



FH
[REDACTED]

**STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals**

In the Matter of

[REDACTED]

DECISION

FOP/144490

PRELIMINARY RECITALS

Pursuant to a petition filed October 10, 2012, under Wis. Admin. Code § HA 3.03, to review a decision by the Burnett County Department of Social Services in regard to FoodShare benefits (FS), a hearing was held on November 27, 2012, at Siren, Wisconsin.

The issue for determination is whether the petitioner must repay an alleged overpayment of FoodShare.

There appeared at that time and place the following persons:

PARTIES IN INTEREST:

Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

Respondent:

Department of Health Services
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703

By: Carolyn Carroll

Burnett County Department of Social Services
7410 County Road K, #280
Siren, WI 54872

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Michael D. O'Brien

Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The petitioner (CARES # [REDACTED]) is a resident of Burnett County.
2. The petitioner lives with his girlfriend. They have at least one child in common and purchase and prepare food together. There are a total of six persons in the household.

3. The county agency alleges that the petitioner and his girlfriend were overpaid \$2,188 in FoodShare from May through August 2012 because the income he received after returning to work in March 2012 was not counted when determining their benefits.
4. The petitioner earned a total of \$11,175 from March through August 2012 that the agency did not consider when determining his benefits. These wages varied throughout the period and included overtime.
5. The county agency assumed that the petitioner's wages were the same each month.
6. The county agency's worksheet indicates that the petitioner did not earn any money in July or August 2012.

DISCUSSION

Federal regulations require state agencies to “establish a claim against any household that has received more [FoodShare] benefits than it is entitled to receive.” 7 CFR § 273.18(a). This regulation requires the agency to recover all FoodShare overpayments regardless of whose error caused the overpayment. The amount of a FoodShare allotment depends upon net income and the number of persons in the household. The county agency contends that the petitioner's household received \$2,188 more FoodShare than it was entitled to from May through August 2012 because the agency did not count income he earned after returning to work in March 2012. He contends that he reported this to the Great Rivers Consortium two days after returning to work, which is believable because at the hearing he provided the phone number he called from his cell phone. Nevertheless, because the agency must recover all incorrectly paid benefits, this does not prevent its action.

Still, the agency must prove that it is entitled to recover the amount it says is due. Agencies are instructed when determining an overpayment to “[o]nly use the income and expenses reported or required to be reported for each month of the adjustment period.” *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 7.3.2.1. The petitioner was required to report the change in income by the 10th day of the month following his return to work, which the preponderance of the credible evidence indicates that he did. *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 6.1.1.2.; 7 CFR § 273.12. He would then have 10 more days to verify that income. *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 1.2.1; 273.2(f). Changes that reduce benefits generally do not go into effect until the agency has had adequate time to process a negative notice. *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 6.1.3.6.; 7 CFR 273.12(c)(2)(i).

When determining earned income, the agency must count “income only for the month in which it is received.” *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 4.3.2. This is based on the simple premise that the less money a person has at any particular time, the less he can spend on food. When determining future benefits, the agency must always make an educated guess about a recipient's income based upon his past and current circumstances. When recovering an overpayment, it generally is no longer necessary to guess at what the recipient earned—assuming the agency can gather sufficient information about his income during the alleged overpayment period.

The total amount the petitioner earned during the relevant period is not in doubt, but the evidence the agency and its investigator, O'Brien & Associates, submitted at the hearing is insufficient to prove that he owed \$2,188. The only documentation was blurry and unreadable, and no one could explain how the agency determined the amount of the overpayment. After the hearing, the agency submitted worksheets prepared by O'Brien & Associates breaking down the overpayment month by month, but these too are deficient because they assume that the petitioner earned the same amount of money each month when the testimony indicated that inconsistent overtime caused his income to vary throughout the period. The inconsistency of his income is important because the agency determined that his average income made him ineligible during all four months of the overpayment period. This means that any additional income in any particular month would not lead to a greater overpayment during that month but that less income

might allow him to be eligible, which would lead to a smaller overpayment in that month. It does not appear that the agency or O'Brien & Associates made any attempt to obtain the petitioner's monthly income figures.

