



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

MARLON I. BROWN, DPA  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: March 29, 2024  
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-005690  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully**

**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, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130, and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on March 20, 2024, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Rebecca Brown, 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 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. On an application for assistance dated November [REDACTED] 2020, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of household income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Exhibit A, pp 9-14.

2. Respondent reported on her November [REDACTED] 2020, application for assistance that she was not receiving any income as a household of one. Respondent also reported that she was not responsible for any shelter expenses. Exhibit A, p 13.
3. Department records indicate that on November [REDACTED] 2020, Respondent reported during an eligibility interview that she was receiving unemployment compensation benefits of \$[REDACTED] per week. Exhibit A, pp 24-26.
4. On a Redetermination (DHS-1010) form received by the Department on September [REDACTED] 2021, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of household income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Exhibit A, pp 27-31.
5. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that her September [REDACTED] 2021, Redetermination form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete. Exhibit A, p 30.
6. Respondent reported on her September [REDACTED] 2021, Redetermination form that she was receiving bi-weekly Unemployment Compensation Benefits of \$[REDACTED] Exhibit A, p 29.
7. On November [REDACTED] 2021, the Department notified Respondent that she was eligible for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a household of one receiving a gross monthly income of \$[REDACTED] Exhibit A, pp 32-39.
8. Respondent began receiving Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSDI) payments on October 1, 2021, and continued to receive those payments through August 31, 2022. Exhibit A, pp 40-41.
9. Respondent received monthly pension payments in the gross monthly amount of \$[REDACTED] from December 1, 2020, through August 31, 2022. Exhibit A, pp 50-57.
10. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$[REDACTED] from December 1, 2020, through August 31, 2022. Exhibit A, pp 62-69.
11. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on September 7, 2023, to establish that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). Exhibit A, p 2.
12. On September 7, 2023, the Department sent Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$[REDACTED] overpayment. Exhibit A, pp 114-116.
13. On September 7, 2023, the Department sent Respondent a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-6.
14. This was Respondent's first established IPV.

15. A notice of hearing was mailed on February 14, 2024, to Respondent at her 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), 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 funded under the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 through 7 USC 2036a. It is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. The Department administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 of the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1 *et seq*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through 400.3011.

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 OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$500 or more, or
  - the total OI 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual BAM 720 (October 1, 2017), pp 12-13.

## Overissuance

An “overissuance” is an amount owed because of benefits that are overpaid, which the Department must establish and collect. 7 CFR 273.18(a). When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (October 1, 2018), p 1.

Clients must report changes in circumstance that potentially affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days of receiving the first payment reflecting the change. Changes that must be reported include changes of household income. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 105 (March 1, 2024), p 12. The Department will act on a change reported by means other than a tape match within 15 workdays after becoming aware of the change, except that the Department will act on a change other than a tape match within 10 days of becoming aware of the change. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 220 (November 1, 2023), p 7. A pended negative action occurs when a negative action requires timely notice based on the eligibility rules in this item. Timely notice means that the action taken by the department is effective at least 12 calendar days following the date of the department’s action. BAM 220, p 12.

On an application for assistance dated November █ 2020, Respondent acknowledged the duty to report any changes of household income. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Respondent reported on her November █ 2020, application for assistance that she was not receiving any income, but then disclosed during an eligibility interview that she was receiving weekly unemployment checks of \$█. Respondent failed to report that she had started receiving social security payments on October 1, 2020.

On a Redetermination form received by the Department on September █ 2021, Respondent reported that she was receiving bi-weekly unemployment checks of \$█ but denied receiving any other income. Respondent acknowledged under penalties of perjury that her September █ 2021, Redetermination form was examined by or read to her, and, to the best of her knowledge, contained facts that were true and complete.

Respondent failed to report to the Department when she began receiving social security payments in the gross monthly amount of \$█ on October 1, 2021, and these payments continued through August 31, 2022. Respondent also failed to report that she was receiving monthly pension payments in the gross monthly amount of \$█. If Respondent had reported her social security payments in a timely manner, the Department would have redetermined her eligibility for ongoing FAP benefits by the first benefit period after November 2, 2021.

Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$█ from December 1, 2020, through August 31, 2022. If Respondent had reported all of her household income in a timely manner, she would not have been eligible for any of those benefits because of her income

exceeded the \$ [REDACTED] net monthly income limit for her to receive any FAP benefits. During that period, Respondent received additional supplemental FAP benefits authorized by the Consolidated Appropriations Act and the Department does not have authority to recoup those benefits. Therefore, Respondent received a \$ [REDACTED] overissuance of FAP benefits.

### **Intentional Program Violation**

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; see also 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6).

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct, and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), reh den 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

Respondent acknowledged the duties and responsibilities of receiving FAP benefits on an application for assistance dated November [REDACTED] 2020, and a Redetermination form received by the Department on September [REDACTED] 2021. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. It is the Department's practice to provide pamphlet material to eligible FAP recipients advising them of their duty to report all household income. The hearing record supports a finding that Respondent was provided with notice that she was required to report all household income in a timely manner.

Respondent failed to report on her November [REDACTED] 2020, application form or during her November [REDACTED] 2020, eligibility interview that she had started receiving social security payments on October 1, 2020, or that she was receiving monthly pension payments.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld reporting her monthly pension payments and her social security payments for the purposes of becoming eligible for and maintaining her eligibility for FAP benefits that she would not have been eligible for otherwise.

## **Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15-16. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group if the disqualified person 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, or except when the OI relates to MA. BAM 720, p. 13. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) BAM 710 (January 1, 2018), p. 2. 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.

The record evidence indicates that this is Respondent's first established IPV violation.


The Department has established an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

## **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 Intentional Program Violation (IPV).
2. Respondent did receive an overissuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$[REDACTED]
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$[REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/dm

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kevin Scully**  
Administrative Law Judge  
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings  
and Rules (MOAHR)

**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

**Via-Electronic Mail :**

**Petitioner**  
OIG  
**MDHHS-OIG-  
HEARINGS@michigan.gov**  
**DHHS**  
Richard Latimore  
Wayne-Conner-DHHS  
**MDHHS-Wayne-57-  
Hearings@michigan.gov**

**StebbinsN**

**Policy-Recoupment**

**BSC4HearingDecisions**

**Via-First Class Mail :**

**MOAHR  
Respondent**

██████████  
██████████████████  
██