RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Christopher Seppanen
Executive Director

MIKE ZIMMER
DIRECTOR

[redacted]

Date Mailed: March 23, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 15-003141
Agency No.: [redacted]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Jonathan Owens

HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and 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 45 CFR 235.110; and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 11, 2016, 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 Traffic Food Assistance Program (FAP)?

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 12 months?

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 March 10, 2015, to establish Respondent trafficked FAP benefits and allegedly committed an IPV by doing so.

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 rules and responsibilities of the FAP program.

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 the trafficking took place on or about [redacted], [redacted]

7. Respondent posted on social media an attempt to purchase FAP benefits.

8. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.

9. A Notice of Hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and **was** returned by the U.S. Post Office as undeliverable.

10. The OIG sent a copy of the hearing packet to the same last known address and this packet was not returned.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Adult Services Manual (ASM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, 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 Department of Human Services) administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10; the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1-.119b; and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to .3015.

Effective October 1, 2014, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of $500.00 or more under the AHH program.

- FAP trafficking overissuances 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 amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is $500 or more, or

  - the total amount is less than $500, 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; ASM 165.

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; BAM 720.

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

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 (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 Respondent was identified through a social media search as a person seeking to purchase food stamps. Respondent posted on social media on [redacted],

[redacted] "If anyone has a Bridge Card to sell today in the next 2 hours I WANT IT!!!!" Respondent was identified through Bridges based on name as well as her reported phone number listed on social media post. Respondent was contacted by telephone and interviewed. She stated she did make the post but said she was posting it for someone else. Respondent acknowledged she understood this was a violation of the program, and the penalties associated with the offense were explained. She requested the forms be sent to her via mail agreeing to sign and return them. Paperwork was sent to the Respondent at her last known address in Bridges. That paperwork was returned to sender. Paperwork was then sent to most recent address on Lexis Nexis. That paperwork was not returned to sender.

Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed a Trafficking offense by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720; BEM 708. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. BAM 720. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he/she lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720.

In this case, the Respondent posted on social media a desire to purchase FAP benefits. The Respondent was interviewed, and she acknowledged she was aware of the program rules. Further, the Respondent admitted she was seeking to purchase benefits for someone else.

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.

The Department is ORDERED to disqualify Respondent from FAP for a period of **12 months**.

MJB/jaf

Jonathan Owens
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Department of Health and Human Services

NOTICE OF APPEAL: A party may appeal this Order in circuit court within 30 days of the receipt date. A copy of the circuit court appeal must be filed with the Michigan Administrative Hearing System (MAHS).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MAHS within 30 days of the date the Order was issued. The party requesting a rehearing or reconsideration must provide the specific reasons for the request. MAHS will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MAHS. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 335-6088; Attention: MAHS Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Administrative Hearings
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

DHHS [redacted]

Petitioner [redacted]

Respondent [redacted]