



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR



Date Mailed: June 22, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-004582  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Jeffrey Kemm

**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 Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulation (CFR), particularly 7 CFR 273.16. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on June 20, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Mark Mandreky, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent, Dylan Stradinger, did not appear. The hearing was conducted in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4).

**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 FAP benefits?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. On January 22, 2015, Respondent applied for assistance from the Department, including FAP benefits.
2. In the application Respondent completed on January 22, 2015, the Department advised Respondent that he may not use his benefits to purchase anything other than eligible food items and that he may not trade or sell his benefits.

3. The Department approved Respondent for FAP benefits and issued him benefits.
4. The Department provided Respondent with a pamphlet titled Important Things to Know (DHS-PUB-1010) and a brochure titled How to Use Your Bridge Card.
5. The Things to Know pamphlet advised Respondent that trading or selling FAP benefits was considered FAP trafficking.
6. The How to Use Your Bridge Card brochure advised Respondent that misuse of food benefits is a violation of law, including allowing a retailer to buy FAP benefits in exchange for cash.
7. Respondent did not have any apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit his understanding or ability to fulfill his responsibilities to the Department.
8. From January 28, 2015, through March 11, 2015, Respondent made EBT transactions with [REDACTED]
9. On January 31, 2015, Respondent made an EBT transaction of \$ [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]
10. On February 4, 2015, Respondent made an EBT transaction of \$ [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]
11. On February 12, 2015, Respondent made an EBT transaction of \$ [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]. The transaction depleted all of his available benefits except for \$ [REDACTED]
12. On March 11, 2015, Respondent made an EBT transaction of \$ [REDACTED] with [REDACTED]. The Transaction depleted all of his available benefits except for \$ [REDACTED]
13. [REDACTED] is a business which operates as a mobile food retailer.
14. The United States Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) conducted an investigation of [REDACTED]
15. On May 4, 2016, FNS performed an inspection of All Things. FNS found that All Things did not have an operable mobile food vehicle, a valid mobile food establishment license, or any sort of transaction device other than an EBT machine.
16. The FNS examined EBT transaction records for [REDACTED] and found that the business had transactions indicative of trafficking because there were multiple transactions from the same individual benefit accounts in unusually short time frames, the majority or all of individual recipient benefits were exhausted in unusually short periods of time, and excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

17. On September 21, 2016, the FNS notified [REDACTED] that it suspected the business of FAP trafficking from February 2016 through July 2016 and that it was charging the business with trafficking pursuant to 7 CFR 271.2.
18. On October 6, 2016, the FNS notified [REDACTED] that FNS had determined the store engaged in FAP trafficking and that it was permanently disqualified from participating in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) as a result.
19. The Department conducted an investigation of Respondent's EBT transactions at All Things.
20. The Department determined that Respondent trafficked FAP benefits at [REDACTED] from January 2015 through March 2015 when Respondent made EBT transactions which were excessively large and/or depleted the majority of Respondent's available benefits; the Department determined that the amount trafficked was \$ [REDACTED]
21. On May 3, 2018, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent received an OI of benefits and that Respondent committed an IPV.
22. The OIG requested Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits for 12 months for a first IPV.
23. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at his 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), 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.

### **Intentional Program Violation**

An IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720 (October 1, 2014), p. 1.

Trafficking is:

- The buying or selling of FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food. Examples would be liquor, exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives or controlled substances.
- Selling products purchased with FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- Purchasing containers with deposits, dumping/discarding product and then returning containers to obtain cash refund deposits.

BAM 700 (May 1, 2014), p. 2.

An IPV requires that the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the client has trafficked FAP benefits. BAM 720, p. 1; see also 7 CFR 273(e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence which is so clear, direct, weighty, and convincing that it enables a firm belief as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established. *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995) (citing *In re Jobes*, 108 NJ 394 (1987)).

In this case, I find that the Department has met its burden. [REDACTED] was not operating a legitimate mobile food delivery business, and Respondent made EBT transactions at [REDACTED] that were indicative of trafficking because they were excessively large and/or depleted the majority of Respondent's available benefits. Respondent did not provide any explanation for his transactions.

### **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. 16. In general, Clients are disqualified 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, there is no evidence that Respondent has ever been found to have committed an IPV related to FAP benefits. Thus, this is Respondent's first IPV related to FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent is subject to a one-year disqualification.

**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 trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked benefits (attempted or actually trafficked) as determined by: (1) a court decision; (2) the individual's admission; or (3) 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. BAM 720, p. 8. This can be established through circumstantial evidence. BAM 720, p. 8. In this case, Respondent engaged in trafficking when he made EBT transactions January 2015 through March 2015 which were excessively large and/or depleted the majority of Respondent's available benefits. The amount of his trafficking transactions was \$ [REDACTED] so that is the amount he was overissued.

**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. Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] that the Department is entitled to recoup.
2. The Department has established, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an IPV.
3. Respondent should be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits.

IT IS ORDERED THAT the Department may initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$ [REDACTED] in accordance with Department policy.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be disqualified from FAP benefits for a period of one year.

JK/nr



---

Jeffrey Kemm  
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**

Kimberly Kornoelje  
121 Franklin SE  
Grand Rapids, MI  
49507

Kent County DHHS- via electronic mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

M. Shumaker- via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI  
48909-7562

**Respondent**

