



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR



Date Mailed: November 16, 2016  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-007861  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Christian Gardocki**

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION AND  
OVERISSUANCE**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), 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 October 13, 2016, from Detroit, Michigan. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS) was represented by [REDACTED], regulation agent with the Office of Inspector General. Respondent did not appear.

**ISSUE**

The issue is whether MDHHS established that Respondent committed an intentional program violation (IPV) based on trafficking of 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. Respondent was an ongoing FAP benefit recipient.
2. From July 2012 through August 2013, Respondent had 39 EBT transactions from a store (hereinafter "Store") suspected of FAP trafficking.
3. From July 2012 through August 2013, [REDACTED] of Respondent's EBT history with Store included 7 for whole dollar amounts, 20 transactions involving multiple transactions on the same date, and 2 transactions exceeding \$90.

4. Respondent did not clearly and convincingly traffic FAP benefits.
5. On [REDACTED], MDHHS requested a hearing to establish Respondent committed an IPV and is responsible for an overissuance of [REDACTED] in allegedly trafficked FAP benefits from July 2012 through August 2013

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

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. MDHHS (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-.3011. MDHHS policies are contained in the Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

MDHHS requested a hearing to establish Respondent committed an IPV. [MDHHS] may request a hearing to... establish an intentional program violation and disqualification... [or to] establish a collectable debt on closed cases. BAM 600 (October 2015), p. 4.

MDHHS presented an unsigned Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (Exhibit 1, pp. 5-6), dated [REDACTED]. The repay agreement and MDHHS testimony alleged Respondent trafficked [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from July 2012 through August 2013.

The Code of Federal Regulations defines an IPV. Intentional program violations shall consist of having intentionally: (1) made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) committed any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of coupons, authorization cards or reusable documents used as part of an automated benefit delivery system. 7 CFR 273.16 (c).

[For FAP benefits only, an] IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720 (January 2016), p. 1. Trafficking is [established by one of the following]:

- The buying, selling or stealing of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. Examples would be liquor, exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives or controlled substances.
- Selling products purchased with FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- Purchasing containers with deposits, dumping/discarding product and then returning containers to obtain cash refund deposits.

- Attempting to buy, sell or steal FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.

BAM 700 (January 2016), p. 2.

IPV is suspected when there is **clear and convincing** [emphasis added] evidence that the client or CDC provider has intentionally withheld or misrepresented information for the purpose of establishing, maintaining, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. *Id.* 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. It is a standard which requires reasonable certainty of the truth; something that is highly probable. Black's Law Dictionary 888 (6th ed. 1990).

MDHHS alleged Respondent trafficked FAP benefits by selling FAP benefits, presumably for cash. The evidence against Respondent was circumstantial. Generally, circumstantial evidence is less persuasive than direct evidence, however, at some point, circumstantial evidence may accumulate to meet the clear and convincing requirement of an IPV. The simplified argument against Respondent is as follows:

- Store was involved in FAP trafficking.
- Store has a limited supply of food where it is unlikely that someone would make regular and/or large purchases of food.
- Over a period of time, Respondent had suspicious transactions at Store which were indicative of trafficking FAP benefits.
- Therefore, Respondent trafficked FAP benefits.

MDHHS presented various photos (Exhibit 1, pp. 12-15) of the inside of Store. The photos depicted the following customer areas of Store: a small canned food section, various snack displays, fruit and vegetable displays (some without any items for sale), an ice cream freezer, and two freezers of beverages. Other areas were pictured, though the type of food available for sale was not identifiable. Presented photos also included a photo of 3 EBT card with papers wrapped around them, and other pictures of documents. The photos were presumably obtained from the Food and Nutrition Service as part of the investigation of Store for FAP benefit trafficking.

MDHHS presented the photographs in an attempt to verify Store's involvement with trafficking. Few certain conclusions can be made from the presented evidence.

The presented photographs of the inside of Store were indicative of a store with a relatively small (compared to larger grocery stores) inventory of food items. Though the store's food inventory appeared to be modest, it cannot be stated with any certainty that Store trafficked in FAP benefits simply based on the presented photographs. The photos of various documents and EBT cards were consistent with a store that trafficked FAP benefits, however, no context or explanation for the photographs was presented.

MDHHS presented a Benchmark: Store FS Trans Stats by Month (Exhibit 1, p. 10-11). Minimum, maximum, average, and total EBT transaction for “Combination Grocery/Other”, “Fruits/Veg Specialty”, and “Small Grocery Store” were stated.

MDHHS alleged the report was indicative of fraud because Store’s EBT transactions were too frequent and large in amounts given the inventory. The report was not clear if the listed transaction summary was for Store’s transactions or for stores of a similar size and inventory of Store. For such evidence to be indicative of fraud, some contrast must be established between Store’s transactions and those from a store with a comparable food inventory.

MDHHS testimony conceded Store was not yet convicted of FAP benefit trafficking. The absence of charges could be partially due to the shut-down of Store. MDHHS testimony alleged Store closed as a result of the investigation.

