



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: December 19, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-009225  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Kevin Scully

### **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 with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on November 27, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Gary Shuk, 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 the 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. On a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form received by the Department on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of employment status and increases of earned income. Exhibit A, pp 10-15.

2. Respondent reported on her [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, Redetermination form that she was not receiving any income. Exhibit A, p 13.
3. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2017, the Department received Respondent's State Emergency Relief (SER) application where she reported working since [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016. Exhibit A, pp 23-38.
4. Respondent started employment on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, and received earned income from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2017. Exhibit A, pp 17-20.
5. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$ [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2017. Exhibit A, p 16.
6. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2018, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$ [REDACTED] overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-8.
7. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 3.
8. 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.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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

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-.3011.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- FAP trafficking OIs 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 OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$500 or more, or
  - the total OI 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (January 1, 2016), pp 12-13.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (January 1, 2018), p 1.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. Changes that must be reported include changes of employment status and increases of earned income. Department of Human Services Bridges Assistance Manual (BAM) 105 (January 1, 2018), pp 1-20.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount. Changes must be reported within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (January 1, 2018), p 12. The Department will act on a change reported by means other than a tape match within 15 workdays after becoming aware of the change, except that the Department will act on a change other than a tape match within 10 days of becoming aware of the change. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 220 (January 1, 2018), p 7. A pended negative action occurs when a negative action requires timely notice based on the eligibility rules in this item. Timely notice means that the action taken by the department is effective at least 12 calendar days following the date of the department's action. BAM 220, p 12.

On a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form received by the Department on March 29, 2016, Respondent acknowledged the duties and responsibilities of receiving FAP benefits. Respondent truthfully reported to the Department that she was not working.

Respondent started employment on [REDACTED] 2016, and received earned income from [REDACTED] 2016, through [REDACTED] 2017, and beyond. This earned income was not applied to Respondent's eligibility for FAP benefits.

Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$[REDACTED] from [REDACTED] 2016, through [REDACTED] 2017. If Respondent's earned income had been applied towards her eligibility for FAP benefits during that period, she would have been eligible for only \$[REDACTED] of those benefits. Therefore, Respondent received a \$[REDACTED] overissuance of FAP benefits.

### **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 the reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the understanding or ability to fulfill reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700, p 7, 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 273.16(e)(6).

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), reh den 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

The evidence supports a finding that Respondent did not report her earned income in a timely manner, which resulted in an overissuance of FAP benefits.

However, the evidence does not support a finding that Respondent reported false information to the Department. Respondent reported to the Department on [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2017, that she had been working since [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2016, which supports a finding that Respondent did not intend to conceal her earned income from the Department.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has not presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination. The evidence supports a finding that it was client error that caused the overissuance.


The Department has not established an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

### **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 did receive an OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$926.
2. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$926 in accordance with Department policy.
3. The Department is ORDERED to delete the finding of an Intentional Program Violation from Respondent's benefit file.

KS/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kevin Scully**  
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**

Lindsay Miller  
125 E. Union St 7th Floor  
Flint, MI 48502

Genesee County (Union), DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

M. Shumaker via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
MI [REDACTED]