Although the agency has not established that the petitioner owes \$2,188, it is clear that he owes something because his household income averaged about \$2,100 a month more than the agency used to determine his allotment. The agency's overpayment correctly determined that although he began working in March, it cannot collect any overpayment until May because that is when his full allotment would have ended after considering the time needed to process a negative notice. But the overpayment should be based upon his household's actual income during the remaining months in question. It is unclear what that income was in May and June because of the average used by the agency. In July and August, the agency's own worksheet submitted after the hearing indicates that he did not earn any money, so his total household income returned to what it was before he became employed. This means that his income was the same as that used to determine the benefits he actually received. As a result, he was not overpaid FoodShare in those months.

I am going to remand this matter to the agency with instructions to end its attempts to recover FoodShare provided in July and August 2012 and to redetermine the FoodShare overpayment for May and June 2012 using the petitioner's actual household income during this period. The petitioner must cooperate with the agency to ensure that it receives adequate documentation of his earned income. If the time he requires to document this income causes the agency to take more than 10 days to determine the new amount of the overpayment, he should request that the Division of Hearings and Appeals leave the record open by calling 715-836-4901,

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The petitioner did not receive an overpayment of FoodShare in July and August 2012 because his income was the same as the amount the agency used to determine his benefits.
2. The agency incorrectly determined the amount of the petitioner's FoodShare overpayment for May and June 2012 because it did not base that overpayment on his actual income.

THEREFORE, it is

ORDERED

That this matter is remanded to the county agency with instructions that within 10 days of the date of this decision it end its attempts to recover FoodShare provided to the petitioner's household in July and August 2012 and that it redetermine the amount of the overpayment in May and June 2012 by calculating that overpayment based upon the petitioner's actual household income during those months. The petitioner shall cooperate with the agency in providing any documentation it requires to determine his actual income during those months. If he disagrees with the agency's calculations, he may file a new appeal, but he may not relitigate the underlying finding that he must repay benefits received as a result of the agency's error.

REQUEST FOR A REHEARING

This is a final administrative decision. If you think this decision is based on a serious mistake in the facts or the law, you may request a rehearing. You may also ask for a rehearing if you have found new evidence which would change the decision. Your request must explain what mistake the Administrative Law Judge made and why it is important or you must describe your new evidence and tell why you did not have it at your first hearing. If you do not explain these things, your request will have to be denied.

To ask for a rehearing, send a written request to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875. Send a copy of your request to the other people named in this decision as

"PARTIES IN INTEREST." Your request for a rehearing must be received no later than 20 days after the date of the decision. Late requests cannot be granted.

The process for asking for a rehearing is in Wis. Stat. § 227.49. A copy of the statutes can be found at your local library or courthouse.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be served and filed with the appropriate court no more than 30 days after the date of this hearing decision (or 30 days after a denial of rehearing, if you ask for one).

For purposes of appeal to circuit court, the Respondent in this matter is the Department of Health Services. After filing the appeal with the appropriate court, it must be served on the Secretary of that Department, either personally or by certified mail. The address of the Department is: 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. A copy should also be sent to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, 5005 University Avenue, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53705-5400.

The appeal must also be served on the other "PARTIES IN INTEREST" named in this decision. The process for appeals to the Circuit Court is in Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53.

Given under my hand at the City of Madison,
Wisconsin, this 12th day of December, 2012

\sMichael D. O'Brien
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals



State of Wisconsin \DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

David H. Schwarz
Suite 201
5005 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096
FAX: (608) 264-9885
email: DHAmail@wisconsin.gov
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on December 12, 2012.

Burnett County Department of Social Services
Public Assistance Collection Unit
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability