



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: January 7, 2020  
MOAHR Docket No.: 19-012716  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Kevin Scully**

### **HEARING DECISION**

Following Petitioner's request for a hearing, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 400.37; 7 CFR 273.15 to 273.18; 42 CFR 431.200 to 431.250; 45 CFR 99.1 to 99.33; and 45 CFR 205.10. After due notice, a telephone hearing was held on January 2, 2020, from Lansing, Michigan. Petitioner was represented by himself. The Department of Health and Human Services was represented by Colleen Corey.

### **ISSUE**

Did the Department of Health and Human Services (Department) properly close Petitioner's 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 November 21, 2019, the Department notified Petitioner that he was not eligible for Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits as of November 20, 2019. Exhibit A, pp 11-14.
2. On November 22, 2019, the Department received Petitioner's request for a hearing protesting the closure of his Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Exhibit A, pp 4-5.

### **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.

An individual convicted (under Federal or State law) of any offense which is classified as a felony by the law of the jurisdiction involved and which has as an element the possession, use, or distribution of a controlled substance (as defined in section 102(6) of the Controlled Substance Act, 21 U.S.C.802(6)) shall not be considered an eligible household member unless the State legislature of the State where the individual is domiciled has enacted legislation exempting individuals domiciled in the State from the above exclusion. 7 CFR 273.11(m).

Subject to federal approval, an individual is not entitled to the exemption in this section if the individual was convicted of 2 or more separate felony acts that included the possession, use, or distribution of a controlled substance and both acts occurred after August 22, 1996. 2019 PA 139 § 619 (Appropriations Act).

An individual convicted of a felony for the use, possession, or distribution of controlled substances two or more times in separate periods will be permanently disqualified if both convictions were for conduct which occurred after August 22, 1996. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM) 203 (May 1, 2018), p 4.

On November 21, 2019, the Department notified Petitioner that he was not eligible for FAP benefits based on its findings that he had been convicted of more than one felony offense involving controlled substances where each separate offense occurred after August 22, 1996.

Petitioner denied having more than one felony conviction involving controlled substances and argued that the Department is basing its eligibility determination on faulty information.

The Department apparently requested certified copies of Petitioner's felony conviction record but did not actually receive those documents, or equivalent records from an electronic database, due to the cost demanded by the 22<sup>nd</sup> Judicial District Court of Louisiana. Apparently, the Department was unable to obtain evidence of the felony offenses by any other means.

The production of evidence to support the department's position is clearly required under BAM 600 as well as general case law (see e.g., *Kar v Hogan*, 399 Mich 529; 251 NW2d 77 [1976]). In *McKinstry v Valley Obstetrics-Gynecology Clinic, PC*, 428 Mich167; 405 NW2d 88 (1987), the Michigan Supreme Court addressed the issue of burden of proof, stating in part:

The term "burden of proof" encompasses two separate meanings. [citation omitted.] One of these meanings is the burden of persuasion or the risk of nonpersuasion. The other is the risk of going forward or the risk of nonproduction. The burden of producing evidence on an issue means the liability to an adverse ruling (generally a finding or a directed verdict) if evidence on the issue has not been produced. It is usually on the party who has pleaded the existence of the fact, but..., the burden may shift to the adversary when the pleader has discharged [its] initial duty. The burden of producing evidence is a critical mechanism[.]

The burden of persuasion becomes a crucial factor only if the parties have sustained their burdens of producing evidence and only when all of the evidence has been introduced.

McKinstry, 428 Mich at 93-94, quoting McCormick, Evidence (3d ed), Sec. 336, p. 946.

The Department failed to offer direct evidence that Petitioner has more than one felony conviction for offenses involving controlled substances. Further, no evidence of the size and composition of Petitioner's household was offered during the hearing.

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and for the reasons stated on the record, if any, finds that the Department failed to satisfy its burden of showing that it acted in accordance with Department policy when it determined that Petitioner is not eligible for the Food Assistance Program (FAP).


### **DECISION AND ORDER**

Accordingly, the Department's decision is REVERSED.

THE DEPARTMENT IS ORDERED TO BEGIN DOING THE FOLLOWING, IN ACCORDANCE WITH DEPARTMENT POLICY AND CONSISTENT WITH THIS HEARING DECISION, WITHIN 10 DAYS OF THE DATE OF MAILING OF THIS DECISION AND ORDER:

Initiate a determination of Petitioner's eligibility for the Food Assistance Program (FAP) as of November 20, 2019.

KS/hb

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**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

**DHHS**

Yaita Turner  
51111 Woodward Ave 5th Floor  
Pontiac, MI 48342

Oakland County (District 4), DHHS

BSC4 via electronic mail

M. Holden via electronic mail

D. Sweeney via electronic mail

**Petitioner**

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