



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

MARLON I. BROWN, DPA  
ACTING DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: November 27, 2023  
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-003564  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen Lack**

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS or the Department) requested a hearing alleging that Respondent [REDACTED] committed an intentional program violation (IPV). Pursuant to MDHHS' request and in accordance with MCL 400.9, 7 CFR 273.16, 42 CFR 431.230(b), and 45 CFR 235.110, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge. After due notice, a hearing was held via telephone conference on October 24, 2023.

Craig Curtiss, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), represented MDHHS.

Respondent did not appear at the hearing, and it was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4); Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130(5); or Mich Admin Code, R 400.3178(5).

**ISSUES**

1. Did MDHHS establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an IPV concerning Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for FAP?
3. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of FAP benefits that MDHHS is entitled to recoup and/or collect as a recipient claim?

### FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. From November 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021 (fraud period), Respondent received \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits. (Exhibit A, pp. 74-78)
2. On November [REDACTED] 2020, Respondent submitted an Assistance Application for FAP for herself. Respondent reported her home address as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] MI. Respondent listed no other household members and reported the only income was from her unemployment compensation benefits (UCB). (Exhibit A, pp. 10-14)
3. On November [REDACTED] 2020 an interview was completed with Respondent. Respondent reported that there were three children in the home, one daughter Respondent has full time, and the other two children Respondent has 15 nights per month. Respondent reported the only income was from her UCB. The rights and responsibilities were reviewed with Respondent. (Exhibit A, pp. 23-25)
4. On December [REDACTED] 2020, Respondent submitted an Assistance Application for FAP for herself and three children. Respondent reported her home address as [REDACTED] [REDACTED] MI. Respondent listed no other household members and reported the only income was other income of \$ [REDACTED] per month. (Exhibit A, pp. 26-32)
5. Respondent's signature on the assistance applications certified that the information she provided was accurate and that she read and understood the rights and responsibilities, which would include providing accurate information and timely reporting any changes. (Exhibit A, pp. 14-22 and 32-40; Regulation Agent Testimony)
6. A December [REDACTED] 2020 case comment indicates no social security number was provided for one of the children so the child was not part of the FAP group at that time. (Exhibit A, p. 42)
7. A February [REDACTED] 2021 case comment indicates Respondent reported the child's social security number and the case was updated. (Exhibit A, p. 42)
8. A March [REDACTED] 2021 case comment documents that a New Hire was returned, income was pulled from a report from The Work Number and was budgeted. UCB was being budgeted but Respondent had not received a payment since September 19, 2020 plus the case was under review. UCB was ended. (Exhibit A, p. 42)
9. A September [REDACTED] 2021 case comment documents that Respondent reported the father of the children had returned to the home. FAP was denied due to income. (Exhibit A, p. 41)

10. Respondent and the father of the children were divorced on December █ 2019. At that time there were two children. The father was to have primary physical custody of the children and Respondent was to have approximately 78 overnights per year with the children. The property at █ █ MI was awarded to the father of the children. (Exhibit A, pp. 43-57)
11. On September █ 2021, the father of the children sold the property at █ █ MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 58-60)
12. On October █ 2021, the father of the children purchased the property at █ MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 61-63)
13. A report from The Work Number documents that the father of the children was employed with █ from September █ 2013 to June █ 2022. He reported his address as █, MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 64-67)
14. In a February █ 2022 Hearing Decision, the Administrative Law Judge determined that the evidence overwhelmingly established that the father of the children resided with Respondent. Therefore, the Department properly included him in the FAP group and terminated FAP benefits beginning January 2022. (Exhibit A, pp. 69-73)
15. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to accurately report information and to timely report any changes. (Exhibit A, pp. 14-22, 25, and 32-40; Regulation Agent Testimony)
16. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the ability to understand or fulfill the reporting requirements. (Exhibit A, pp. 12, 24, and 29)
17. Respondent has no prior FAP IPV disqualifications. (Exhibit A, p. 4)
18. On June 29, 2023, MDHHS' OIG filed a hearing request alleging that Respondent intentionally failed to report a mandatory group member and his income to the Department and as a result, received FAP benefits from November 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021 (fraud period) that Respondent was ineligible to receive. OIG requested that (i) Respondent repay \$█ to MDHHS for FAP benefits that Respondent was ineligible to receive and (ii) Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of 12 months due to committing an IPV. (Exhibit A, pp. 1-115)
19. 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**

MDHHS policies are contained in the MDHHS 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 funded under the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 7 USC 2036a. It is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. MDHHS administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 of the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1 *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to R 400.3031.

### **Intentional Program Violation**

An IPV occurs when a recipient of MDHHS benefits intentionally made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed, or withheld facts. 7 CFR 273.16(c)(1). Effective October 1, 2014, MDHHS's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases where (1) the total repayment amount sought from Respondent for all programs combined is \$500 or more or (2) the total repayment amount sought from Respondent for all programs combined is less than \$500 but the group has a previous IPV, the matter involves concurrent receipt of assistance, the IPV involves FAP trafficking, or the alleged fraud is committed by a state government employee. BAM 720 (October 1, 2017), p. 12-13.

To establish an IPV, MDHHS must present clear and convincing evidence that the household member committed, and intended to commit, the IPV. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6); BAM 720, p. 1. Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in "a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue." *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102, 114-115; 793 NW2d 533 (2010); see also M Civ JI 8.01. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing; conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing despite the fact that it has been contradicted. *Smith* at 115. The clear and convincing standard is "the most demanding standard applied in civil cases." *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995). For an IPV based on inaccurate reporting, MDHHS policy also requires that the individual have been clearly and correctly instructed regarding the reporting responsibilities and have no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits the ability to understand or fulfill these reporting responsibilities. BAM 720, p. 1.

