



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: August 20, 2019  
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-004860  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ellen McLemore**

**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 August 14, 2019, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Adriane Laugavitz, 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 receiving FAP benefits for 24 months?

**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 [REDACTED], 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 FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report changes in income and group size to the Department within 10 days.
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 August 22, 2018 through November 30, 2018 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,929 in FAP 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 FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,929.
9. This was Respondent's second 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 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), 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 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 (October 2017), 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 (January 2018), 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 273.16(e)(6). The federal regulations define an IPV as intentionally: (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), SNAP regulations, or any state statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing for trafficking of SNAP benefits or Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards. 7 CFR 273.16(c). 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 alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she failed to notify the Department of a mandatory group member in her household, who also had income. While this evidence may be sufficient to establish that Respondent may have been overissued benefits, to establish an IPV, the Department must present clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining benefits.

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented an application for FAP benefits submitted by Respondent on August 22, 2018. The Department asserts that when completing the application process, Respondent acknowledged that she had received the Information Booklet advising her regarding "Things You Must Do," which explained reporting change circumstances including employment and group size. The Department also highlighted that in the application Respondent did not include her husband as an individual living in the home and only reported her own income.

The Department presented correspondence from Respondent's husband's employer stating that his listed address was the same as that reported in her application. Additionally, the Department presented documents filed in Lapeer County Court related to Respondent's divorce proceedings. On the document filed [REDACTED], 2018, Respondent indicated that she and her husband lived at the same address. In a statement filed by Respondent's husband in the divorce proceeding, he stated that he lived in the home periodically until November 2018. The statement was signed on February 22, 2019.

The Department testified that because Respondent and her husband were still legally married and lived together, they should have been in the same group. Therefore, Respondent's husband's income should have also been included when determining Respondent's FAP benefit amount.

FAP budget calculations require the consideration of the group size. The Department will determine who must be included in the FAP group prior to evaluating the non-financial and financial eligibility of everyone in the group. BEM 212, p. 1. (October 2015), p. 1. The FAP group composition is established by determining all of the following: who lives together, the relationship(s) of the people who live together whether

the people living together purchase and prepare food together or separately, and whether the person(s) resides in an eligible living situation. BEM 212, p. 6. Living with means sharing a home where family members usually sleep and share any common living quarters such as a kitchen, bathroom, bedroom or living room. Persons who share only an access area such as an entrance or hallway or non-living area such as a laundry room are not considered living together. BEM 212, p. 3. Spouses who are legally married and live together must be in the same group. BEM 212, p. 1.

The Department presented sufficient evidence that Respondent and her husband were living together during the fraud period. Respondent submitted an application for benefits during the fraud period and failed to report her husband living in the home and his income. Respondent failed to attend the hearing to provide an explanation for her actions. Therefore, the Department sufficiently established that Respondent misrepresented her circumstances to fraudulently obtain benefits. Thus, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld information for the purpose of maintaining her eligibility for FAP benefits and committed 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 she lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

The Department requested that Respondent be subject to a 24-month disqualification period. In support of its argument, the Department presented Respondent's IPV Sanction Summary, which showed Respondent had a previous FAP IPV violation. As discussed above, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP. As Respondent has a previous IPV disqualification, she is subject to a two-year disqualification from her receipt of FAP benefits.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. At the hearing, the Department established that the State of Michigan issued a total of \$1,929 in FAP benefits to Respondent during the fraud period. The Department alleges that Respondent was eligible for \$0 in FAP benefits during this period.

As stated above, the Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that Respondent's husband was living in her household, and therefore, should have been included in her FAP group. The Department presented overissuance budgets showing the amount of FAP benefits Respondent received (based on a group size of 4) and the amount of FAP benefits she should have received (based on a group size of 5) with her husband's income included. Therefore, the Department established it is entitled to recoup/collect \$1,929 in FAP benefits that were overissued to Respondent during the fraud period.

### **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 overissuance of FAP program benefits in the amount of \$1,929.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$1,929, less any amounts already recouped/collected, in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 24 months.

EM/cg



---

**Ellen McLemore**  
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

**Via Email:**

MDHHS-Lapeer-Hearings  
OIG Hearings  
Recoupment  
MOAHR

**Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:**

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████