIG Hearing Decisions
Recoupment
MAHS

Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]