



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: June 27, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 16-009953
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Lynn M. Ferris

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).

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 the Department establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for FAP?

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 not traffic her FAP benefits for cash.
5. Respondent did not have 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, Respondent was issued \$ [REDACTED] in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan; and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
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 (1/1/16), pp. 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 (October 2016), p. 7; 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 her FAP benefits because she trafficked \$ [REDACTED] of her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. Both establishments were being operated by the same person. Trafficking is (i) the buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food; (ii) selling products purchased with FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food; and (iii) purchasing containers with deposits, dumping/discarding product and then returning containers to obtain cash refund deposits. BAM 700, pp 1-2; see also Department of Human Services, Bridges Policy Glossary (BPG) (July 2013), p. 65. 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 (November 2012), p. 3.

The Department presented evidence that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were found in administrative hearings before the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to have trafficked FAP benefits and had their authorization to accept FAP benefits revoked. To support a trafficking case against Respondent, however, the Department must establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that *Respondent* engaged in trafficking when she used her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. The stores were permanently disqualified by the USDA on [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, pp. 25-26.

The Department presented evidence of Respondent's FAP transaction history at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] showing \$ [REDACTED] spent in FAP transactions in amounts up to \$ [REDACTED] in one transaction between [REDACTED]. The Department contended that Respondent's transactions were trafficked because [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] did not have the inventory or infrastructure to support the high-dollar transactions, as the normal amount for a transaction at this type of store is around \$ [REDACTED]. Specifically, the Department argued that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] are gas station/convenience stores selling mostly snack food items with a limited stock of other eligible food items, limited counter space, and no shopping carts or baskets. In addition, the Department stated that the cash register area is enclosed with bulletproof glass making it impractical to purchase large amounts of food or to support the high volume of transactions that were occurring in short amounts of time. Exhibit A, pp. 41-53.

Additionally, a review of Respondent's transaction history at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] reveals that Respondent made several purchases of high-dollar amounts on the same day within the same minute or within just minutes of each other, indicative of trafficking. Further, a comparison of the transaction history at both locations shows that three (3) purchases in high amounts (\$ [REDACTED], \$ [REDACTED], and \$ [REDACTED] were made at store [REDACTED] within minutes, in particular on [REDACTED]. Exhibit A, p. 17. In addition, on [REDACTED], Respondent made two purchases in the amounts of \$ [REDACTED] and \$ [REDACTED] within one minute. Several of Respondent's other transactions ended in

numbers such as .00, and .99, which the Department stated are figures consistent with trafficking. Exhibit A, p. 17.

The Department spoke with Respondent who told the Department that she allowed her “baby daddy” to use the card; and he did the trafficking; however, this testimony was unconvincing as the transactions occurred in [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]; and there is no evidence to suggest that someone else was using the card. The Respondent also failed to appear and testify at the hearing.

The foregoing evidence, coupled with the USDA’s finding that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] trafficked and was disqualified from the SNAP program, was sufficient, when viewed under the totality of the circumstances, to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

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. 17; BEM 708 (October 2016), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for 10 years for an 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. 161. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p. 1. 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 Department established a trafficking IPV, and thus, is entitled to a finding of disqualification of Respondent from receiving 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 a court decision, the individual’s admission, or 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. 7.

The Benefit Summary Inquiry provided by the Department establishes that Respondent was issued FAP benefits by the State of Michigan during the fraud period, and the FAP transaction history the Department presented showed Respondent had \$ [REDACTED] in countable FAP transactions at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. This evidence established that Respondent trafficked \$ [REDACTED] of her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]; and the Department is entitled to recoup that amount.

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.
2. Respondent **did** receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP for a period of **12 months**.

LMF/jaf



Lynn M. Ferris
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]