In this case, MDHHS alleges that Respondent committed an IPV based on Respondent intentionally failing to report a mandatory group member and his income to the Department, resulting in receiving FAP benefits from November 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021 (fraud period) that Respondent was ineligible to receive.

The Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibilities to accurately report information and to timely report any changes to the Department. Department policy requires clients to completely and truthfully answer all questions on forms and in interview. BAM 105 (July 1, 2020) p. 9. Households must also report all

changes in household composition, such as the addition or loss of a household member, as well as changes in residence and the resulting change in shelter costs. 7 CFR 273.12(a)(1)(ii) and 7 CFR 273.12(a)(1)(iii) Department policy requires clients to report any change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days. This includes changes with household composition and residence. BAM 105, pp. 11-13. Respondent's signature on the Assistance Applications certified that the information she provided was accurate and that she read and understood the rights and responsibilities, which would include providing accurate information and timely reporting any changes. The rights and responsibilities were reviewed with Respondent during the interviews. (Exhibit A, pp. 14-22, 25, and 32-40; Regulation Agent Testimony). Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the ability to understand or fulfill the reporting requirements. (Exhibit A, pp. 12, 24, and 29).

On November █ 2020, Respondent submitted an Assistance Application for FAP for herself. Respondent reported her home address as █ MI. Respondent listed no other household members and reported the only income was from her unemployment compensation benefits (UCB). (Exhibit A, pp. 10-14). On November █ 2020 an interview was completed with Respondent. Respondent reported that there were three children in the home, one daughter Respondent has full time, and the other two children Respondent has 15 nights per month. Respondent reported the only income was from her UCB. The rights and responsibilities were reviewed with Respondent. (Exhibit A, pp. 23-25).

On December █ 2020, Respondent submitted an Assistance Application for FAP for herself and three children. Respondent reported her home address as █ MI. Respondent listed no other household members and reported the only income was other income of \$█ per month. (Exhibit A, pp. 26-32)

A December █ 2020 case comment indicates no social security number was provided for one of the children so the child was not part of the FAP group at that time. (Exhibit A, p. 42). A February █ 2021 case comment indicates Respondent reported the child's social security number and the case was updated. (Exhibit A, p. 42).

A March █ 2021 case comment documents that a New Hire was returned, income was pulled from a report from The Work Number and was budgeted. UCB was being budgeted but Respondent had not received a payment since September █ 2020 plus the case was under review. UCB was ended. (Exhibit A, p. 42).

A September █ 2021 case comment documents that Respondent reported the father of the children had returned to the home. FAP was denied due to income. (Exhibit A, p. 41).

Respondent and the father of the children were divorced on December █ 2019. At that time there were two children. The father was to have primary physical custody of the children and Respondent was to have approximately 78 overnights per year with the children. The property at █ MI was awarded to the father of the

children. (Exhibit A, pp. 43-57). On September [REDACTED] 2021, the father of the children sold the property at [REDACTED] MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 58-60).

On October [REDACTED] 2021, the father of the children purchased the property at [REDACTED] MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 61-63).

A report from The Work Number documents that the father of the children was employed with [REDACTED] from September [REDACTED] 2013 to June [REDACTED] 2022. He reported his address as [REDACTED] MI. (Exhibit A, pp. 64-67).

In a February [REDACTED] 2022 Hearing Decision, the Administrative Law Judge determined that the evidence overwhelmingly established that the father of the children resided with Respondent. Therefore, the Department properly included him in the FAP group and terminated FAP benefits beginning January 2022. (Exhibit A, pp. 69-73).

The evidence shows that Respondent did not accurately and timely report the household composition when she was receiving FAP benefits, as required per policy. The father of the children was a mandatory group member, and his income should have been included in the FAP budgets. Respondent's failure to accurately and timely report the household composition resulted in an OI of FAP benefits. Therefore, MDHHS has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.

### **IPV Disqualification**

An individual who is found pursuant to an IPV disqualification hearing to have committed a FAP IPV is disqualified from receiving benefits for the same program for 12 months for the first IPV, 24 months for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1); BAM 720, p. 16. As discussed above, MDHHS has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV. Respondent has no prior FAP IPV disqualifications. (Exhibit A, p. 4). Because this was Respondent's first IPV for FAP, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from receipt of FAP benefits.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, MDHHS must attempt to recoup the OI as a recipient claim. 7 CFR 273.18(a)(2); BAM 700, (October 1, 2018), p. 1. The amount of a FAP OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. 7 CFR 273.18(c)(1); BAM 720, p. 8; BAM 715 (October 1, 2017), p. 6; BAM 705 (October 1, 2018), p. 6.

In this case, MDHHS alleged that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits totaling \$[REDACTED] during the fraud period. From November 1, 2020 to September 30, 2021 (fraud period), Respondent received \$[REDACTED] in FAP benefits. (Exhibit A, pp. 74-78). When the corrected household composition and income was utilized to redetermine eligibility for FAP, Respondent's household was not eligible for FAP benefits during the fraud period.

(Exhibit A, pp. 91-113). Therefore, MDHHS is entitled to repayment from Respondent of \$ [REDACTED] in overissued FAP benefits for 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. MDHHS has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from FAP.
3. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

**IT IS ORDERED** that MDHHS initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with MDHHS policy for a FAP OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] less any amounts already recouped/collected for the fraud period.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Respondent be personally disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.

CL/dm

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Colleen Lack  
Administrative Law Judge

**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**  
Marlena Huddleston  
Muskegon County DHHS  
**MDHHS-Muskegon-  
Hearing@michigan.gov**

**Policy-Recoupment**

**StebbinsN**

**MOAHR**

**Via-First Class Mail :**

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]