



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: January 22, 2024  
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-005746  
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 January 2, 2024, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Walter Broadworth, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent represented herself.

**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 July [REDACTED] 2020, Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to report changes of employment status and increases of earned 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 8-14.

2. Respondent reported on her July █ 2020, application for assistance that she was on maternity leave from her employment. Exhibit A, pp 12-13.
3. On July █ 2020, the Department notified Respondent that she was eligible for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as a household of three receiving no income and that she was required to report if her household income exceeded \$█ Exhibit A, pp 15-21.
4. The hearing record supports a finding of a gap in Respondent's employment after her June █ 2020, paycheck, but that she failed to report returning to work and receiving earned income from employment with bi-weekly paychecks exceeding \$1,000 starting on August 3, 2020. Exhibit A, pp 22-24.
5. Respondent received Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits totaling \$█ from October 1, 2020, through November 30, 2020. Exhibit A, p 25.
6. On October █ 2022, the Department notified Respondent that she had received a \$█ overissuance of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits due to unreported income that the Department intended to recoup, and Respondent did not dispute that recoupment has already been initiated. Exhibit A, p 31.
7. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on September 12, 2023, to establish that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). Exhibit A, p 2.
8. On September 12, 2023, the Department sent Respondent a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 5-6.
9. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the 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.

Respondent received FAP benefits totaling \$[REDACTED] from October 1, 2020, through November 30, 2020. During that period, she was receiving earned income from employment that she had not reported to the Department. The Department has established a \$[REDACTED] overissuance of FAP benefits due to that unreported income and recoupment of that debt has already been initiated.

### **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.*

The Department's representative presented as a knowledgeable witness who provided a credible account of an investigation of a household of three receiving FAP benefits but no reported income.

Respondent acknowledged the duties and responsibilities of receiving FAP benefits on an application for assistance dated July █ 2020, including the duty to report changes of employment status and increases of earned income. 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 changes of employment and increases of household income in a timely manner. The hearing record supports a finding that Respondent was provided with notice that she was notified of her duty to report changes of employment status and increases of earned income.

On July █ 2020, the Department notified Respondent that she was eligible for FAP benefits as a household of three not receiving any income and that she should report if her household income exceeded \$2,311. Respondent had reported being on maternity leave from her employment. Respondent failed to report returning to work and that in August of 2020, she received gross income totaling \$█. Respondent's earned income from employment would continue through December 21, 2020, and as a result of this unreported income, Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits.

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent intentionally withheld reporting that she had returned to work after her maternity leave and began receiving earned income from her employment for the purposes of 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. 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

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

**Via-Electronic Mail :**

**Petitioner**  
OIG  
**MDHHS-OIG-  
HEARINGS@michigan.gov**

**DHHS**  
Heather Dennis  
Jackson County DHHS  
**MDHHS-Jackson-  
Hearings@michigan.gov**

**Policy-Recoupment**

**StebbinsN**

**MOAHR**

**Via-First Class Mail :**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]