



RICK SNYDER  
GOVERNOR

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

SHELLY EDGERTON  
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: October 29, 2018  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-008445  
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 October 25, 2018, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Darren Bondy, 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 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. Respondent is a FAP recipient. The Department issued Respondent informational publications called "Important Things to Know" and "How to Use Your Michigan Bridge Card" when the Department issued Respondent an EBT card to complete transactions with her FAP benefits. These publications advised Respondent that she may be guilty of an intentional program violation if she sold or traded her FAP

benefits or if she used her FAP benefits to obtain anything other than eligible food items.

2. Respondent used her FAP benefits to complete EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart from January 2012 through September 2016.
3. Liquor Plus Mini Mart was a stand-alone convenience store located in Flint. Liquor Plus Mini Mart did not have any shopping carts or baskets, it had limited inventory of eligible food items, inventory of non-food items, and inventory of alcohol and tobacco. Liquor Plus Mini Mart had a counter with a glass barrier and turn-style carousels to separate the workers from the customers. Liquor Plus Mini Mart was a location of known criminal activity.
4. During the time that Respondent used her FAP benefits at Liquor Plus Mini Mart, Liquor Plus Mini Mart was engaged in the trafficking of FAP benefits. Liquor Plus Mini Mart was purchasing FAP benefits for \$0.50 per \$1.00 by either exchanging cash for the benefits or selling ineligible items and charging twice the price to EBT cards. Liquor Plus Mini Mart purchased and physically held some EBT cards to spread purchases over time and to complete purchases of inventory at other retailers.
5. In August 2016, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) executed a search warrant at Liquor Plus Mini Mart in conjunction with other agencies. Thereafter, the owner of Liquor Plus Mini Mart was charged with criminal food stamp fraud and convicted.
6. The Department reviewed the EBT transactions completed at Liquor Plus Mini Mart and identified numerous individuals suspected of engaging in FAP trafficking, including Respondent.
7. The Department contacted Respondent to obtain an explanation for her EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart. Respondent denied using her FAP benefits to obtain anything other than eligible food items.
8. On August 3, 2018, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish that Respondent committed an IPV and that Respondent owed the Department the amount of the FAP benefits she trafficked.
9. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at her last known address and it was not returned by the United States Postal Service as undeliverable.
10. The OIG requested recoupment of a \$1,340.90 debt for the value of FAP benefits trafficked, and the OIG requested that Respondent be disqualified from FAP 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 Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) is a federal food program designed to promote general welfare and to safeguard well-being by increasing food purchasing power. 7 USC 2011 and 7 CFR 271.1. The Department administers its food assistance program 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 intentional program violation (IPV) “shall consist of having intentionally: (1) Made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or (2) Committed any act that constitutes a violation of SNAP, SNAP regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of SNAP benefits or EBT cards.” 7 CFR 273.16(c).

Trafficking means:

- (1) The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone;
- (2) The exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances, as defined in section 802 of title 21, United States Code, for SNAP benefits;
- (3) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits that has a container requiring a return deposit with the intent of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intentionally returning the container for the deposit amount;
- (4) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits with the intent of obtaining cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food; or
- (5) Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- (6) Attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card

numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.

7 CFR 271.2.

An IPV requires that the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the client has trafficked FAP benefits. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6) and BAM 720, p. 1. 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. Respondent completed EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart, which was a retailer known to engage in the trafficking of FAP benefits. Respondent completed EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart which were excessively high considering the size of the store and its inventory of eligible food items. Respondent's transactions were consistent with an individual completing EBT transactions to obtain items other than eligible food items, and Respondent did not provide a legitimate explanation for her transactions. The Department presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent's EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart were for cash or consideration other than eligible food items, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone. Therefore, Respondent's conduct meets the definition of trafficking in 7 CFR 271.2.

### **Disqualification**

In general, individuals found to have committed an intentional Program violation through an administrative disqualification hearing shall be ineligible to participate in the Program: (i) for a period of 12 months for the first violation, (ii) for a period of 24 months for the second violation, and (iii) permanently for a third violation. 7 CFR 273.16(b). Only the individual who committed the violation shall be disqualified – not the entire household. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(11).

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 12-month disqualification.

### **Overissuance**

A recipient claim is an amount owed because of benefits that were overpaid or benefits that were trafficked. 7 CFR 273.18(a)(1). A recipient claim based on trafficking is the value of the trafficked benefits. 7 CFR 273.18(c)(2). In this case, Respondent engaged in trafficking when she completed EBT transactions at Liquor Plus Mini Mart. The Department presented sufficient evidence to establish that at least \$1,310.29 of

Respondent's EBT transactions were related to trafficking. The Department alleged that \$1,340.90 of Respondent's EBT transactions were related to trafficking, but a review of the Department's highlighted transactions revealed that only \$1,310.29 were highlighted as trafficking. Thus, only the amount that was highlighted as trafficking will be considered. Respondent owes the Department \$1,310.29 because she trafficked FAP benefits valued at that amount.

### **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 should be disqualified from FAP.
3. Respondent owes the Department \$1,310.29 for the value of FAP benefits she trafficked.

IT IS ORDERED THAT the Department may initiate recoupment procedures to collect the \$1,310.29 debt Respondent owes the Department for the benefits she trafficked.

It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent shall be disqualified from the FAP program for a period of 12 months.

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**

Lindsay Miller  
125 E. Union St 7th Floor  
Flint, MI  
48502

Genesee Union St. 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**

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