



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: July 6, 2020
MOAHR Docket No.: 20-003585
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jeffrey Kemm

HEARING DECISION

On March 11, 2020, Petitioner, [REDACTED], requested a hearing to dispute a notice of overissuance. Following Petitioner's hearing request, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9, 7 CFR 273.15, and Mich Admin Code, R 792.11002. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on July 1, 2020. Petitioner appeared with his case manager, [REDACTED]. Respondent, Department of Health and Human Services (Department), had Jason Morris, Recoupment Specialist, appear as its representative. Neither party had any additional witnesses. A Kinyarwanda interpreter, [REDACTED], provided interpretation for the hearing.

One exhibit was admitted into evidence during the hearing. A 102-page packet of documents provided by the Department was admitted collectively as the Department's Exhibit A.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly determine that Petitioner owes the Department a debt of \$1,094.00 for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that were overissued to him from October 2019 through November 2019?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Petitioner is a FAP recipient.
2. In August 2019, Petitioner and his spouse began working at [REDACTED].
3. Petitioner did not report his or his spouse's employment to the Department.

4. The Department continued to issue FAP benefits to Petitioner without taking into consideration his change in household income from his and his spouse's new employment.
5. The Department issued Petitioner FAP benefits of \$547.00 per month from October 2019 through November 2019 based on a budgeted household income of [REDACTED] per month.
6. Petitioner's household income was [REDACTED] in October 2019 and [REDACTED] in November 2019.
7. The Department discovered that Petitioner had an unreported change in household income, and the Department determined that it overissued FAP benefits to Petitioner as a result.
8. The Department recalculated the amount of FAP benefits that Petitioner was eligible for by taking into consideration his and his spouse's income from their employment at [REDACTED].
9. The Department determined that Petitioner was eligible for \$0.00 in October 2019 and \$0.00 in November 2019.
10. The Department subtracted the total amount of FAP benefits that Petitioner was eligible for from the total amount of FAP benefits he received from October 2019 through November 2019, and the Department determined that Petitioner was overissued \$1,094.00.
11. On February 24, 2020, the Department mailed a notice of overissuance to Petitioner to notify him that he received an overissuance of \$1,094.00 in FAP benefits from October 2019 through November 2019.
12. On March 11, 2020, Petitioner requested a hearing to dispute the notice of overissuance.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) 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 administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001-.3011.

When a client receives more benefits than he was entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700 (October 1, 2018), p. 1. The overissuance amount is the amount of benefits in excess of the amount the client was eligible to receive. *Id.* at 2. In this case, the Department issued Petitioner more FAP benefits than what he was eligible to receive because the Department issued Petitioner FAP benefits without taking into consideration all of his household income. The Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that the total amount overissued was \$1,094.00, and Petitioner did not present any evidence to rebut the Department's evidence. Therefore, I must find that the Department properly determined that Petitioner owes the Department a debt of \$1,094.00.


Petitioner argued that he should not be responsible for paying the overissuance because it was not his fault that he was overissued FAP benefits since his case manager reported his and his spouse's employment to the Department. There was insufficient evidence presented to establish that Petitioner's and his spouse's employment at [REDACTED] was reported to the Department timely. In any event, regardless of whether the overissuance was due to the Department's error or Petitioner's error, the Department is required to recoup the overissuance when the amount involved is \$250.00 or more. *Id.* at 10. The Department acted in accordance with its policies when it pursued the overissuance because the amount involved was more than \$250.00.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department did act in accordance with its policies and the applicable law when it determined that Petitioner owes the Department a debt of \$1,094.00 for FAP benefits that were overissued to him from October 2019 through November 2019.

IT IS ORDERED that the Department's decision is AFFIRMED.

JK/ml



Jeffrey Kemm
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 Department Rep.

MDHHS-Recoupment – Via Electronic Mail

DHHS

Kalamazoo County DHHS – Via Electronic Mail

OIG – Via Electronic Mail

BSC3 – Via Electronic Mail

M. Holden – Via Electronic Mail

D. Sweeney – Via Electronic Mail

Petitioner

[REDACTED] – Via First Class Mail
[REDACTED] MI [REDACTED]