Presented evidence that Store engaged in FAP trafficking was not compelling. MDHHS alleged Respondent’s transactions with Store were further evidence of FAP benefit trafficking. The allegation is based on various EBT expenditure patterns that are consistent with FAP benefit trafficking.

MDHHS presented Respondent’s transaction history from [REDACTED], with Store (Exhibit 1, pp. 16-18). Of the 39 transactions, MDHHS alleged 22 involved FAP trafficking. The transactions alleged to be trafficking are as follows:

<u>DATE</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>	<u>DAILY TOTAL</u>
[REDACTED]	\$130.86	\$130.86
[REDACTED]	\$22.00	\$22.00
[REDACTED]	\$35.00	\$35.00
[REDACTED]	\$17.00	\$17.00
[REDACTED]	\$17.00	\$17.00
[REDACTED]	\$90.96	\$90.96
[REDACTED]	\$23.00	\$23.00
[REDACTED]	\$19.00	\$19.00
[REDACTED]	\$41.09, \$38.00, and \$13.49 (1-2 hours apart)	\$92.58
[REDACTED]	\$15.95, \$23.55, and \$19.88 (5-6 hours apart)	\$59.38
[REDACTED]	\$42.39, \$38.55, and \$13.36 (3-4 hours apart)	\$94.30
[REDACTED]	\$11.50, \$10.75, and \$19.99 (18 minutes apart)	\$42.24
[REDACTED]	\$37.83 and \$4.85 (2 minutes apart)	\$42.68

MDHHS verified Respondent had 2 EBT transactions exceeding \$90.00. Respondent also had two days where the total EBT purchases exceeded \$90.00.

Generally, a store with an unimpressive food inventory is unlikely to have legitimate “large” EBT transactions. This generality is based on the assumption that most people would prefer to buy food in bulk from larger grocery stores with a better selection of food inventory. MDHHS essentially alleged Store’s inventory was such that Respondent’s purchases over \$90 are explainable by trafficking FAP benefits.

Photos of fresh vegetables, pop, candy, some canned goods, and bread were presented. The pictures did not establish what items were available at the time of Respondent’s purchases. The photos also did not establish all inventory items of Store. Though food purchases from Store exceeding \$90 are likely to be uncommon, presented evidence did not convincingly establish Respondent’s transactions to be FAP benefit trafficking.

EBT transactions occurring multiple times per day may be a sign of FAP benefit trafficking. This signal is based on the practice of smaller stores attempting to disguise FAP benefit trafficking by splitting suspiciously large transactions into smaller transactions.

Multiple EBT transactions within a day can also be indicative of a client’s legitimate shopping preferences. Respondent’s EBT history was not so unusual that FAP trafficking can be inferred.

Generally, legitimate “large” EBT transactions will require the purchase of several food items. Generally, stores require several minutes to process orders involving several food items. Thus, a “large” EBT transaction following another EBT transaction within a time period that the store could not have possibly processed the “large” order can be indicative of FAP benefit trafficking. Respondent’s presented history was not indicative of EBT transactions which were impossibly close in time so that trafficking was the likeliest explanation.

Clients who traffic FAP benefits are likely to do so for a whole dollar amount (e.g. \$20.00, \$50.00, \$75.00...). Stores engaged in FAP benefit trafficking are known to often pay a client \$.50 for each EBT dollar received. Thus, a client or store not attempting to disguise FAP benefit trafficking transactions may have an inordinate amount of transactions for whole dollar amounts. A recurrence of such transactions is particularly alarming when factoring that such transactions should randomly occur only 1 out of 100 times. A store’s pricing and/or a person’s item preference may coincidentally somewhat increase the likelihood of whole dollar EBT transactions.

Respondent had 7 of 39 transactions (17.9%) with Store for whole dollar amounts. The percentage and frequency of whole dollar transactions, by itself, is a pattern consistent with FAP trafficking.

Assuming Store paid \$.50 in exchange for an EBT dollar, Respondent would have received cash of \$11.00, \$17.50, \$8.50, \$8.50, \$11.50, \$9.50, and \$19.00. The

relatively small transaction amounts are not particularly indicative of trafficking. The odd-numbered dollar amounts are also not particularly indicative of FAP trafficking.

Presented evidence demonstrated Respondent's EBT history included unusually large transactions from a store investigated for trafficking FAP benefits with a modest food inventory. The history included recurring multiple purchases within the same date. The history also included several whole dollar transactions, though not for dollar amounts that are particularly indicative of trafficking. Though Respondent's EBT history was suspicious, the history is not found to be clear and convincing evidence of FAP benefit trafficking.

Based on presented evidence, it is found that Respondent did not engage in FAP benefit trafficking. Accordingly, any corresponding IPV disqualification and/or OI cannot be granted.

### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The administrative law judge, based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, finds that MDHHS failed to establish that Respondent trafficked FAP benefits. The MDHHS request to establish an IPV and overissuance of [REDACTED] in FAP benefits from July 2012 through August 2013 is **DENIED**.

CG/hw



---

**Christian Gardocki**

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]

[REDACTED]

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]