

3. Respondent **was** informed of the responsibility not to buy, sell, trade, exchange, or otherwise traffic FAP benefits.
4. Respondent **did not have** an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.
5. The Department's OIG indicates that the incident leading to the allegation of fraud occurred on July 21, 2018.
6. This was Respondent's **first** alleged IPV.
7. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and **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), 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, 2014, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.
- FAP trafficking OIs that are not forwarded to the prosecutor.
- Prosecution of welfare fraud or FAP trafficking is declined by the prosecutor for a reason other than lack of evidence, and
 - The total amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs combined is \$500.00 or more, or
 - the total amount is less than \$500.00, and

- the group has a previous IPV, or
- the alleged IPV involves FAP 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 (October 2017), pp. 5, 12-13; ASM 165 (August 2016).

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.

BAM 700 (October 2018), p. 8; BAM 720, p. 1.

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

An IPV requires that the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the client has intentionally withheld, misrepresented information, or withheld facts or committed any act constituting a violation of Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP) regulations or State statutes for the **purpose** of establishing, maintaining, using, presenting, transferring, receiving, possessing, trafficking, increasing or preventing reduction of program benefits or eligibility. BAM 720, pp. 1, 12-13 (emphasis in original); 7 CFR 273.16(c) and (e)(6). Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in a clear and firm belief that the proposition is true. See M Civ JI 8.01.

In this case, the Department alleges that Respondent committed an IPV of FAP because she purchased FAP benefits from another person. Trafficking is the buying or selling or attempting to buy or sell FAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone. BAM 700, p. 2; 7 CFR 271.2. In this case, the Department established that it

adequately notified Respondent at the time of her application in April 2018 that she could not buy, sell, exchange, or otherwise traffick FAP benefits.

The Department alleges that Respondent bought FAP benefits and then made a Facebook post about the purchase using an account with a username or profile name of which is the same as her legal name. To establish that this account belongs to Respondent, the Department points to similarities between the account holder and Respondent. First, the Facebook lists the account holder as living in [REDACTED]. Second, Respondent's application and Bridges account list her as having the same name as the name listed on the Facebook profile. In addition, the Facebook page also has a post made by someone else to the account holder's page wishing them a Happy Birthday on [REDACTED]. Respondent's application lists her birthday as [REDACTED]. In addition, there are two posts about the account holder's son's birthday on [REDACTED] 2016 and [REDACTED] 2018 for a [REDACTED] birthday. According to Bridges, as of [REDACTED] 2018, Respondent's son by the same name as the child in the Facebook post is [REDACTED] years old. Finally, the Department compared photos of the account holder to Respondent's Secretary of State Driver's License photo, and the woman pictured in both images appears to be the same. After reviewing all of the similarities between Respondent and the Facebook Account Holder's personal information and photos, the Department has met its burden of proof in establishing that the Facebook account by the name of [REDACTED] belongs to Respondent.

Through her Facebook account, Respondent posted "[j]ust bought a orange card... About to tear the grocery store DOWN!!" with four dancing lady emojis. Orange card is a colloquial name for the Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) card because the card itself is orange. As discussed above, buying FAP benefits is a form of trafficking and trafficking is an IPV. Since Respondent posted no value for the purchase or sale of the EBT cards, there is no overissuance received by Respondent. Regardless, federal regulation and policy do not require an overissuance in a trafficking IPV case. Therefore, the Department has met its burden of proof in establishing that Respondent committed an IPV.

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. 15. Clients are disqualified for 10 years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FAP, 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; 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1) and (5). A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as he lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

In this case, the Department has satisfied its burden of showing that Respondent committed an IPV. This was Respondent's first IPV. Therefore, she is subject to a one-year disqualification under the FAP.

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.

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



AMTM/jaf

Amanda M. T. Marler
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

Amber Gibson
MDHHS- [REDACTED] Hearings
L Bengel
Policy Recoupment

Petitioner

MDHHS-OIG-Hearings

Respondent

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