



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: February 8, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-018545  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: C. Adam Purnell

### **HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

Upon the request for a hearing by the Department of Health and Human Services ("Department" or "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 with Mich Admin Code, R 00.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on February 1, 2017, from Lansing, Michigan. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), represented the Department. 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 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?

### **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 December 19, 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.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department. [Exh. 1, p. 27].
4. Respondent had a FAP group size of 1. [Exh. 1, p. 27].
5. Respondent was issued an Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) card that contained a Personal Identification Number (PIN). [Exh. 1, pp. 28-32].
6. The Department provided Respondent with written instructions that indicated that his PIN was to remain confidential and that disclosure or release of his EBT card and/or PIN was prohibited. [Exh. 1, pp. 33-48].
7. Respondent did not have an authorized representative (AR) with authority to use his EBT card. [Exh. 1, p. 26].
8. Respondent was incarcerated from August 12, 2015, to present. [Exh. 1, p. 12].
9. Respondent fraudulently allowed his EBT card and/or PIN to be used by a third party while he was incarcerated. [Exh. 1, pp. 28-29].
10. Respondent was aware that it was unlawful to allow a third party to use his EBT card. Respondent was also aware that it was unlawful to allow a third party to have his private PIN. [Exh. 1, pp. 26, 33-48].
11. Respondent had no apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to comply with the policies and/or laws concerning FAP benefits.
12. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period they are considering the fraud period is August 20, 2015, to October 21, 2015 (fraud period).
13. During the alleged fraud period, Respondent is alleged to have trafficked \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.
14. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI of benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].
15. This was Respondent's first FAP IPV.
16. 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 Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), the Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and the 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-.3011.

### **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, (1-1-2016) p. 1.

An IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked or is trafficking FAP benefits. BAM 720, (1-1-2016) 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, (10-1-2015) 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.

The OI amount for trafficking-related IPVs 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. 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. 14-16. 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, pp.14-16.

### **Clear and Convincing Evidence**

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 due to FAP trafficking because he fraudulently permitted a third party to use his EBT card while he was incarcerated. The Department OIG Agent further argues that Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits as a result. Respondent did not appear at the hearing to dispute the Department OIG Agent's contentions.

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.

Based upon the above Findings of Fact, the Administrative Law Judge finds that Respondent fraudulently used and/or transferred his EBT card and/or his PIN to a third party without authorization. See BEM 203, p. 3. This is supported by the jail records that showed Respondent was incarcerated during the fraud period. This is also supported by the benefit issuance records and the FAP purchase history (IG-311) that showed Respondent received FAP benefits and that his EBT card was used during the fraud period. [Exh. 1, pp. 28-29].

Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application, along with the informational booklet in this record, certifies that he was aware that fraudulent participation in FAP could result in criminal, civil, or administrative claims. [Exh. 1, pp. 26, 33-48]. Based on the above analysis, this Administrative Law Judge finds that, by clear and convincing evidence, the Department OIG Agent has established that Respondent fraudulently

used, transferred, altered, acquired, or possessed coupons, authorization cards, or access devices as defined by BEM 203, p. 3. Consequently, the Department OIG Agent has established that Respondent committed an IPV 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 he 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 because the FAP amounts that were issued were used fraudulently or through trafficking. 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 resulting in a total \$ [REDACTED] overissuance. This is Respondent's first FAP IPV. 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]

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Department may 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.



CAP/mc

---

**C. Adam Purnell**  
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

**Petitioner**

[REDACTED]

**DHHS**

[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]