

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-002001  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: [REDACTED]  
Hearing Date: July 1, 2014  
County: Wayne County DHS #17

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Gary F Heisler

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge for an Intentional Program Violation hearing pursuant to MCL 400.9 and MCL 400.37, 7 CFR 273.16, MAC R 400.3130, and MAC R 400.3178 upon the Department of Human Services' request. After due notice, a hearing was held on July 1, 2014. Respondent and his spouse appeared and testified. Respondent was represented by [REDACTED]. Participants on behalf of the Department of Human Services (Department) included [REDACTED].

**ISSUE**

Whether Respondent engaged in trafficking Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$2,539?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

- (1) Respondent was an ongoing recipient of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Respondent signed the affidavit in the Assistance Application (DHS-1171) certifying that he was aware of the conditions that constitute fraud/IPV and trafficking and the potential consequences.
- (2) In December 2012, a USDA-FNS investigation determined that the [REDACTED] was trafficking Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. The determination was based on analysis of the store's Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card transactions, the inventory and mix of authorized items carried at the store, the transaction records of similar stores in the same geographic area and statements from the owner [REDACTED].

- (3) Between September 18, 2011 and January 6, 2013 Respondent's Food Assistance Program (FAP) Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card was used for approximately 200 transactions at the [REDACTED]. The total of Respondent's trafficking transactions is \$ [REDACTED].
- (4) On May 2, 2014, the Office of Inspector General submitted the agency request for hearing of this case

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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 1997 AACR 400.3001-3015.

In this case, the Department has requested a disqualification hearing to establish an over-issuance of benefits as a result of Food Assistance Program (FAP) trafficking and the Department has asked that Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits. Department policies provide the following guidance and are available on the internet through the Department's website.

#### **BPG GLOSSARY**

#### **GLOSSARY**

##### **TRAFFICKING**

The buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.

##### **BEM 203 CRIMINAL JUSTICE DISQUALIFICATIONS**

##### **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

##### **FIP, RAP, SDA, CDC and FAP**

People convicted of certain crimes, fugitive felons, and probation or parole violators are not eligible for assistance.

Policy for IPV disqualifications and over issuances is found in BAM 700 and 720.

##### **FAP TRAFFICKING**

##### **FAP**

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.

## **BAM 720 INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATIONS**

### **DEPARTMENT POLICY**

#### **All Programs**

Recoupment policies and procedures vary by program and over-issuance (OI) type. This item explains Intentional Program Violation (IPV) processing and establishment.

### **DEFINITIONS**

#### **FAP Only**

IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits.

#### **IPV**

#### **FIP, SDA and FAP**

The client/authorized representative (AR) is determined to have committed an IPV by:

- A court decision.
- An administrative hearing decision.
- The client signing a DHS-826, Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing or DHS-830, Disqualification Consent Agreement or other recoupment and disqualification agreement forms.

#### **FAP Only**

IPV exists when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked.

## **OVER-ISSUANCE AMOUNT**

**FAP Trafficking** The OI amount for trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked benefits as determined by:

- The court decision.
- The individual's admission.
- Documentation used to establish the trafficking determination, such as an affidavit from a store owner or sworn testimony from a federal or state investigator of how much a client could have reasonably trafficked in that store. This can be established through circumstantial evidence.

## **OIG RESPONSIBILITIES**

#### **All Programs**

Suspected IPV cases are investigated by OIG. Within 18 months, OIG will:

- Refer suspected IPV cases that meet criteria for prosecution to the Prosecuting Attorney.

- Refer suspected IPV cases that meet criteria for IPV administrative hearings to the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).
- Return non-IPV cases to the RS.

### **IPV Hearings**

#### **FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP**

OIG represents DHS during the hearing process for IPV hearings.

OIG requests IPV hearings when no signed DHS-826 or DHS-830 is obtained, and correspondence to the client is not returned as undeliverable, or a new address is located.

**Exception:** For FAP only, OIG will pursue an IPV hearing when correspondence was sent using first class mail and is returned as undeliverable.

OIG requests IPV hearing for cases involving:

1. FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
2. 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 combined is \$1000 or more, **or**
- The total OI amount is less than \$1000, **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.

Excluding FAP, OIG will send the OI to the RS to process as a client error when the DHS-826 or DHS-830 is returned as undeliverable and no new address is obtained.

### **DISQUALIFICATION**

#### **FIP, SDA, CDC AND FAP ONLY**

Disqualify an active **or** inactive recipient who:

- Is found by a court or hearing decision to have committed IPV, **or**
- Has signed a DHS-826 or DHS-830, **or**
- Is convicted of concurrent receipt of assistance by a court, **or**
- For FAP, is found by SOAHR or a court to have trafficked FAP benefits.

A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them. Other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits.

### **Standard Disqualification Periods FIP, SDA, CDC and FAP**

The standard disqualification period is used in all instances except when a **court** orders a different period (see Non-Standard Disqualification Periods in this item).

Apply the following disqualification periods to recipients determined to have committed IPV:

One year for the first IPV.

Two years for the second IPV.

Lifetime for the third IPV.

In this case the Department alleges that every one of Respondent's approximately 200 EBT transactions at the Baghdad Mini Mart was an incident of FAP trafficking. Respondent's transactions ranged in amount from \$ [REDACTED] to \$ [REDACTED]. The evidence submitted by the Department included photographs showing that there were eligible FAP items for purchase on some of the store's shelves.

A typical trafficking pattern exists of small "feeler" transactions to determine the EBT card's balance followed by large transactions within minutes if there is a large balance. None of Respondent's transactions are in that pattern. The Department accurately points out that the majority of Respondent's transactions are for amounts that have 0 or 99 cents. The Department argues that even though the amount of the transactions are not large, they are suspicious and were purchases of already prepared "hot" foods which cannot be purchased with FAP benefits. When asked what evidence there is to show that all the transactions were trafficking, the Department representative stated that if Respondent had spoken with him and identified which of the transactions were not trafficking; those transactions would not have been included. The Department representative went on to say that Respondent had that chance but elected not to speak to him without an attorney.

Evidence was presented that the [REDACTED] sold already prepared "hot" foods. However, there was no evidence showing specific prices for hot foods in December 2012, much less all the way back to September 2011 when the Department alleges Respondent's transactions were trafficking.


The Department failed to meet their burden of presenting sufficient clear and convincing evidence to support their allegation that all of Respondent's approximately 200 transactions at the [REDACTED] were trafficking.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, finds that the Department has NOT established by clear and convincing

evidence that Respondent engaged in Food Assistance Program (FAP) trafficking in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] which the Department is entitled to recoup.

This Departmental action is **REVERSED** and the Department is ORDERED to delete the over-issuance and cease any recoupment action.



Gary F. Heisler  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **7/15/2014**

Date Mailed: **7/15/2014**

GFH / hj

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

cc:

