



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED], MI [REDACTED]

Date Mailed: March 5, 2020
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-012274
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: OIG
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully

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, and with Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178. After due notice, telephone hearing was held on February 20, 2020, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Mark Mandreky, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG). Officer Brannnon Pierman of the Portage Department of Public Safety testified on behalf of the Department. 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).

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 the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
3. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. On an application for assistance dated May 22, 2018, the Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to use Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in a manner consistent with the Food and

Nutrition Act of 2008. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement. Exhibit A, 22-27.

2. Store security cameras show Respondent purchasing soda from that store with her Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Exhibit A, pp 16-18.
3. Respondent's Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits were used to make a \$27.20 purchase on October 16, 2018. Exhibit A, p 21.
4. The only items Respondent purchased at that store was soda. Exhibit A, p 14.
5. On October 16, 2018, Officer Brannon Pierman observed Respondent in a store parking lot pouring out soda that she had just purchased with her Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Exhibit A, pp 12-13.
6. Officer Pierman testified that Respondent told him that she was disposing of the soda so that she could purchase cigarettes with the money she would get from the can deposit money. Exhibit A, pp 12-13.
7. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on October 31, 2019, to establish an OI of benefits received by Respondent as a result of Respondent having allegedly committed an IPV. Exhibit A, p 3.
8. On October 31, 2019, the Department sent the Respondent an Intentional Program Violation Repayment Agreement (DHS-4350) with notice of a \$27.20 overpayment, and a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 6-9.
9. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
10. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the US Postal Service as undeliverable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Department policies are contained in the Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), Department of Health and Human Services Reference Tables Manual (RFT), and Department of Health and Human Services Emergency Relief Manual (ERM).

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-.3011.

The Department's OIG requests IPV hearings for the following cases:

- 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 OI amount for the FIP, SDA, CDC, MA and FAP programs is \$500 or more, or
 - the total OI 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.

Department of Health and Human Services Bridges
Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (October 1, 2017), pp 12-13.

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

When a client group receives more benefits than it is entitled to receive, the Department must attempt to recoup the overissuance. Department of Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 700 (October 1, 2018), p 1.

Federal regulations provide the following definition of intentional program violations:

Definition of intentional Program violation. Intentional Program violations 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 of SNAP or FAP benefits includes “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.” 7 CFR 271.2, BAM 700, p 2.

Respondent acknowledged her duties and responsibilities including the duty to use FAP benefits in a manner consistent with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 on an application for assistance dated May 22, 2018. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.

On October 16, 2018, Respondent was observed by a police officer disposing of soda she had purchased with her FAP benefits for the purposes of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intending to return the container for the deposit amount. Respondent’s actions fit the definition of FAP trafficking, which creates an overissuance in the amount of the FAP benefits that were trafficked.

The Department has the burden of establishing by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). The clear and convincing evidence standard, which is the most demanding standard applied in civil cases, is established where there is evidence so clear, direct and weighty and convincing that a conclusion can be drawn without hesitancy of the truth of the precise facts in issue. *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102; 793 NW2d 533 (2010), reh den 488 Mich 860; 793 NW2d 559 (2010).

Clear and convincing proof is that which produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing. Conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing even if contradicted. *Id.*

This Administrative Law Judge finds that the Department established by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent intentionally purchased a product with her FAP benefits that had 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 in a manner other than authorized by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 2036a, and that fits the Department’s definition of benefit trafficking in Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 720 (October 1, 2017), pp 1-22.

A court or hearing decision that finds a client committed IPV disqualifies that client from receiving program benefits. BAM 720, p. 15-16. A disqualified recipient remains a member of an active group as long as the disqualified person lives with them, and other eligible group members may continue to receive benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

Clients who commit an IPV are disqualified for a standard disqualification period except when a court orders a different period, or except when the OI relates to MA. BAM 720, p. 13. Refusal to repay will not cause denial of current or future MA if the client is otherwise eligible. BAM 710 (January 1, 2018), p. 2. Clients are disqualified for periods of one year for the first IPV, two years for the second IPV, lifetime disqualification for the third IPV, and ten years for a FAP concurrent receipt of benefits. BAM 720, p. 16.

The record evidence indicates that this is Respondent's first established IPV violation.


The Department has established an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

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 OI of Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits in the amount of \$27.20.
3. The Department is ORDERED to initiate recoupment procedures for the amount of \$27.20 in accordance with Department policy.
4. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/nr



Kevin Scully
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

Petitioner

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

Kalamazoo County DHHS- via electronic
mail

MDHHS- Recoupment- via electronic mail

L. Bengel- via electronic mail

DHHS

Renee Olian
322 Stockbridge
Kalamazoo, MI
49001

Respondent

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED], MI