



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]

Date Mailed: January 12, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-012858

[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 21, 2016, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner personally appeared and testified.

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 [REDACTED] exhibits which were admitted into evidence. 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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP 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 June 12, 2016, 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. [Dept. Exh. 1].
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department. [Dept. Exh. 13-15].
4. Respondent was aware that it was unlawful to buy or sell FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. [Dept. Exh. 85-86].
5. 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.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is April 1, 2009 through July 31, 2012 (fraud period). [Dept. Exh. 5].
7. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent is alleged to have trafficked ██████████ in FAP benefits. [Dept. Exh. 5].
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of ██████████ [Dept. Exh. 5].
9. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV. [Dept. Exh. 1, 5].
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 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**

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 720, p 1; BAM 700, p 6.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 1. "Trafficking" is the buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. BAM 700, p 1. A person is disqualified from FAP when an administrative hearing decision, a repayment and disqualification agreement or court decision determines FAP benefits were trafficked. BEM 203, (7-1--2014) pp 2-3. These FAP trafficking disqualifications are a result of: (1) fraudulently using, transferring, altering, acquiring, or possessing coupons, authorization cards, or access devices; or (2) redeeming or presenting for payment coupons known to be fraudulently obtained or transferred. BEM 203, p 3.

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 she engaged in unlawful transactions using her Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card at the [REDACTED], which was under a federal investigation for FAP trafficking. The Department alleges that Respondent was engaged in FAP trafficking based on records that showed she had several unauthorized transactions at the store during the alleged fraud period.

Respondent testified that she bought meat bundles of ground beef, orange roughy, hot dogs, bacon, lettuce and tomatoes, in addition to cooking grease and taco shells at the market. She denied ever selling her food stamps. The Regulation Agent testified that only transactions in excess of [REDACTED] were counted as trafficking. Respondent stated that she did make the [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] transactions. The Regulation Agent stated that there were no other authorized users on Respondent's FAP benefits.

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 the market was engaged in "the buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible

food” as defined by BAM 700. This is supported by the photographs of the store which showed that the market was a convenience store with limited eligible food stock items that were not expired. The photographs in the record revealed that the market provided only a limited inventory of eligible items including, but not limited to snack foods, milk, juice, soft drinks, and related items. The record evidence also shows that the store lacks sufficient eligible food items in its inventory to support high dollar transactions, but engaged in multiple high-dollar transactions using EBT cards that were above the average for similar stores in the same general geographical area. Further, there were numerous statements from employees that the market was trafficking FAP benefits, in addition to videotaped transactions.

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 during the fraud period, used her EBT FAP card at the store and made several purchases that were unauthorized. The IG-312 EBT history records showed that Respondent engaged in several EBT transactions that were well above the average transaction for that type of store. Some of these transactions were only minutes apart which is evidence that the transactions was unlawful. The records also show that the size of the market coupled with the amount of items in the store inventory demonstrate that Respondent’s EBT transactions were not lawful. 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.

### **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 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 her 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, and for the reasons stated on the record, 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 receiving FAP benefits 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

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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

[REDACTED]

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