



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]
MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: May 18, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 17-016697
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Janice Spodarek

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), 7 CFR 273.16, 42 CFR 431.230(b), 45 CFR 235.110, 7 USC 2011 to 2030, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and 400.3178. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on May 15, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan.

The Department was represented by Craig Baylis, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

Respondent did not appear at the hearing. Respondent signed and returned both the repay agreement and the request for hearing. As there is inconsistent documentation as to why Petitioner would sign both, the hearing 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).

Department Exhibit 1-30 was admitted.

ISSUES

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of Food Assistant 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?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the clear and convincing evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on 11/27/17, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV due to FAP trafficking.
2. The OIG **has** requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits due to FAP trafficking on social media.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department during the alleged fraud period.
4. On 10/14/16, Respondent signed a Rights and Responsibilities acknowledgment indicating that she read and was aware of the assistance application Information Booklet information, was aware of her rights and responsibilities, and that she understood that she could be prosecuted for fraud and/or required to repay any amount wrongfully received for all programs applicable including trafficking. Respondent further acknowledged that she understood that trafficking FAP benefits can result in a disqualification.
5. Respondent **did not have** an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill her acknowledged responsibilities.
6. On 11/24/16, Respondent posted on Facebook "500\$ bridge card for sale for 250\$" and on 11/8/16 posted: "My aunt has a bridge card for sale if anyone needs one." Exhibit 12.
7. Respondent engaged in trafficking during the period of 11/1/16 to 11/30/16 which resulted in a trafficking of \$500.00 in FAP benefits as defined by policy.
8. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.

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 over issuances 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, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016).

Also applicable to the case herein is policy found in the Criminal Justice Disqualification policy found at BEM 203.

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 720 p 1; BAM 700, p 6.

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.

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. 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. 18. 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 (4/1/2016). 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 17.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the OI. BAM 700, p 1.

A recipient is informed and agree pursuant to their signatures on the Acknowledgment Form at application and redetermination that they understand and acknowledge that they are prohibited from receiving benefits in contradiction to the agreements acknowledged on the application regarding residency, misuse, failure to report income and changes to the Department. This includes acknowledgement that a recipient may not sell, trade, or give away FAP benefits, PIN or Michigan Bridge card. A recipient may not allow a retailer to buy FAP benefits in exchange for cash. No one is allowed to use someone else's FAP benefits or Bridge card for their household. DHS-Pub-322 (11-10).

In this case, the evidence is unrefuted that Respondent engaged in FAP trafficking on or about 11/8/16 and 11/24/16. The Department has established that Respondent was

aware that misuse of her food benefits is a violation of state and federal laws for which she may be disqualified from the program, fined, put in prison, or all three and repayment of the food benefits. Respondent's trafficking IPV consists of \$500.00 in FAP benefits. The Department's evidence was unrefuted.

Based on the evidence presented and the credible testimony of the Resident Agent, the Administrative Law Judge found the OIG established, under the clear and convincing standard, that Respondent committed an IPV in this matter.

DECISION AND ORDER


The Administrative Law Judge, based upon clear and convincing evidence of record and 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 Food Assistance Program benefits in the amount of \$500.00 due to trafficking.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for the amount of \$500.00 in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program for a period of **12 months**.

JS/hb



Janice Spodarek
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) 763-0155; 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

Jeanette Cowens
2524 Clark Street
Detroit, MI 48209

Wayne County (District 41), DHHS

Policy-Recoupment via electronic mail

M. Shumaker via electronic mail

Petitioner

OIG
PO Box 30062
Lansing, MI 48909-7562

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] MI [REDACTED]