



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], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: August 15, 2019  
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-002790  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Landis Lain

### **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 13, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Julie Price, 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).

Petitioner's Exhibit A, pages 1-54 were admitted as evidence.

### **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 the 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 March 18, 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 his status.
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 July 24, 2017-October 31, 2017 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$632 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 \$632.
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.

For FAP:

A person is considered a resident **while living in Michigan** for any purpose other than a vacation, even if there is no intent to remain in the state permanently or indefinitely.

A homeless person is an individual who lacks a fixed and regular nighttime dwelling or whose temporary night time dwelling is one of the following:

- Supervised private or public shelter for the homeless.

Exception: For FAP, a Respondent is considered homeless only for the first 90 days.

- Halfway house or similar facility to accommodate persons released from institutions.
- Home of another person.

Exception: For FAP, a Respondent is considered homeless only for the first 90 days.

- Place not designed or ordinarily used as a dwelling (for example, a building entrance or hallway, bus station, park, campsite, vehicle).

Exception: **For FAP, a Respondent is considered homeless only for the first 90 days. Lack of a permanent dwelling or fixed mailing address does not affect an individual's state residence status.** Assistance cannot be denied solely because the individual has no permanent dwelling or fixed address. BEM 220, page 2

Effective October 1, 2014, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- 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.

**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. 6; BAM 720

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, (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.

**Disqualification**

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

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the OI relates to MA or FAP. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710. 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.

**Overissuance**

**When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700.**

This Administrative Law Judge finds:

Per BRIDGES, the Respondent signed a DHS-1171 on [REDACTED], 2017, acknowledging his rights and responsibilities. On the application Respondent stated he was homeless with a mailing address in [REDACTED] Michigan. The Respondent was mailed a DHS-1605 on

August 22, 2017, informing him of his FAP benefits, and to report any changes to DHS within 10 days. Per Infoview, the Respondent began spending their EBT card exclusively in the State of Mississippi from April 4, 2017, through October 24, 2017. Per work number, the Respondent began working at [REDACTED] with a first paycheck on March 30, 2017. The address used by the Respondent was [REDACTED] [REDACTED] MS, [REDACTED]. Over issuance of benefits is from July 24, 2017, through October 31, 2017, when benefits were closed, in the amount of \$632.00. The Respondent lied at application and misrepresented his alleged residency. The Respondent was living and working in Mississippi, and receiving FAP benefits from the State of Michigan.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, substantial and material evidence on the record that Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits as a result of an intentional program violation which the Department must recoup. The evidence on the record establishes that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation.

### **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, concludes that:

1. The Department **has** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$632.00.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/**collection** procedures for the amount of \$632 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from participation in the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for 12 months.

LL/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Landis Lain**  
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

**DHHS**

Jeanenne Broadnax  
25637 Ecorse Rd.  
Taylor, MI 48180

Wayne County (District 18), DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

L. Bengel via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]