

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

IN THE MATTER OF:

[REDACTED]

Reg. No.: 14-010898
Issue No.: 3005
Case No.: [REDACTED]
Hearing Date: November 03, 2014
County: WAYNE 49

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn Ferris

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 November 3, 2014, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], 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 benefits for Food Assistance Program (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. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on 9/11/4, 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 of the responsibility to not exchange his Food Assistance for cash or other non-food eligible items.
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 February 1, 2010 through August 30, 2013, and that the Respondent trafficked his FAP benefits at both [REDACTED] (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI of Food Assistance (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
9. This was Respondent's first alleged 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 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 (12-1-11), p. 10.

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 (12/1/11), p. 1; 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 the Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits when trafficked his Food Assistance benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], exchanging his Food Assistance benefits for cash. The Department further alleges that [REDACTED] were part of a group of wholesalers in the [REDACTED], that utilized runners to procure cash for Food Assistance benefit recipients in lieu of food. 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;

As part of its proofs, the Department presented the Respondent's FAP purchases at [REDACTED]. Exhibit 1 pp. 26 and 35. The purchases were made beginning September 19, 2011 [REDACTED] and continued through August 19, 2013. All of the transactions were for large even amounts and the majority were made on the 19th of every month, often leaving a zero balance on the Respondent's EBT card. These purchases total [REDACTED] which is the amount of the over issuance the Department seeks to recover due to trafficking at [REDACTED].

As regards the [REDACTED]'s purchases, the Department alleges that the purchases were made beginning February 10, 2010 and ended August 26, 2011. Three of the purchases resulted in small amounts [REDACTED] left on the EBT card after the purchase. All of the transactions were for large even amounts and the majority were made on the 10th of every month, often leaving a less than a dollar balance on the Respondent's EBT card. These purchases total [REDACTED] which is the amount of the over issuance the Department seeks to recover due to trafficking at [REDACTED].

As further proof of its trafficking allegations, the Department presented the USDA disqualification letter of May 16, 2014 disqualifying [REDACTED] as of that date and revoking their authority to accept FAP benefits was revoked. Exhibit 1p. 12-13. As further proof of its trafficking allegations, the Department presented the USDA disqualification letter of November 14, 2013 disqualifying [REDACTED] as of that date and revoking their authority to accept FAP benefits was revoked. Exhibit 1p.27-28. Based upon the evidence presented, it is determined that the Department has demonstrated by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent trafficked his FAP benefits. This determination is in large part based upon the series of transactions which are all even numbers in amount during the entire time period, several transactions of

large dollar amounts made on the same day of the month and several transactions which left a zero balance or small balances on the Respondents EBT card .

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. 12-13.

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 (10/1/09), 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. 13.

In this case, because the Department has demonstrated that the Respondent trafficked his benefits, it is determined that the Department is entitled to a one-year disqualification period as requested.

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 An overissuance is the amount of benefits issued to the client group in excess of what they were eligible to receive. For FAP benefits as in this case an overissuance is also the amount of benefits trafficked (traded or sold). BAM 700, p.1.

In this case, In this case, the Department seeks an over issuance and recoupment of the trafficked benefits which it demonstrated was [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

As part of its proofs the Department provided the Respondents EBT purchase records which totaled [REDACTED], the alleged over issuance amount. 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 [REDACTED] in countable FAP transactions at [REDACTED]. This evidence established that Respondent trafficked [REDACTED] of his FAP benefits at [REDACTED] during the periods set forth in the Conclusions of Law and the Department is entitled to recoup that amount.


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 [REDACTED] from the following program(s) FAP Food Assistance.

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 the FAP Food Assistance program for 12 months.



Lynn Ferris
Administrative Law Judge
for Maura Corrigan, Director
Department of Human Services

Date Signed: 11/7/2014

Date Mailed: 11/10/2014

LMF / tm

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:

