



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
Julie A. McMurtry
Interim Executive Director

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: July 26, 2017
MAHS Docket No.: 17-000963
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Denise McNulty

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 Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent was represented by herself.

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 former recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. The Department alleges that it notified Respondent of the responsibility to use FAP benefits for lawful purchases and that trafficking of benefits is unlawful and a violation of policy and could possibly result in a disqualification from receipt of benefits in the future. The Department further alleges it notified Respondent that the violation of policy by trafficking could result in recoupment of issued benefits.
5. Respondent has 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. The Department alleges a \$ [REDACTED] overissuance (OI) in this case.
8. This was Respondent's first alleged FAP IPV.
9. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the U.S. Postal Service 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 October 1, 2014, 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 (January 2016), p. 5.

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 (May 2014), 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.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV in [REDACTED] by offering to purchase FAP benefits through a posting on [REDACTED]. 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 (May 2014), pp 2; see also Department of Human Services, Bridges Policy Glossary (BPG) (July 2015), p. 66. 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 (July 2015), p. 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.

In support of its contention that Respondent trafficked FAP benefits, the Department presented a copy of a posting on [REDACTED] from Respondent’s email with an authorized telephone number that matched Respondent’s. [Exhibit A, p. 14.] The posting was titled: “Wanted: EBT Bridge Cards - \$200” and the body of the posting stated, “Looking to buy bridge cards at 50%. Text with what you have. Will pay cash up front.” [Exhibit A, p. 11.] It is found that the posting and identifying Respondent information fail to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent is the author of the ad. However, Respondent testified that she did post the ad. She further testified that she did not know it was a violation of policy to post such an ad. Respondent suffered a closed head injury in a recent serious automobile collision. At the time she posted the ad, she was not able to take care of herself due to the head injury she sustained in the collision. Respondent did not receive any Bridge Cards as the result of the [REDACTED] ad.

The posting itself is insufficient to establish trafficking. Under 7 CFR 271.2, trafficking includes an attempt to buy or otherwise affect an exchange of FAP benefits. The Department argued that the posting, “Looking to buy bridge cards at 50%. Text with what you have. Will pay cash up front” was an attempt to purchase FAP benefits contrary to law. The Department acknowledged that Respondent was not a FAP recipient at the time of the [REDACTED] posting and could not establish that Respondent had taken any steps beyond the posting to procure FAP benefits. The posting itself does not expressly indicate that Respondent sought to purchase FAP benefits, although there is an implication of such. However, a mere solicitation of information concerning FAP benefits does not establish that Respondent attempted to purchase the FAP benefits. “Attempt” anticipates something beyond a request or solicitation. In this case, there was no evidence that any action was taken beyond the posting. Therefore, there was no trafficking established under the circumstances presented.

Under the evidence presented, the Department has failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent engaged in trafficking. Accordingly, it is found that Respondent did not commit an IPV concerning FAP.

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 ten years for a 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 failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV. Accordingly, Respondent is not subject to a disqualification from receipt of FAP benefits on the basis of IPV.

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 failed to present clear and convincing evidence to support its allegation that Respondent trafficked FAP benefits. Therefore, the Department is not entitled to recoup or collect from Respondent for trafficked benefits.

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 not** established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.
2. Respondent **did not** receive a FAP OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

The Department is ORDERED to delete the OI and cease any recoupment and/or collection action.



DM/jaf

Denise McNulty
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

DHHS

[REDACTED]

Petitioner

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

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