

Reasons for Decision:

Order # AP1718-0503

The appellant appealed that an overpayment was assessed against their income assistance file.

The program representative stated that on <date removed> the appellant requested that their rent amount be included in their monthly budget rather than paid directly to their landlord. A letter was sent to them on <date removed> advising that they are now responsible to pay their own rent to the landlord.

On <date removed>, the appellant advised their worker that they had a potential job offer and requested funds for transportation and clothing for employment. The appellant had previously received a clothing allowance for employment in <date removed>. The program received a letter from the appellant's employer confirming that they have accepted a position and will start employment with them on <date removed>. The program was advised by the employer that the appellant's first pay would be <date removed> and they were issued funds for a bus pass for the month of <month removed> and funds for clothing. It was also confirmed that the appellant had missed time and that termination could result in an overpayment. On <date removed>, the program received confirmation from the employer that their last day worked was <date removed>. The cheque issued to the appellant was picked up and cashed on <date removed>, which was after they were terminated. Also on the same date, the program received confirmation from the appellant's landlord, that they had left their rental unit without notice as of <date removed> and is in rental arrears since <date removed>.

The program assessed an overpayment on <date removed> for shelter benefits they received when they were no longer residing at their residence and for transportation and clothing allowance for employment supports when they were not employed.

The appellant stated they agree that an overpayment should apply, however, feels like they are paying for it twice. In regards to the shelter benefits, they do not understand why they are responsible to pay Employment and Income Assistance (EIA) for an overpayment for rent, as well as their previous residence with Manitoba Housing. The appellant is in rental arrears with Manitoba Housing and has been making payments to them. The appellant is also deducted an overpayment with EIA for shelter allowance. The appellant feels that they are making double payments to the same department. In regards to cashing the cheque for transportation and clothing for employment, the appellant stated that they cashed the cheque, as they still needed the money for transportation as they said they were looking for work.

After carefully considering the written and verbal information, the Board has determined that the program is correct in assessing an overpayment on the appellant's EIA file. It was clarified for the appellant at the hearing that EIA and Manitoba Housing are two separate programs. The appellant is responsible to pay back EIA for shelter funds they received, which they were not entitled to, and to Manitoba Housing for rental arrears. Therefore, the Board must confirm the decision of the Director and this appeal is dismissed.

DISCLAIMER

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.