



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: October 24, 2016
MAHS Docket No.: 16-010898
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Susanne E. Harris

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 October 20, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED] Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent, [REDACTED], appeared and testified.

ISSUES

Did the Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP) and thereby receive an Over issuance (OI) that the Department is entitled to recoup/collect?

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 May 4, 2016, to establish an OI of benefits received by the Respondent as a result of the Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG has requested that the Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. The Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.

4. The Respondent was issued the "How To Use Your Michigan Bridge Card" booklet at the same time as he was issued an Electronic Benefit Transfer Card. The booklet provided the Respondent with notice of the Food Assistance Program rules and consequences for breaking those rules.
5. The Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding of the proper usage of the Respondent's EBT card.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the OI period is May 1, 2014 to January 31, 2015.
7. The Department alleges that the Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
8. This was the Respondent's first alleged IPV.
9. A notice of hearing was mailed to the 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 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.

Intentional Program Violation

Effective January 1, 2016, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- 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 \$ [REDACTED] or more, or

- the total amount is less than \$ [REDACTED] 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 (2016), pp. 12, 13.

7 CFR 271.2

Trafficking means:

- The buying, selling, stealing or otherwise affecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher in signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone;
- The exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances, as defined in section 802 of title 21, United States Code, for SNAP benefits;
- Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits that has a container requiring a return deposit with the intent of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intentionally returning the container for the deposit amount;
- Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food; or
- Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- Attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via EBT cards, card numbers and PINs, or by manual voucher and signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.

In this case, the timing and amount of Respondent's transactions were in a pattern and manner which does not reflect normal purchases for the inventory and mix of authorized items carried at the [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is an establishment that the USDA has permanently disqualified from participating in SNAP benefits after an investigation revealed that the establishment was trafficking in FAP benefits.

Specifically, the Petitioner had several high dollar FAP EBT transactions on the same day, within two minutes apart at this establishment. What is even more peculiar, is that the Respondent testified that he and the person at the gas station "were cool". The Respondent testified that he was allowed to run a tab at the gas station. Furthermore, the Respondent testified that he had lost his EBT card. The Regulation Agent at the hearing testified that the Respondent did lose his EBT card on October 17, 2013 and that the card was replaced shortly thereafter. However, that was well before the OI time period. The testimony of the Regulation Agent was not contested and furthermore, "running a tab" at the [REDACTED] would also constitute trafficking according to the above cited federal regulation. Therefore, this Administrative Law Judge concludes that the Department has met its burden of proving that the Respondent trafficked in FAP benefits and did thereby commit a first IPV.

Disqualification

A client who is found to have committed an IPV by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, pp. 15, 16. 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, p.16. 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, p. 16.

In this case, the Administrative Law Judge has concluded that the Respondent has committed a first IPV. Therefore, the appropriate disqualification period to be imposed is one year.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p. 1. The OI amount for trafficking-related IPV's 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.

In this case, the Department has met its burden of establishing that the Respondent, as a result of the IPV, received an OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] that the Department is entitled to recoup/collect.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law concludes that the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an IPV. The Department is **ORDERED** to initiate recoupment/collection procedures and to impose a disqualification period in accordance with departmental policy.



SH/nr

Susanne E. Harris
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]