



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: September 21, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 17-005172
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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 September 11, 2017, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Jennifer Patton, 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 benefits for 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 [REDACTED], 2017, 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 not** aware of the responsibility to report drug felony convictions alleged to have been committed by Respondent's son.
5. Respondent **had** an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. The OIG credibly testified at the hearing that she had spoken with Respondent several times by phone and did not believe the Respondent had the capacity to understand the matter or properly complete the application due to her disability.
6. Based upon the acknowledgement by the OIG that the Respondent has a mental disability that would make her not able to comprehend or intentionally commit an IPV regarding her completion of the application, no IPV is found.
7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is November 1, 2015, to April 30, 2016, (fraud period).
8. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$1,510 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan; and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$624 in such benefits during this time period.
9. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$886.
10. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
11. 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 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 or more, or
 - the total 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.

BAM 720 (January 2016), pp. 12-13; ASM 165 (January 2016), pp. 1-2.

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 2016), 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(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, based upon the testimony of the OIG Agent who appeared on behalf of the Department in this case it is determined that the Respondent [REDACTED] is disabled and after several conversations with Respondent, the OIG Agent testified credibly that the Respondent lacked the mental capacity to commit an intentional act necessary to establish and IPV for failure to report prior drug felonies of her son when completing the November 18, 2015, FAP application

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. 12.

In this case, the Department did not establish and IPV and, therefore, is not entitled to a finding of Disqualification of Respondent.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p.1. The amount of the OI is the benefit amount the group or provider actually received minus the amount the group was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8.

Although the Department conceded that Respondent lacked capacity to have committed an IPV for failure to disclose her son's drug felony records, the Respondent did receive FAP benefits than she was not entitled to receive as her son, based upon his prior drug felony convictions was not eligible for FAP benefits.

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 2012), p. 2.

The evidence presented demonstrated that Respondent's son [REDACTED] was convicted of drug felonies on [REDACTED], 2013, in the [REDACTED] County Circuit Court and on [REDACTED], 2012; in the [REDACTED] County Circuit Court, he was convicted of a drug felony and sentenced on [REDACTED] 2013. Exhibit A, pp. 52 and 49, respectively. See also [REDACTED] 2015, application pp. 15-16.

Based upon the evidence present the Respondent's son [REDACTED] should have been permanently disqualified from FAP eligibility when Petitioner applied for benefits in on [REDACTED] 2015, because he was convicted of two or more drug-related felony convictions in separate periods and in which both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. See BEM 203, p. 2.

After the second conviction on [REDACTED] 2013, Respondent's son was no longer eligible to receive FAP. Thus, because her son was not eligible for FAP benefits, Petitioner was overissued FAP benefits for any period he was ineligible to receive FAP benefits.

As such, the Department is entitled to recoup \$886 of FAP benefits it issued from November 1, 2015, through April 30, 2016. The Department presented FAP overissuance budgets for each month in the fraud period which were reviewed at the hearing which calculated the correct benefit amount when Petitioner's son was removed from the Respondent's FAP group. The budgets as presented are correct. See OI Budgets, Exhibit A, pp. 57-67. The budgets indicate that for December 2015 through April 30, 2016, the Respondent received \$278 a month in food assistance for herself and her son who was not eligible; thus, she was only entitled to \$115. Exhibit A, p. 75. Department further demonstrated that Petitioner received FAP benefits throughout the period. Exhibit A, pp. 54-55.


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 not** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$886 from the following program(s) Food Assistance.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$886 in accordance with Department policy.

LF/jaf



Lynn M. Ferris
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) 335-6088; 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

MDHHS-Wayne-15-Hearings

Petitioner

MDHHS-OIG-Hearings

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

M Shumaker
Policy Recoupment
L M Ferris
MAHS