



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
MICHIGAN OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS AND RULES

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

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

Date Mailed: September 19, 2019
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-007224
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED] [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 September 18, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Taylor Jenkins, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Respondent, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] appeared with her witness, [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Neither party had any additional witnesses.

One exhibit was admitted into evidence during the hearing. A 57-page packet of documents provided by the Department was admitted collectively as the Department's Exhibit A.

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 received FAP benefits from the Department.

2. The Department provided Respondent with an electronic benefit transfer (EBT) card to purchase eligible food items with her FAP benefits.
3. On January 18, 2019, Respondent went to [REDACTED] and made two purchases. At 8:44 PM, Respondent completed a purchase of \$52.42 with her FAP benefits. Respondent was present with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] at the time of the purchase. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] left with the purchased food items, and then Respondent completed another purchase. At 8:56 PM, Respondent completed a purchase of \$98.34 with her FAP benefits. Respondent was present with another individual. Respondent left with the purchased food items.
4. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is Respondent's friend. Sometimes Mr. [REDACTED] would provide Respondent with food when she was out of food and FAP benefits. When Respondent got her FAP benefits, she would purchase some food and give it to Mr. [REDACTED] as repayment.
5. The Department investigated Respondent's case and determined that Respondent was engaged in trafficking her FAP benefits.
6. The Department attempted to contact Respondent to obtain her explanation for the transactions on January 18, 2019, but the Department was unable to obtain an explanation from Respondent.
7. On June 16, 2019, the Department's OIG filed a hearing request to establish (a) that Respondent committed an IPV by trafficking FAP benefits and (b) that Respondent owes the Department a debt equal to the value of the FAP benefits she trafficked.
8. The OIG requested an order that (a) disqualifies Respondent from FAP for 12 months for a first IPV and (b) establishes that Respondent owes the Department a debt of \$150.76 for the value of FAP benefits 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.

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 created 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 not met its burden. Respondent purchased eligible food items with her FAP benefits and then gave those food items to Mr. [REDACTED] to pay him back for food he had provided to her when she was out of food and FAP benefits. The Department did not present any evidence to establish that Respondent received anything other than eligible food items in exchange for her FAP benefits or the food items she gave to Mr. [REDACTED]. Respondent's conduct does not meet the definition of trafficking as set forth in 7 CFR 273.16(c).

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, Respondent did not commit an intentional program violation. Therefore, Respondent is not disqualified.

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 did not traffic her FAP benefits. Therefore, Respondent does not owe the Department a debt.

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 should not be disqualified from FAP.
3. Respondent does not owe the Department a debt for the value of FAP benefits allegedly trafficked.

IT IS ORDERED THAT Respondent shall not be disqualified from the FAP program.



JK/nr

Jeffrey Kemm
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 Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR).

A party may request a rehearing or reconsideration of this Order if the request is received by MOAHR 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. MOAHR will not review any response to a request for rehearing/reconsideration.

A written request may be mailed or faxed to MOAHR. If submitted by fax, the written request must be faxed to (517) 763-0155; Attention: MOAHR Rehearing/Reconsideration Request.

If submitted by mail, the written request must be addressed as follows:

Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules
Reconsideration/Rehearing Request
P.O. Box 30639
Lansing, Michigan 48909-8139

DHHS

Fiona Wicks
12185 James St Suite 200
Holland, MI
49424

Ottawa 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]
MI