



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS  
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: April 24, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 17-014984  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Ellen McLemore**

**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, 42 CFR 431.230(b), 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 April 19, 2018, from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by Patrick Waldron, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent was present with her husband [REDACTED]. Also present was Bengal Interpreter, [REDACTED].

**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 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 October 11, 2017, 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 lawful purchases.
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 March 1, 2015 through July 31, 2016 (fraud period).
7. During the fraud period, the Department alleges that Respondent was not entitled to receive \$2,194.36 in FAP benefits.
8. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$2,194.36.
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 United States Postal Services 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 \$500.00 or more, or
  - the total amount is less than \$500.00, 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. 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 because she trafficked her FAP benefits at [REDACTED] (Store). 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, p 2.

The Department presented evidence that the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) charged Store with trafficking and that they it 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 she used her FAP benefits at Store.

In support of its contention that Respondent trafficked her FAP benefits, the Department presented a FAP transaction history for Respondent showing her FAP purchases at Store by date, time, and amount. Respondent's FAP transaction history at Store showed a multitude of transactions over \$80 and up to \$195.99. Respondent also made multiple transactions at Store on the same date. Additionally, Respondent had an unusually high number of transactions ending in the same cents value. The Department also pointed to a transaction that occurred on June 22, 2016, where Respondent made a \$0 purchase and then exhausted all of her benefits less than a minute later.

The Department testified that the high-priced transactions were not supported by Store's inventory. The evidence showed that Store was a small store with an adding machine and no optical scanners. Store had shopping carts and baskets but less than ten of each. Store had a limited inventory of food items. There were frozen foods and food bundles but no fresh meat other than fish. Store also had no storage area for additional inventory.

Respondent's husband stated that he would often buy food items in bulk. Specifically, Respondent's husband stated he would buy large pieces of fish, which were expensive. Respondent stated the reason why there were multiple transactions at Store on the same date was because he would forget items and would return to Store to purchase the items that he neglected to purchase previously in the day. When asked why there was a \$0 purchase followed by a \$181.02 purchase on July 22, 2016, Respondent stated he checked his balance then made his purchases in the store.

Store's size and inventory made Respondent's high expense FAP purchases unlikely to be legitimate food purchases. Additionally, Respondent's husband's testimony that he checked the balance and then shopped for his food items was not credible. To believe Respondent's husband's testimony, Respondent's husband would have had to check the account balance and then have the requisite number of food items ready to purchase within one minute that almost exactly totaled the balance left on Respondent's account. Such a scenario is improbable.

A review of Respondent's transactions at Store, in consideration of Store's inventory and layout, 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 her FAP benefits, it has established that she committed an IPV in connection with her 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; BEM 708 (October 2016), p. 1. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a 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. 16. 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 requested that Respondent be subject to a 12-month disqualification period. As discussed above, the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV concerning FAP. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a one-year disqualification from her 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 identified all transactions on Respondent's transaction history at Store in excess of amounts that reasonably could have been expended at Store. These transactions total \$2,194.36. Therefore, the Department is entitled to recoup and/or collect \$2,194.36 for trafficked FAP benefits at Store during the fraud period.


**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 program benefits in the amount of \$2,194.36 from the FAP program.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with Department policy for a FAP OI amount of \$2,194.36, less any amount already recouped and/or collected.

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



EM/cg

---

**Ellen McLemore**  
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

**Via Email:**

MDHHS-Wayne-55-Hearings  
OIG Hearings  
Recoupment  
MAHS

**Respondent – Via First-Class Mail:**

