



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: January 18, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 17-012976  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Amanda M. T. Marler**

**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 January 17, 2018 from Detroit, Michigan. The Department was represented by [REDACTED], Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). The Respondent was self-represented.

**ISSUES**

1. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of the 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 the 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 August 24, 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 notify the Department in any changes in his circumstances and not to let others use his FAP benefits.
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 6, 2017 through June 20, 2017 (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 \$ [REDACTED] 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 United States 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 \$500.00 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. 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 (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. 11.

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 the Respondent committed an IPV of his FAP benefits by trafficking his FAP benefits while he was incarcerated. 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 (October 2016), p. 2.

The Respondent was confirmed to have been incarcerated from February 7, 2017 through July 6, 2017. While incarcerated, he was issued FAP benefits each month from February 2017 through June 2017 in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]. The benefits were used while he was incarcerated from March 6, 2017 through June 20, 2017 in the amount of \$ [REDACTED].

The Respondent testified that he was not aware that anyone had been using his Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card nor had he given anyone permission to use his card while he was incarcerated. He had been arrested and placed in jail without an opportunity to organize his personal affairs. Therefore, his wallet and EBT card had been left on the counter at his mother's house. Respondent suggested that his mother may have been the one to use his card since she had previously been listed on his FAP case and as a result, knew the PIN for his card.

The Department's evidence shows that clearly someone used the Respondent's FAP benefits while he was incarcerated. However, based on Department policy, a finding of FAP benefit trafficking requires more than allowing someone outside of the FAP benefit group to use FAP benefits. Department policy requires "cash or consideration" in exchange for use of the FAP benefits. BAM 700, p. 2. Department policy does not define "consideration", but it is generally defined as something of value that is bargained for by a party as part of a contract. The requirement of "cash or consideration" requires the Department to establish that Respondent received something of value for use of his FAP benefits; no evidence of cash or consideration was presented by the Department. Finally, the Respondent credibly testified that he had no knowledge of the use and had not given anyone permission to use his card. Therefore, the Department has not met its burden of proof in establishing an IPV.

### **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 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. 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, as mentioned above, the Department has not met its burden of proof to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an IPV. Therefore, the Respondent is not subject to a disqualification under the FAP program.

### **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 amount of a FAP OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. BAM 720, p. 8; BAM 715 (January 2016), p. 6; BAM 705 (January 2016), p. 6. The OI amount for a trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked amount as determined by an administrative hearing decision, repayment and disqualification agreement, or court decision. BAM 720, p. 8.

A person is a resident of an institution when the institution provides the majority of his meals as part of its normal services. BEM 212 (January 2017), p. 8. Jail, prison, juvenile detention and secure short-term detention are included in the definition of an institution. BEM 265 (July 2015), p. 1. Residents of institutions are not eligible for FAP benefits unless one of the following is true: the facility is authorized by the Food and Consumer Service to accept FAP benefits, the facility is an eligible group living facility, or the facility is a medical hospital and there is a plan for the person's return home. BEM 212, p. 8.

Respondent was incarcerated from February 7, 2017 through July 6, 2017 and there was no evidence that the location where he was institutionalized fell within any of the qualifying conditions set forth in policy. BEM 212, p. 8. The Department presented a FAP purchase history showing that Respondent's benefits were used during the alleged fraud period. According to the application and testimony, Respondent was the only member of his FAP group and was incarcerated during the alleged fraud period; therefore, he was not eligible for any of the benefits issued to him during the period of incarceration.

Since the Department requested recoupment of the value of the trafficked benefits which is less than the entire value of FAP benefits issued to Respondent, the Department may recoup/collect the value requested of \$ [REDACTED] from Respondent for the overissuance of FAP 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 **received** an OI of program benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] from the FAP.

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 **is not subject** to a period of disqualification from the FAP.



AM/jaf

---

**Amanda M. T. Marler**  
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]

**DHHS**

[REDACTED]

**Respondent**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]