



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: September 16, 2019  
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-005934  
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 29, 2019, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Nicole Heinz-Hosking, 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 12 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 related to the FAP and Family Independence Program (FIP).
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 any felony drug convictions 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 May 24, 2012 through December 31, 2014 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$10,091 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$5,291 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$4,800.
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 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).

#### **FIP**

The Family Independence Program (FIP) was established pursuant to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Pub. L. No. 104-193, and 42 USC 601 to 679c. The Department (formerly known as the Department of Human Services) administers FIP pursuant to 45 CFR 233-260, MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3101-.3131.

On June 19, 2019, a Notice of Hearing was sent to Respondent, advising him of a hearing scheduled on July 23, 2019. The Notice of Hearing was returned as

undeliverable. On July 24, 2019, an Order of Adjournment was sent to Respondent, notifying him that the July 23, 2019 hearing was adjourned. A second Notice of Hearing was sent on July 25, 2019, advising Respondent that a hearing was scheduled on August 29, 2019. The Notice of Hearing and Order of Adjournment were returned as undeliverable.

The OIG requests Intentional Program Violation (IPV) hearing when no signed DHS-826 or DHS-830 is obtained, and correspondence to the client is not returned as undeliverable, or a new address is located. BAM 720 (October 2017), p. 12. For the Food Assistance Program (FAP) only, the OIG will pursue an IPV hearing when correspondence was sent using first class mail and is returned as undeliverable. BAM 720, p. 12.

The Department testified at the hearing that it was seeking an IPV and overissuance related to the FIP program. Per policy, the OIG cannot seek an IPV if correspondence was returned as undeliverable, unless it is an IPV for FAP benefits. As the underlying issue was, in part, related to Respondent's FIP benefits, the undersigned ALJ does not have authority to hear the matter related to that issue. Therefore, the Request for Hearing related to the FIP program is **DISMISSED**.

## **FAP**

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. 5

### **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 (October 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: (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 his FAP benefits, because he failed to notify the Department of his drug-related felony convictions, all of which occurred after August 22, 1996. An individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more

times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. BEM 203 (October 2015), p. 2; 21 USC 862.

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented applications submitted by Respondent on May 24, 2012; August 4, 2012; July 16, 2013; April 11, 2014; and August 22, 2014. In the applications, Respondent stated he had not been convicted of a drug-related felony.

Additionally, the Department presented documentation which showed that Respondent had been convicted of drug-related felonies on November 21, 2000; March 14, 2005; August 26, 2008. Given that the applications were submitted after the convictions occurred, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of maintaining FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent 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; BEM 708 (October 2016), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, 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; 7 CFR 273.16(b). CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p. 1. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he/she lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Accordingly, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification under the FAP program, as it is his first IPV related to FAP.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p. 1; 7 CFR 273.18. In this case, the Department is seeking recoupment of FAP benefits as it alleges that Respondent received more benefits than he was entitled.

The Department presented Respondent's Benefit Issuance Summary which showed Respondent was issued \$10,091 in FAP benefits during the fraud period. The Department submitted budgets which revealed that Respondent would have been entitled to \$5,291 in FAP benefits. Accordingly, the Department has established that an overissuance occurred in the amount of \$4,800, and it is therefore entitled to recoup that amount for FAP benefits it issued 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 related to FAP.
2. Respondent did receive an overissuance of FAP program benefits in the amount of \$4,800.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$4,800, 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 12 months.

The Request for Hearing related to the FIP program is **DISMISSED**.

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-Ingham-Hearings  
OIG Hearings  
Recoupment  
MOAHR

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

██████████  
██  
██