



RICK SNYDER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
LANSING

SHELLY EDGERTON
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: July 13, 2018
MAHS Docket No.: 18-005253
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 July 11, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Daniel Beck, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent, [REDACTED], did not appear. The hearing was held 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 February 17, 2017, the Department issued a lump-sum payment of \$3,120.00 to Respondent pursuant to a Federal court order in *Barry v Lyon*. The issuance was available to Respondent through the use of a Bridge Card.

2. From February 23, 2017, to March 26, 2017, Respondent's FAP benefits were used to make EBT transactions totaling \$2,527.38 at various businesses.
3. On February 23, 2017, Respondent's FAP benefits were used to make a single EBT transaction for \$1,000.00 at Sam's Club. All eligible food items were purchased, which was primarily bulk quantities of meat.
4. The large dollar amount of Respondent's EBT transaction at Sam's Club prompted the Department to conduct an investigation.
5. The Department contacted Respondent to ask him about his transaction at Sam's Club. Respondent said he received the *Barry v Lyon* lump-sum payment, but that he lost his card shortly thereafter and did not make the transaction at Sam's Club.
6. Respondent had not reported his Bridge Card as lost or stolen, and a PIN was required to make an EBT transaction with it.
7. The Department determined that it was unlikely the eligible food items purchased at Sam's Club were for personal consumption. Therefore, the Department concluded that Respondent must have been trafficking his FAP benefits.
8. On February 6, 2018, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent received an overissuance of benefits and that Respondent committed an IPV.
9. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at his last known address and it was not returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable.
10. The OIG requested a recoupment of \$2,527.38 in FAP benefits and that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits for 12 months for a first IPV.

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 (January 1, 2016), p. 1.

Trafficking is:

- The buying, selling or stealing 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.
- Attempting to buy, sell or steal FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.

BAM 700 (October 1, 2016), 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. The Department established that Respondent's FAP benefits were used to make a single EBT transaction at Sam's Club that was excessively large and that Respondent provided an unbelievable story to explain it. Respondent told the Department he lost his Bridge Card with his PIN number written on it and that someone else used it to make the excessively large transaction at Sam's Club and all other transactions thereafter. I find that the story Respondent gave the Department was unbelievable because (1) a reasonable person with more than \$2,000 in available benefits on a Bridge Card would not have written the PIN on it; (2) if he had written his PIN on his Bridge Card and he lost it, he would have immediately reported it lost or stolen to prevent its use; and (3) if his Bridge Card was used before he was able to stop it, he would have filed a police report to try to recover his stolen benefits. The fact that Respondent provided an unbelievable story to the Department leads me to conclude that Respondent was lying to cover up the improper use of his FAP benefits. The fact that Respondent lied to the Department about his EBT transactions, the fact that his benefits were used to make an excessively large purchase at Sam's Club, and the fact that each EBT transaction required the use of his PIN leads me to conclude that Respondent was engaged in the trafficking of his FAP benefits.

Therefore, I find that the Department has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent was engaged in the trafficking of his FAP benefits.

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

An overissuance is the amount of benefits issued to the client in excess of what the client was eligible to receive. BAM 700, p.1. When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p. 1. The overissuance 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, the Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that Respondent trafficked benefits valued at \$2,527.38. Therefore, Respondent was overissued \$2,527.38 in 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. Respondent received an overissuance of FAP benefits in the amount of \$2,527.38 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 \$2,527.38 in accordance with Department policy.

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

JK/hb



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

Clarence Collins
12140 Joseph Campau
Hamtramck, MI 48212

Wayne County (District 55), 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]