



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS  
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: April 12, 2019  
MAHS Docket No.: 18-013618  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:** Vicki L. Armstrong

**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 April 10, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan.

The Department was represented by Philip Giuliani, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Mr. Giuliani testified on behalf of the Department. The Department submitted 57 exhibits which were admitted into evidence.

Respondent did not appear at the hearing; and it 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). The record was closed at the conclusion of the hearing.

**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 benefits for 12-months?

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on December 11, 2018, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. [Dept. Exh. 1].
2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits. [Dept. Exh. 1, 3-4].
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits in the amount of \$3,120.00, issued by the Department on February 17, 2017. [Dept. Exh. 13].
4. Respondent was aware that misusing his benefits by allowing a retailer to buy his food benefits in exchange for cash was a violation of state and federal laws. [Dept. Exh. 11-13].
5. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. [Dept. Exh. 29].
6. The FAP Purchase History shows purchases were made with Respondent's EBT card from February 18, 2017 through February 20, 2017. [Dept. Exh. 3-4].
7. On February 18, 2017, an unauthorized user made two transactions at [REDACTED] using Respondent's EBT card. [Dept. Exh. 11, 17-19].
8. On February 20, 2017, an unauthorized user made two transactions at [REDACTED] using Respondent's EBT card. [Dept. Exh. 11, 14-16, 20-24].
9. On February 20, 2017, Respondent reported his EBT card had been stolen. [Dept. Exh. 13].
10. Respondent did not appear and give evidence at the scheduled hearing to rebut the evidence presented by Petitioner in the Hearing Summary and admitted exhibits.
11. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is February 18, 2017 through February 20, 2017. [Dept. Exh. 3-4].
12. During the fraud period, Respondent's FAP Purchase History shows \$2,537.00 in unauthorized FAP benefits on Respondent's EBT card. [Dept. Exh. 3-4].
13. The Department alleges that Respondent trafficked his FAP benefits during this time period and Respondent received an overissuance in the amount of \$2,537.00. [Dept. Exh. 3-4].
14. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV. [Dept. Exh. 1, 3].

15. A Notice of Hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the US Post Office 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, 2017, the Department's Office of Inspector General requests Intentional Program Violation hearings for the following cases:

1. FAP trafficking overissuances that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
2. Prosecution of welfare fraud or Food Assistance Program trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
  - The total amount for the Family Independence Program (FIP), State Disability Assistance (SDA), Child Development and Care (CDC), Medicaid (MA) and Food Assistance Program (FAP) programs combined is \$500 or more, or
  - the total amount is less than \$500, and
    - the group has a previous Intentional Program Violation, or
    - the alleged Intentional Program Violation involves Food Assistance Program 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 (10/1/2017).

### **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. 7 CFR 271.2; BAM 720, p 1 (emphasis in original).

A FAP 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 Department submitted uncontroverted evidence that Respondent sold, traded or gave away his EBT card and PIN to unauthorized users who utilized the card to make \$2,537.00 in purchases.

### **Disqualification**

A client who is found to have committed an Intentional Program Violation by a court or hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1); 7 CFR 273.16(b)(5); 7 CFR 273.16(b)(11); BAM 720, p 16. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a Food Assistance Program Intentional Program Violation involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other Intentional Program Violation cases involving Family Independence Program, Food Assistance Program or State Disability Assistance, for standard disqualification periods of one year for the first Intentional Program Violation, two years for the second Intentional Program Violation, and lifetime for the third Intentional Program Violation or conviction of two felonies for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances in separate periods if both offenses occurred after August 22, 1996. 21 USC 862a; 7 CFR 273.1(b)(7)(vii); 7 CFR 273.11(m); 7 CFR 273.11(c)(1); BEM 203, p 2; BAM 720, p 16. A disqualified member may continue as the grantee **only if** there is no other eligible adult in the group. BAM 720, p 17 (emphasis in original).

Because this was Respondent's first IPV, Respondent is disqualified for 12 months.

**Overissuance**

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

Here, the Department has established that Respondent was aware that misuse of his food benefits is a violation of state and federal laws for which he may be disqualified from the program, fined, put in prison, or all three and repayment of the food benefits.

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 by allowing unauthorized persons to use his EBT Card.

**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 did receive an overissuance of program benefits in the amount of \$2,537.00 from the FAP program.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$2,537.00 in accordance with Department policy.

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

VLA/nr

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicki L. Armstrong  
Administrative Law Judge  
for Robert Gordon, 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**

LaClair Winbush  
17455 Grand River  
Detroit, MI  
48227

Wayne 31 County DHHS- via electronic  
mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

L. Bengel- via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

OIG  
PO Box 30062  
Lansing, MI  
48909-7562

**Respondent**

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