



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Date Mailed: January 22, 2019
MAHS Docket No.: 18-010028
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: John Markey

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 January 15, 2019, 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. The hearing 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). During the hearing, a 44-page packet of documents was offered and admitted into evidence as Exhibit A, pp. 1-44.

ISSUES

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) and/or Medicaid (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)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits?

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], 2016, Respondent submitted to the Department an application for FAP and MA benefits. Exhibit A, pp. 12-23.

2. Respondent signed the application. By signing the application, Respondent certified that she received, reviewed, and understood the information contained within the DHHS publication titled "Things You Must Do." Exhibit A, pp. 22-23.
3. "Things You Must Do" advised Respondent that she was required to report any changes in address or moving out of the state of Michigan within 10 days and that an intentional failure to do so violated the law and if proven, would result in criminal and/or civil penalties, including disqualification from the program. Exhibit A, p. 23.
4. Based on the information Respondent provided in the application, the Department approved Respondent for FAP and MA benefits. Exhibit A, pp. 1-5; 41-44.
5. Starting February 25, 2017, Respondent's FAP benefits were redeemed exclusively in the State of Texas. From then on, Respondent's FAP benefits were used regularly and exclusively in Texas through the end of June 2017. Exhibit A, pp. 24-26.
6. On February 10, 2017, Respondent registered a car with a Texas address. Exhibit A, p. 27.
7. On March 24, 2017, Respondent signed a lease for an apartment in Texas. The lease was from April 2017 through July 2018. Exhibit A, pp. 28-36.
8. On or about March 24, 2017, Respondent began working for Amazon in Texas. Exhibit A, pp. 37-39.
9. Based on Respondent's pattern of exclusive use of Department-issued FAP benefits in Texas, the Department investigated the matter to determine whether Respondent was eligible to receive the benefits. During the course of the investigation, the Department found that Respondent appeared to be living in Texas. Exhibit A, pp. 24-39.
10. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on September 28, 2018, to establish an overissuance of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV by collecting FAP and MA benefits from Michigan after moving out of state.
11. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
12. The OIG requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of one year.
13. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period with respect to FAP benefits is April 1, 2017, through May 31, 2017, (fraud period), during which the Department issued Respondent \$388 in FAP benefits. The alleged fraud period with respect to MA is April 1, 2017, through June 30,

2017, during which the Department dispensed \$125.22 in MA benefits. Exhibit A, pp. 1-5, 41-44.

14. 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), 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.

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.

The Department's position in this matter is that Respondent's failure to report her move out of state while continuing to be covered by Michigan's MA and use her Michigan issued EBT card amounted to an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) with respect to MA and FAP.

Overissuance

Only residents of Michigan are eligible to receive benefits from the Department. BEM 220 (January 2016), p. 1. When an ineligible client is issued benefits or an eligible client is issued more benefits than the client is entitled, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700 (January 2016), p. 1.

In this case, the Department showed by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was a Texas resident as of mid-February 2017, at the latest. This conclusion is based on the facts that Respondent's EBT card was exclusively used in Texas starting February 25, 2017, she registered a car in Texas on February 10, 2017, she signed a lease for an apartment in Texas in March 2017, and she began working at a job in Texas in March 2017.

Thus, Respondent was no longer a Michigan resident and was ineligible to receive benefits. However, because of Respondent's failure to report her move to Texas, the Department issued for Respondent's benefit FAP benefits of \$388 and MA benefits of \$125.22. As Respondent was ineligible to receive those benefits, they are considered an overissuance. In total, the overissuance was \$513.22.

Intentional Program Violation

The Department's policy in effect at the time of Respondent's alleged IPV defined an IPV as an overissuance in which the following three conditions exist: (1) the client intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination; (2) the client was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities; and (3) the client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill his or her reporting responsibilities. BAM 720 (January 2016) 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; see also 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, the Department has met its burden. Respondent was required to report changes in her circumstances to the Department within 10 days of the date of the change. BAM 105 (April 2016), pp. 11-12. The Department clearly and correctly instructed Respondent to report changes to the Department. Respondent failed to report that she moved out of state at any point in time. Respondent's failure to report this change to the Department must be considered an intentional misrepresentation to maintain her FAP and MA benefits since Respondent knew or should have known that she was required to report the change to the Department and that reporting the change to the Department would have caused the Department to stop issuing her FAP and MA benefits. Instead of reporting the change, Respondent, for months, continued to use the Michigan-issued benefits in Texas. Respondent did not have any apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit her understanding or ability to fulfill her reporting requirement.

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, pp. 15-16. In general, clients are disqualified 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.

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 one-year disqualification from receiving 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. Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$388 that the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect.
2. The Department paid an overissuance of MA benefits in the amount of \$125.22 that the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect.
3. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV with respect to his FAP and MA benefits.
4. Respondent is subject to a one-year disqualification from receiving FAP benefits.

IT IS ORDERED that the Department may initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures for the total overissuance amount of \$513.22 established in this matter less any amounts already recouped or collected.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of one year.

JM/cg



John Markey
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

Via Email:

MDHHS-Wayne-57-Hearings
OIG Hearings
Recoupment
MAHS

Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]