



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: May 18, 2017  
MAHS Docket No.: 16-017854  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Zainab A. Baydoun**

### **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 [REDACTED], from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent appeared for the hearing and represented himself.

### **ISSUES**

1. Did the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) of the Food Assistance Program (FAP)?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits?
3. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of FAP benefits that the Department is entitled to recoup?

### **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 [REDACTED], 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.
4. Respondent was aware of the responsibility to use FAP benefits for only lawful food purchases.
5. The Department was not aware of Respondent having an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
6. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is [REDACTED], (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, the Department alleges that Respondent trafficked \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]
9. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
10. A Notice of Hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the U.S. 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 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 (January 2016), pp. 5, 12-13.

### **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 700 (January 2016), pp. 7-8; BAM 720, p. 1.

An IPV is also suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 1.

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 M Civ JI 8.01.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits because he trafficked \$ [REDACTED] of his FAP benefits at [REDACTED] (Store). During the fraud period, Department policy provided that trafficking is: the buying, or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. BAM 700 (December 2011/February 2013), pp. 1-2. Trafficking also includes (i) fraudulently using, transferring, altering, acquiring, or possessing coupons, authorization cards, or access devices; or (ii) redeeming or presenting for payment coupons known to be fraudulently obtained or transferred. BEM 203 (October 2011/October 2012), pp. 2-3. The federal regulations define trafficking to include “attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect an exchange of [FAP] benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) . . . for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.” 7 CFR 271.2.

The Department presented evidence that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) charged the Store with trafficking and that the Store was permanently disqualified from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). To support a trafficking case against Respondent, however, the Department must establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that *Respondent* engaged in trafficking when he used his FAP benefits at Store.

In support of its contention that Respondent trafficked his FAP benefits, the Department presented: (i) a FAP transaction history for Respondent showing his FAP purchases by establishment, date, time, and amount; and (ii) a benefit summary inquiry showing that he received FAP benefits during the fraud period (Exhibit A, pp. 70-77). A review of Respondent’s transaction history shows that Respondent had several very high dollar purchases at Store in amounts up to \$ [REDACTED]. The transaction history showed that among other purchases, Respondent made six transactions at Store, each in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] throughout the fraud period.

The Department argued that such large purchases were not supported by the Store’s inventory, pointing to photos of Store including large quantities of expired food and limited eligible food stock. The Department testified that an investigation revealed that Store owners and employees were exchanging EBT FAP benefits for cash, generally \$.50 in cash for \$1.00 in FAP benefits. Based on the investigation conducted, the Department concluded that single transactions in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] or greater and back-to-back transactions totaling \$ [REDACTED] or greater were trafficked. (Exhibit A, p. 3.)

At the hearing, Respondent testified that he was incarcerated during the fraud period, specifically, for about a one-year period in [REDACTED]. Respondent asserted that he was not responsible for making the purchases at Store and maintained that he left his EBT card at his home, and his roommate used it at Store. Respondent further testified that his roommate knew the pin number to his EBT card and had access to the card. The evidence established that Respondent was the sole member of his FAP group and had no authorized representative. Thus, he was the only individual eligible to use his FAP benefits and they were required to be used for his benefit.

A review of Respondent's unusual transactions at Store, coupled with evidence that Store was a trafficking establishment and had limited non-expired inventory, was sufficient to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked at Store. Because the Department established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked his FAP benefits, it has established that he committed an IPV in connection with his FAP case.

### **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. 15. Clients are disqualified for 10 years for an FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FAP, 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.

As discussed above, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV concerning the FAP. Because the Department established that this is Respondent's first IPV, he is subject to a one-year disqualification from his receipt of FAP benefits.

### **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 a trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked benefits as determined by (i) a court decision, (ii) the individual's admission, or (iii) 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, which can be established through circumstantial evidence. BAM 720, p. 8.

As discussed above, the Department presented clear and convincing evidence, through its testimony and Respondent's transaction history, to support its allegation that Respondent trafficked at Store. The Department testified that, pursuant to the federal government's investigation of Store, it concluded that all transactions at or over \$ [REDACTED] and back-to-back transactions in excess of \$ [REDACTED] involved trafficking. The identified transactions on the transaction history at Store in question total \$ [REDACTED]. Therefore, the Department's evidence established that \$ [REDACTED] in FAP transactions at Store involved trafficking. As such, the Department is entitled to recoup or collect that amount from Respondent.

## **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, if any, concludes that:

1. The Department **has** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV by trafficking FAP benefits at Store.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures in accordance with Department policy for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] less any amount already recouped and/or collected

It is FURTHER ORDERED that the Department disqualify Respondent from FAP for a period of **12 months**.



ZAB/jaf

---

**Zainab A. Baydoun**  
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]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**DHHS**

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