

**Date Mailed:** October 22, 2025  
**Docket No.:** 25-027459  
**Case No.:** [REDACTED]  
**Petitioner:** OFFICE OF INSPECTOR  
GENERAL (OIG)

### **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 Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on October 21, 2025. The Department was represented by Office of Inspector General (OIG) Regulation Agent Rebecca Brown. Respondent [REDACTED] did not appear. The hearing was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4).

A 63-page packet of documents provided by the Department was admitted collectively as the Department's Exhibit A.

### **ISSUES**

1. Did the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits for 12 months?

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

The Administrative Law Judge based on the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record finds as material fact:

1. On January 9, 2024, Respondent submitted a redetermination. The only household income reported was Retirement, Survivors, and Disability Insurance (RSI) income of [REDACTED] per month for Respondent's daughter and RSDI income of [REDACTED] per month for Respondent's son. No household employment was reported.
2. On January 12, 2024, Respondent completed an interview with the Department and the only household income reported was RSDI income of [REDACTED] per month for Respondent's daughter and [REDACTED] per month for Respondent's son. No other household employment was reported. Respondent's rights and responsibilities were reviewed with Respondent during the interview.

3. On January 12, 2024, the Department mailed a notice of case action to Respondent to notify Respondent that Respondent was approved for FAP benefits based on reported earned income of [REDACTED] per month. The Department instructed Respondent to report when Respondent's household exceeded the simplified reporting (SR) limit of \$2,694.00.
4. On July 11, 2024, Respondent submitted a semi-annual contact report to the Department and reported that Respondent was employed beginning June 24, 2024, earning [REDACTED] per hour, and that the employment was ending on September 11, 2024.
5. On September 13, 2024, the Department mailed a notice of case action to Respondent to notify Respondent that Respondent was approved for FAP benefits of [REDACTED] from August 1, 2024, to August 31, 2024; [REDACTED] from September 1, 2024, to September 30, 2024; and [REDACTED] per month from October 1, 2024, to December 31, 2025. The Department instructed Respondent to report when Respondent's household exceeded the simplified reporting (SR) limit of \$2,798.00. The Department also notified Respondent that Respondent's earned income was budgeted for July and the FAP income limit was exceeded so no FAP benefits would be issued in August 2024.
6. Respondent did not have any impairment that would have limited Respondent's understanding of Respondent's reporting responsibilities or Respondent's ability to carry out Respondent's reporting responsibilities.
7. On July 11, 2024, the Department first became aware of Respondent's unreported earned income from [REDACTED] via a semi-annual contact report.
8. Respondent received Respondent's first paycheck from Respondent's employment at [REDACTED] on June 28, 2019, and Respondent received Respondent's last paycheck on September 6, 2024.
9. From December 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023, and May 1, 2024, to July 31, 2024, Respondent was receiving FAP benefits from the Department while Respondent was employed, and Respondent did not timely report to the Department Respondent's earned income.
10. The Department was unaware of Respondent's employment income, so the Department continued to pay FAP benefits to Respondent while Respondent was working and earning income.
11. The Department investigated Respondent's case and determined that it overpaid FAP benefits to Respondent because Respondent had unreported income.

12. The Department determined that Respondent was overpaid [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from December 1, 2023, to December 31, 2023, and May 1, 2024, to July 31, 2024.
13. The Department established a claim for the amount of the overpayment.
14. On July 30, 2025, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent committed an IPV.
15. The Department's OIG requested that Respondent be disqualified from the FAP for 12 months for a first IPV.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a federal food assistance program designed to promote general welfare and to safeguard well-being by increasing food purchasing power. 7 USC 2011 and 7 CFR 271.1. The Department administers its Food Assistance Program (FAP) pursuant to MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-119b; and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015. Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

### **IPV**

An IPV "shall consist of having intentionally: (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of SNAP, SNAP regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of SNAP benefits or EBT cards." 7 CFR 273.16(c). 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. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence, which is so clear, direct, weighty, and convincing that it enables a firm belief as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established. *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995) (citing *In re Jobes*, 108 NJ 394 (1987)).

The Department presented clear and convincing evidence to establish that Respondent had a change in employment and income that Respondent purposely failed to report to the Department so that Respondent could maintain Respondent's FAP benefits. Respondent was required to report changes in Respondent's circumstances to the Department within 10 days of the change. 7 CFR 273.12(a)(2). Although the Department clearly and correctly instructed Respondent to report changes to the Department within 10 days, Respondent failed to report that Respondent had a change in employment and income within 10 days of the date of the change.

## **Disqualification**

In general, individuals found to have committed an IPV through an administrative disqualification hearing shall be ineligible to participate in FAP: (i) for a period of 12 months for the first violation, (ii) for a period of 24 months for the second violation, and (iii) permanently for a third violation. 7 CFR 273.16(b). Only the individual who committed the violation shall be disqualified – not the entire household. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(11).


In this case, there is no evidence that Respondent has ever been found to have committed an IPV related to FAP benefits. Thus, this is Respondent's first IPV related to FAP benefits, and Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from the FAP.

## **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 established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent is personally disqualified from the FAP for 12 months.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



**DANIELLE R. HARKNESS  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**

**APPEAL RIGHTS:** Respondent may appeal this Hearing Decision to the circuit court. Rules for appeals to the circuit court can be found in the Michigan Court Rules (MCR), including MCR 7.101 to MCR 7.123, available at the Michigan Courts website at [courts.michigan.gov](http://courts.michigan.gov). The Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR) cannot provide legal advice, but assistance may be available but assistance may be available through the State Bar of Michigan at <https://lrs.michbar.org> or Michigan Legal Help at <https://michiganlegalhelp.org>. A copy of the circuit court appeal should be sent to MOAHR. A circuit court appeal may result in a reversal of the Hearing Decision.

Either party who disagrees with this Hearing Decision may also send a written request for a rehearing and/or reconsideration to MOAHR within 30 days of the mailing date of this Hearing Decision. The request should include Petitioner's name, the docket number from page 1 of this Hearing Decision, an explanation of the specific reasons for the request, and any documents supporting the request. The request should be sent to MOAHR

- by email to [MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov](mailto:MOAHR-BSD-Support@michigan.gov), OR
- by fax at (517) 763-0155, OR
- by mail addressed to  
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules  
Rehearing/Reconsideration Request  
P.O. Box 30639  
Lansing Michigan 48909-8139

Documents sent via email are not secure and can be faxed or mailed to avoid any potential risks. Requests MOAHR receives more than 30 days from the mailing date of this Hearing Decision may be considered untimely and dismissed.

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Petitioner**

**Via Electronic Mail:**

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG)  
PO BOX 30062  
LANSING, MI 48909-7562  
**MDHHS-OIG-HEARINGS@MICHIGAN.GOV**

**Petitioner**

**Via First Class Mail:**

**Respondent**

