

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

**IN THE MATTER OF:**

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

Reg. No.: 14-004508  
Issue No.: 3005  
Case No.: ██████████  
Hearing Date: October 1, 2014  
County: WAYNE-DISTRICT 17

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab Baydoun**

**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 October 1, 2014, from Detroit, 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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving 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 20, 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 trafficking of benefits is unlawful and a violation of policy and could result in a disqualification from receipt of future benefits and recoupment of issued benefits
5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is December 1, 2009 to October 31, 2012 (fraud period).
7. The Department alleges that Respondent trafficked a total of \$7378.43 in FAP benefits and that she received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$7378.43.
8. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
9. 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 program] is established by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a and is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. The Department (formerly known as the Family Independence Agency) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b; and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

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 \$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.

BAM 720 (May 2014), pp. 12-13.

#### **Intentional Program Violation**

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 (May 2014), p. 7; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 1.

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 M Civ JI 8.01.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of her FAP benefits because she trafficked \$3250.46 of her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] December 1, 2009 to May 31, 2011 and that she trafficked \$4127.97 of her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from December 1, 2011 to October 31, 2012. [REDACTED] were being operated by the same person. Trafficking is (i) the buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food; (ii) selling products purchased with FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food; and (iii) purchasing containers with deposits, dumping/discarding product and then returning containers to obtain cash refund deposits. BAM 700, pp 1-2; see also Department of Human Services, Bridges Policy Glossary (BPG) (July 2014), p 66. Trafficking also includes (i) fraudulently using, transferring, altering, acquiring, or possessing coupons, authorization cards, or access devices, or (ii) redeeming or presenting for payment coupons known to be fraudulently obtained or transferred. BEM 203 (December 2009 and October 2012), pp. 2-3.

The Department presented evidence that [REDACTED] were found in administrative hearings before the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to have trafficked FAP benefits and had their authorization to accept FAP benefits revoked. To support a trafficking case against Respondent, however, the Department must establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that *Respondent* engaged in trafficking when she used her FAP benefits at [REDACTED]

#### Trafficking at [REDACTED]

The Department presented evidence of Respondent's FAP transaction history at [REDACTED] showing a total of \$3250.46 spent in individual transactions in amounts up to \$339.64. The Department contended that purchases greater than \$20 were trafficked because [REDACTED] did not have the inventory or infrastructure to support the high dollar transactions made by Respondent during the fraud period. Specifically, the Department argued that [REDACTED] is a convenience store with a limited food inventory, selling mostly snack food items, much of which were expired. The Department further argued that [REDACTED] had limited counter space, no optical scanners, no shopping carts or baskets and that the checkout counter was enclosed in bullet proof glass which inhibits large scale merchandise transfers.

A review of Respondent's FAP transaction history at [REDACTED] reveals that all of Respondent's purchases were in excess of \$100, indicative of trafficking. In particular, Respondent had three purchases greater than \$300, in the amounts of \$304.56, \$338.56, and \$339.64, as well as seven purchases each greater than \$200. The foregoing evidence, coupled with the USDA's finding that [REDACTED] trafficked FAP benefits, was sufficient, when viewed under the totality of the circumstances, to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked her FAP benefits when she made purchases at [REDACTED]

Trafficking at [REDACTED]

The Department presented evidence of Respondent's FAP transaction history at [REDACTED] showing \$4127.976 spent in FAP transactions in single amounts up to \$151.79 between December 3, 2011 and October 29, 2012. The Department contended that Respondent's transactions were trafficked because [REDACTED] did not have the inventory or infrastructure to support the high dollar transactions, as the normal amount for a transaction at this type of store is around \$5.00. Specifically, the Department argued that [REDACTED] are gas station/convenience stores selling mostly snack food items with a limited stock of other eligible food items, limited counter space, no scanning devices, and no shopping carts or baskets. In addition, the Department presented documentation to establish that the cash register area is enclosed with bullet proof glass making it impractical to purchase large amounts of food or to support the high volume of transactions that were occurring in short amounts of time.

Additionally, a review of Respondent's transaction history at [REDACTED] reveals that Respondent made several purchases of high dollar amounts on the same day within the same minute or within just minutes of each other, indicative of trafficking. For example, on May 17, 2012, Respondent made eight purchases at [REDACTED] spending \$400 in one day. On August 20, 2012, Respondent made one purchase at [REDACTED] in the amount of \$101 and one minute later, another purchase at [REDACTED] in the amount of \$99.99.

Further, a comparison of the transaction history at both locations shows that purchases in high amounts were made at both stores within minutes, in particular on September 17, 2012, where Respondent made three purchases at [REDACTED] spending \$149.91 in one minute and three purchases at [REDACTED] just four minutes later where she spent \$149.99. Similar purchasing patterns took place throughout the fraud period and several of Respondent's transactions ended in numbers such as .00 and .99, which the Department argued are figures consistent with trafficking.

The foregoing evidence, coupled with the USDA's finding that [REDACTED] trafficked FAP benefits, was sufficient, when viewed under the totality of the circumstances, to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked her FAP benefits at [REDACTED]

**Disqualification**

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, 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. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (July 2013), p. 2. 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.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV by trafficking FAP benefits. Because this was Respondent's first IPV, she is subject to a one-year disqualification under the FAP program.

### **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. The OI amount for a trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked benefits as determined by a court decision, the individual's admission, or 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, which can be established through circumstantial evidence. BAM 720, p 7.

The Benefit Summary Inquiry provided by the Department establishes that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan during the fraud period and the FAP transaction history the Department presented showed Respondent had \$3250.46 in countable FAP transactions at [REDACTED] and \$4127.97 in countable FAP transactions at [REDACTED] which established that Respondent trafficked a total of \$7378.43 of her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] between December 1, 2009 and October 31, 2012.

### **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. The Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$7378.43 from the FAP.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$7378.43 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the FAP for a period of 12 months.



---

**Zainab Baydoun**  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Maura Corrigan, Director  
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: **10/15/2014**

Date Mailed: **10/15/2014**

ZB / cl

**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:



A list of names is redacted with black bars. The redaction consists of ten horizontal bars of varying lengths, obscuring the names of the individuals listed in the 'cc:' field.