



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: December 8, 2016  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-014916

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Vicki Armstrong**

**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 December 6, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan.

The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). [REDACTED] testified on behalf of the Department. The Department submitted 29 exhibits which were admitted.

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). The record was closed at the conclusion of the hearing.

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?
2. Did Respondent commit an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits for one year?

**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 September 1, 2016, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. [Dept. Exh. 1, 3-4].
2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits. [Dept. Exh. 1, 3-4].
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits. [Dept. Exh. 26].
4. Respondent was aware that it was unlawful to buy, sell, or transfer FAP benefits. [Dept. Exh. 20-25].
5. On June 20, 2016, a woman was observed using Respondent's EBT card for [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 10, 12].
6. Respondent did not have any other eligible adult on his case and he did not have an authorized user on his account. [Dept. Exh. 3].
7. Respondent was arrested on June 23, 2016, by the [REDACTED]. [Dept. Exh. 15-19].
8. Respondent was still incarcerated at the time of the hearing in the above captioned matter. [Testimony].
9. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to comply with the policies and/or laws that govern FAP benefits.
10. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is June 1, 2016, through July 30, 2016 (fraud period). [Dept. Exh. 10-11].
11. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent is alleged to have trafficked [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.
12. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
13. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV. [Dept. Exh. 28, 29].
14. 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 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 January 1, 2016, 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, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016).

### **Intentional Program Violation**

An Intentional Program Violation (IPV) is a benefit overissuance (OI) resulting from the willful withholding of information or other violation of law or regulation by the client or his/her authorized representative. See Bridges Program Glossary (BPG) at page 24. 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 (5/1/2014).

An IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked or is trafficking FAP benefits. BAM 720, p 1 (1/1/2016). "Trafficking" is the fraudulent use, transfer, alteration, or possession of coupons, authorization cards or access devices. BEM 203, pp 2-3 (10/1/2015). A person is disqualified from FAP when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. *Id.*

With regard to FAP cases only, an IPV exists when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. BAM 700, p 8.

The OI amount for trafficking-related IPV's is the value of the trafficked benefits as determined by: (1) the court decision; (2) the individual's admission; or (3) 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. BAM 720, p 8. This can be established through circumstantial evidence. BAM 720, p 8.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period. BAM 720, p 16. Clients are disqualified for periods of 1 (one) year for the first IPV, 2 (two) years for the second IPV, a lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and 10 (ten) years for a concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p 16. If the court does not address disqualification in its order, the standard period applies. BAM 720, p 17.

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 Michigan Civil Jury Instruction (Mich Civ JI) 8.01.

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an IPV. The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), *reh den* 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

Here, the Department's OIG Agent contends that Respondent is guilty of an IPV because he transferred his Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card to an unknown party before and while he was incarcerated. This unknown party then engaged in unlawful transactions beginning on June 20, 2016, through July 6, 2015. It is unknown whether the party observed using Respondent's EBT card on June 20, 2016, is the same party who used the EBT card the remaining dates.

The Department alleges the Respondent was engaged in FAP trafficking based on records and a videotape showing a woman using his EBT card on June 20, 2016. Respondent did not have any other eligible adult on his case. He also did not have an authorized user on his account. The voluntary transfer of EBT cards and/or FAP benefits to any person outside the FAP group is FAP Trafficking. MCL 750.300a, BEM 203, 7 U.S.C. 2016.

The Department also alleges that Respondent was engaged in FAP trafficking based on records that showed that while he was incarcerated, several unauthorized transactions were made at numerous stores during the alleged fraud period. The voluntary transfer of EBT cards and/or FAP benefits to any person outside the FAP group is FAP Trafficking. MCL 750.300a, BEM 203, 7 U.S.C. 2016. Respondent did not appear at the hearing to dispute the Department OIG Agent's contentions.

Testimony and other evidence must be weighed and considered according to its reasonableness. *Gardiner v Courtright*, 165 Mich 54, 62; 130 NW 322 (1911); *Dep't of Community Health v Risch*, 274 Mich App 365, 372; 733 NW2d 403 (2007). The weight and credibility of this evidence is generally for the fact-finder to determine. *Dep't of Community Health*, 274 Mich App at 372; *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 452; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Moreover, it is for the fact-finder to gauge the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses who appear before him, as best he is able. See, e.g., *Caldwell v Fox*, 394 Mich 401, 407; 231 NW2d 46 (1975); *Zeeland Farm Services, Inc v JBL Enterprises, Inc*, 219 Mich App 190, 195; 555 NW2d 733 (1996).

This Administrative Law Judge has carefully considered and weighed the testimony and other evidence in the record. The following is the Administrative Law Judge's findings based on the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record.

In the present case, the record evidence shows that Respondent was incarcerated from June 23, 2016 ongoing, making him incapable of making the FAP purchases with his EBT card from June 23, 2016 through July 6, 2015. In addition, the woman videotaped using Respondent's EBT card on June 20, 2016, was not an authorized user or eligible adult on Respondent's account.

The Department OIG Agent has established that Respondent fraudulently used, transferred, altered, acquired, or possessed coupons, authorization cards, or access devices. This is supported by the record evidence which revealed that Respondent's EBT FAP card was used at numerous stores during the fraud period without Respondent present and while Respondent was incarcerated.

The Administrative Law Judge finds the evidence is clear and convincing that Respondent fraudulently used, transferred, altered, acquired, or possessed coupons, authorization cards, or access devices in violation of law. Consequently, the Department OIG Agent has established that Respondent committed an IPV through trafficking with respect to the FAP program by giving his EBT card and PIN number to an unauthorized user.

### **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, p 12. 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 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. 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.

Here, the Department has shown that Respondent was guilty of his first IPV concerning FAP benefits. The Department has also shown that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits. According to BAM 700, the Department may recoup this OI.

This Administrative Law Judge therefore concludes that the Department has shown, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an intentional violation of the FAP program through FAP trafficking. Consequently, the Department's request for FAP program disqualification and full restitution must be granted.


### **DECISION AND ORDER**

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, concludes that:

1. Respondent did commit an IPV due to FAP trafficking.
2. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of [REDACTED]

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 FAP for a period of 12 months.



---

**Vicki Armstrong**  
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

