

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM  
ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS FOR THE  
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 2013-5263  
Issue No.: 3055  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: August 20, 2013  
County: Oakland-04 County

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Corey A. Arendt

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37 upon the Department of Human Services' (Department) request for a hearing. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on August 20, 2013 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] [REDACTED] of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Respondent did not appear at the hearing and it was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e), Mich Admin Code R 400.3130(5), or Mich Admin Code R 400.3187(5).

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?
2. Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving 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. October 12, 2012 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG  has  has not requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits from September of 2008 through August of 2011.

4. Between September of 2008 and August of 2011, the Respondent had multiple transactions over \$40 and multiple concurrent transactions at [REDACTED] that combined totaled \$ [REDACTED]
5. During the time periods in question, the inventory at [REDACTED] was limited. The inventory consisted of milk, pop, juice, and alcohol type beverages. There was little meat products and no frozen foods.
6. IN September of 2008, the USDA-OIG determined that [REDACTED] was trafficking benefits.
7. The owners of [REDACTED] agreed EBT purchases over \$40 or more were trafficked.
8. On March 10, 2012, [REDACTED] interviewed the Respondent. During the interview, the Respondent told [REDACTED] she had trafficked FAP benefits at [REDACTED]
9. Respondent  was  was not aware of the responsibility to report all changes within 10 days.
10. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
11. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is September 2008 through August 2011.
12. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from the State of Michigan that were used at [REDACTED]
13. Respondent  did  did not receive an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] under the  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC program.
14. The Department  has  has not established that Respondent committed an IPV.
15. This was Respondent's  first  second  third IPV.
16. A notice of disqualification hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and  was  was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

Department policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The FAP [formerly known as the Food Stamp (F S) program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The Department

(formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10, *et seq.*, and 1999 AC, Rule 400.3001 through Rule 400.3015.

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700.

Suspected IPV means an OI exists for which all three of the following conditions exist:

- The client intentionally failed to report information or intentionally gave incomplete or inaccurate information needed to make a correct benefit determination, and
- The client was clearly and correctly instructed regarding his or her reporting responsibilities, and
- The client has no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his or her understanding or ability to fulfill their reporting responsibilities.

IPV is suspected when there is 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.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. 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 concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720.

A person is disqualified from FAP when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. These FAP trafficking disqualifications are a result of the following actions:

- Fraudulently using, transferring, altering, acquiring, or possessing coupons, authorization cards, or access devices; or
- Redeeming or presenting for payment coupons known to be fraudulently obtained or transferred.

The length of the disqualification period depends on the dollar amount of the FAP benefits trafficked. A person is disqualified for life for a FAP trafficking conviction of \$500 or more. The standard IPV disqualification period is applied to FAP trafficking convictions less than \$500. BEM 203, p. 3. The Department did not seek the lifetime disqualification and only requested a 12 month disqualification.

Based on the credible testimony and other evidence presented, I have concluded the OIG established, under the clear and convincing standard, that Respondent committed an IPV in this matter by trafficking their FAP benefits.

**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, concludes that:

1. Respondent  did  did not commit an IPV
2. Respondent  did  did not receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the following program(s)  FIP  FAP  SDA  CDC.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for 12 months.



**Corey A. Arendt**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: August 21, 2013

Date Mailed: August 21, 2013

**NOTICE:** The law provides that within 30 days of receipt of the above Decision and Order, the Respondent may appeal it to the circuit court for the county in which he/she lives.

CAA/las

cc:

