



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

██████████  
██  
██████████ MI ██████████

Date Mailed: February 28, 2020  
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-009069  
Agency No.: ██████████  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: ██████████

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Amanda M. T. Marler**

**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 February 19, 2020 from ██████████ Michigan. The Department was represented by Taylor Jenkins, 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)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for 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. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on August 9, 2019 seeking to disqualify Respondent from FAP based upon an IPV by failing to report employment income.

2. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department based upon his Application dated March 23, 2018.
3. Respondent **was** informed of the responsibility to report changes in household circumstances to the Department.
4. On August 28, 2018, Respondent began working for S [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Employer).
5. On September 6, 2018, Respondent received his first paycheck from Employer in the amount of \$576.00.
6. On February 28, 2019, Respondent received his final paycheck from Employer prior to the Employer's verification.
7. Respondent did not report his employment at any time.
8. Respondent **did not have** an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
9. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is November 2018 through February 2019 (fraud period).
10. On March 26, 2019, the Department established an overissuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$1,502.00 based upon the same facts as this case.
11. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
12. 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), 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 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 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), pp. 5, 12-13; ASM 165 (August 2016).

### **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. 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, misrepresented information, or withheld facts or committed any act constituting a violation of Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) regulations or State statutes for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, using, presenting, transferring, receiving, possessing, trafficking, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720, pp. 1, 12-13 (emphasis in original); 7 CFR 273.16(c) and (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 asserts that Respondent committed an IPV by intentionally failing to report his employment income to the Department. Earned income received by the client is considered in the calculation of a client's FAP eligibility and amount of benefits. BEM 500 (July 2017); BEM 556 (April 2018), pp. 2-3; 7 CFR 273.9(a). FAP recipients who are not simplified reporters are required to report starting or stopping employment and changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount within ten days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. BAM 105 (January 2018), p. 11; 7 CFR 273.10(b)(1)(i). In addition, clients must completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interviews. BAM 105, p. 8; 7 CFR 273.2(b)(iii).

On March 23, 2018, Respondent submitted an Application to the Department for FAP benefits. On the Application, he listed no sources of income and acknowledged his rights and responsibilities as a program recipient which included reporting changes to the Department when he signed the form. On August 28, 2018, Respondent began working for Employer. He received his first paycheck on September 6, 2018. Between Respondent's Application date and the date of his first paycheck, the Department issued two Notices of Case Action informing Respondent that his FAP benefits were being calculated based upon \$0.00 earned income and reminded him of the responsibilities to report changes in household circumstances to the Department. Two days after he received his first paycheck, the Department issued another Notice of Case Action to Respondent again reminding him that his benefits were based upon \$0.00 earned income and that he had a responsibility to report changes. One final Notice of Case Action was issued to Respondent on December 8, 2018 which reflected the same information as each of the previous notices. In January 2019, Respondent was due for a Redetermination of his FAP benefits; he failed to respond. At the end of January 2019, the Department completed a Wage Match and discovered the income. A Wage Match Client Notice was sent to Respondent, but again he failed to respond. On or about March 4, 2019, the Department received verification of Respondent's income from Employer showing continuous employment from the time of hire to the time of verification.

Based upon a thorough review of the evidence, the Department has satisfied its burden of proof by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent has committed an IPV by failing to report his new employment income in order to maintain his FAP benefits.

**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 10 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; 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1) and (5). 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 has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV. This was Respondent's first IPV. Therefore, he is subject to a one-year disqualification under the FAP.

**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.

It is ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of **12 months**.

AMTM/jaf



---

**Amanda M. T. Marler**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Robert Gordon, Director  
Department of Health and Human Services

