




GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR



Date Mailed: December 13, 2019
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-007177
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Landis Lain

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 December 10, 2019, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Jenna McClellan, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG).

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).

Department's Exhibit A pages 1-85 were admitted as evidence.

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 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. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on July 2, 2019, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV.
2. The OIG has requested that Respondent be disqualified from receiving program benefits.
3. Respondent was a recipient of FAP benefits issued by the Department.
4. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill FAP use requirements.
5. The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) identified Livernois Fuels LLC as being involved in Food Assistance Program (FAP) trafficking and was permanently disqualified from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) program in September 2015 due to this.
6. Respondent's Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Bridge card was identified as being used at [REDACTED].
7. This Agent viewed the documents from the USDA that were provided from their investigation into [REDACTED]. The USDA analyzed EBT transactions from October 01, 2014 to March 31, 2015.
8. The USDA identified the store as having multiple transactions made from individual benefit accounts in unusually short periods of time, the majority of all the individual recipient benefits were exhausted in unusually short periods of time, and excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.
9. The store does not have any shopping baskets or carts for customers, the checkout does not use optical scanners, there is only one cash register and the register is behind a plastic barrier.
10. It was determined that FAP purchases in excess of \$40.03, the majority or all of individual recipient benefits exhausted in unusually short periods of time and purchases made in a 24-hour period more than \$100.00 are excessive for a store of this size and inventory.
11. The IG-312 EBT History - FAP Purchases by Individual Number at a Specific Store report was viewed in regard to Respondent's EBT purchases made at [REDACTED] from January 01, 2012 to September 30, 2015. The report reveals that the EBT Bridge card was used to make unauthorized FAP transactions at the [REDACTED] as documented by the USDA Food and Nutrition Service, including transactions made that were over \$40.03 and transactions made in a 24-hour period that is over \$100.00.

12. An IG-311 EBT History - FAP Purchases by ID Number report was completed and it indicates that Respondent had access to other, larger grocery stores, such as Metro Food Center, Sam's Club, Kroger and Walmart, and [REDACTED] was not her only option to purchase groceries at.
13. An EPPIC search was conducted regarding Respondent EBT card. Respondent did not have an Authorized Representative for her FAP benefits.
14. Respondent did report her EBT card lost and stolen during the alleged fraud period; however, there is only one PIN change made during this time. There are purchase that are made at [REDACTED] well before and after this PIN change was completed.
15. The Department's OIG indicates that the time period it is considering the fraud period is April 17, 2016 (fraud period).
16. During the fraud period, Respondent was issued \$977.23 in FAP benefits by the State of Michigan, and the Department alleges that Respondent was entitled to \$0 in such benefits during this time period.
17. The Department alleges that Respondent received an OI in FAP benefits in the amount of \$977.23.
18. This was Respondent's first alleged IPV.
19. 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.
20. 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.

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 January 1, 2016, the Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- Willful overpayments of \$500.00 or more under the AHH program.
- FAP trafficking overissuances 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 or more, or
 - the total amount is less than \$500, 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, pp 12-13 (1/1/2016)(Emphasis added).

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, p 7 (1/1/2016; BAM 720, p 1 (1/1/2016).

A person who knowingly uses, transfers, acquires, alters, purchases, possesses, presents for redemption or transports food stamps or coupons or access devices other than as authorized by the Food Stamp Act of 1977, 7 USC 2011 to 2030 is guilty of the crime of Food Assistance Program (FAP) trafficking. BEM 203 (Emphasis added). This

includes the voluntary transfer of Bridge cards and/or FAP benefits to any person outside the FAP group. DHS-Publication 322. Recipients cannot sell, trade or give away their FAP benefits, PIN or Michigan Bridge card. *Id.* DHHS policy BAM 700-Overissuance: The amount for trafficking-related IPV is the value of the trafficked benefits (attempted or actually trafficked).

FNS ruled on October 4, 2011, that "an individual who offers to sell their benefits by either making their offer in a public way or posting their EBT card for sale online has committed an IPV." Section 7(b) of the food stamp act and 7 CFR 274.7(a) clearly states posting your EBT card for sale or conversely soliciting the purchase of an EBT card online is a violation resulting in an IPV. BAM 720. Intentional Program Violations states that "IPV is suspected for a client who is alleged to have trafficked FAP benefits". MCL 750.300a, BEM 203, 7 U.S.C. 2016 A person who knowingly uses, transfers, acquires, alters, purchases, possesses, presents for redemption or transports food stamps or coupons or access devices other than as authorized by the food stamp act of 1977, 7. U.S.C. 2011 to 2030 is guilty of the crime of Food Assistance Program (FAP) trafficking. DHHS Policy BAM 700 defines Overissuance "For FAP benefits, an overissuance is also the amount of benefits trafficked) stolen, traded bought or sold) or attempted to be trafficked".

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 2. Clients are disqualified for ten years for a FAP IPV involving concurrent receipt of benefits, and, for all other IPV cases involving FIP, FAP or SDA, 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. CDC clients who intentionally violate CDC program rules are disqualified for six months for the first occurrence, twelve months for the second occurrence, and lifetime for the third occurrence. BEM 708, p 1 (4/1/2016). 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.

This was Respondent's first alleged instance of an IPV. Therefore, a 12-month disqualification is required.

Overissuance

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. BAM 700, p 1 (1/1/2016).

Clear and convincing proof means that the **evidence** presented by a party during the trial must be highly and substantially more probable to be true than not and the trier of fact must have a firm belief or conviction in its factuality.

The Department has established by the necessary competent, material and substantial evidence on the record that it was acting in compliance with Department policy when it determined that Respondent is responsible for unauthorized Food Assistance Program

transactions and engaged in FAP trafficking in contravention of Department policy. The Department has established its case by clear and convincing evidence

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 solicit for/receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$977.23.

The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment/collection procedures for \$977.23 in accordance with Department policy.

It is ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months beginning December 11, 2019.

LL/nr



Landis Lahn
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

Deborah Little
5131 Grand River Ave.
Detroit, MI
48208

Wayne 49 County DHHS- via electronic mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

L. Bengel- via electronic mail

Petitioner

OIG- via electronic mail
PO Box 30062
Lansing, MI
48909-7562

Respondent

