

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

██████████
██████████████████
████████████████████

Reg. No.: 14-004383
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: ██████████
Hearing Date: July 30, 2014
County: Wayne-District 49

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of 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 July 30, 2014 from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by ██████████, Regulation Agent 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 400.3178(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, by clear and convincing evidence, commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the competent, material, and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on June 18, 2014 to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.

2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent was aware that it was unlawful to buy or sell FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
5. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to comply with the policies and/or laws that govern FAP benefits.
7. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is January 1, 2014 through March 31, 2014.
8. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent is alleged to have trafficked [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.
9. This was Respondent's first alleged FAP IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the US Post Office as undeliverable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT). Prior to August 1, 2008, Department policies were contained in the Department of Human Services Program Administrative Manuals (PAM), Department of Human Services Program Eligibility Manual (PEM), and Department of Human Services Reference Schedules Manual (RFS).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp (FS) 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 Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through R 400.3015.

Intentional Program Violation

An Intentional Program Violation (IPV) is a benefit overissuance resulting from the willful withholding of information or other violation of law or regulation by the client or his/her authorized representative. Bridges Program Glossary (BPG) (1-1-2014), p 36.

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 ██████ or more, or
 - the total OI amount is less than ██████, 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.

BAM 720 (7-1-2013), p. 10.

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 reporting responsibilities.

BAM 700 (7-1-2013), p. 6; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked or is trafficking FAP benefits. BAM 720, p 1. "Trafficking" is the buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. BAM 700. A person is disqualified from FAP

when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and **disqualification agreement** or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. BAM 203. These FAP trafficking disqualifications are a result of: (1) fraudulently using, transferring, altering, acquiring, or possessing coupons, authorization cards, or access devices; or (2) redeeming or presenting for payment coupons known to be fraudulently obtained or transferred. BEM 203.

The length of the disqualification period depends on the dollar amount of the FAP benefits trafficked. BEM 203. A person is disqualified for life for a FAP trafficking conviction of ■■■■ or more. BEM 203. The standard IPV disqualification period is applied to FAP trafficking convictions less than \$500. BEM 203.

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 (emphasis in original); see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true. See Michigan Civil Jury Instruction (Mich Civ JI) 8.01.

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the 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 OIG Agent contends that Respondent committed an IPV when he engaged in the unauthorized use of Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card to traffic FAP benefits. Specifically, the Department OIG Agent asserts that Respondent knowingly and intentionally used a deceased person's EBT card to make illegal FAP purchases.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The following is the Administrative Law Judge's findings based on the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record.

In this case, the record shows that a [REDACTED] (a FAP recipient with a household size of 1) died on January 23, 2014, but that Respondent continued to use her EBT card after her death. The record contained [REDACTED] IG-311 EBT history of FAP purchases which revealed that her EBT card was used after her death. The record showed that the decedent's daughter stated that she gave decedent's EBT card to Respondent, who used it to make purchases before her death. Respondent spoke with the Department's OIG Agent and confessed that he used the decedent's EBT card after her death to purchase food for his family. The evidence also shows that Respondent is an active FAP recipient.

The salient issue is whether there is clear and convincing evidence on the record to show that Respondent committed an IPV when he allegedly used the decedent's EBT card to make illegal FAP purchases. It should be noted at the onset that Respondent signed a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (MAHS-827) where he indicated that he admitted to the facts as presented and understand that he will be disqualified from the programs listed on the notice and understands that he will not have a hearing. Despite the admission, the record shows that Respondent did, in fact, use an EBT card belonging to a non-group member without permission to make purchases. Respondent was advised of his rights and responsibilities concerning program benefits. (Exhibit 1, pp. 11-40) Respondent's signature on the assistance application in this record certifies that he was aware of these rights and responsibilities. (Exhibit 1, p. 11) Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that limits his understanding or ability. This Administrative Law Judge finds that the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record shows that Respondent committed an IPV because he engaged in FAP trafficking when he used the EBT card from a deceased person.

Disqualification

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720 (7-1-2013), p. 12. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 13.

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. 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.

Here, because the Department has shown that Respondent was guilty of his first IPV concerning FAP benefits, Respondent shall be personally disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of 1 year.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than they are entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1.

In this matter, the Department has shown that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits. According to BAM 700, the Department may recoup this OI.

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. Respondent did commit an IPV by clear and convincing evidence.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED].

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 FAP for a period of 12 months.



C. Adam Purnell
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **8/1/2014**

Date Mailed: **8/1/2014**

CAP/sw

