



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: February 15, 2019
MAHS Docket No.: 18-010338
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jacquelyn A. McClinton

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 28, 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; 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 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 October 2, 2018, 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 FAP benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to report felony drug convictions to the Department.
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 November 1, 2011 through December 31, 2015 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0.00 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$[REDACTED]
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).

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. 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 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.

Effective October 1, 2011, an individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances will be permanently disqualified from receipt of FAP benefits if the terms of probation or parole are violated and the qualifying conviction occurred after August 22, 1996. In addition, 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 (July 2013), p. 2.

The offense must be classified as a felony by the law of the State and have as an element the possession, use or distribution of a controlled substance. The term “distribute” means to deliver (other than administering or dispensing) a controlled substance or a listed chemical. The term “deliver” or “delivery” means the actual, constructive, or attempted transfer of a controlled substance or a listed chemical, whether or not there is an agency relationship. 21 USC section 862a(a)(1) and (2); 21 USC 802(8) and (11). The disqualification does not apply if the conviction is for conduct occurring on or before August 22, 1996. 21 USC 862a(d)(2).

In support of its contention that Respondent committed an IPV, the Department presented four applications submitted by Respondent to the Department on September 30, 2011, April 15, 2013, September 16, 2013 and September 17, 2015 in which Respondent acknowledged that he had received the Information Booklet advising him regarding “Things You Must Do” which explained reporting requirements for criminal convictions, probation and/or parole violations. In each application, Respondent indicated that 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 April 10, 1997, September 25, 1998 and May 4, 1999. However, the Department testified that the matter was submitted for criminal prosecution but was declined by the prosecutor due to lack of evidence. Under the Department policy, the OIG requests IPV hearing for cases involving:

1. FAP trafficking overissuances that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
2. 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.

Because the case was declined by the prosecutor due to lack of evidence, it is found that the OIG is prohibited from requesting an IPV. As such, it is found that the Department has failed to establish that Respondent committed an IPV.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15. 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.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. BAM 720, p. 13. Clients are disqualified for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has not satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP benefits. Accordingly, Respondent is not subject to a 12-month disqualification under the FAP program.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. Individuals convicted of certain crimes, such as trafficking and drug-related felonies; probation or parole violators; and fugitive felons are not eligible for FAP. BEM 203 (October 2015), p. 1. Although the Department is prohibited from requesting an IPV in cases in which the matter has been declined by the prosecutor due to lack of evidence, the Department is allowed to pursue an overissuance. BAM 720, p. 14.

In this case, the Department is seeking an overissuance related to benefits issued from November 1, 2011 through December 31, 2015. The Department alleged that the OI amount is \$██████████. The Department presented Respondent's benefit summary inquiry which showed that Respondent was issued FAP benefits in the amount of \$██████████ during the fraud period.

Respondent did not appear at the hearing. Therefore, Respondent failed to refute the evidence presented which revealed that he had been convicted of two drug related felonies since ██████████ 1996. Accordingly, the Department established that Respondent was not entitled to benefits and as such, received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$██████████ 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 not established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent is not subject to a 12-month disqualification from FAP benefits as a result of an IPV.

JAM/tlf



Jacquelyn A. McClinton
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-41-Hearings
OIG Hearings
Recoupment
MAHS

Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]