



GRETCHEN WHITMER
GOVERNOR

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

ORLENE HAWKS
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: March 22, 2021
MOAHR Docket No.: 20-007881
Agency No.: [REDACTED]
Petitioner: [REDACTED]
Respondent: [REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Amanda M. T. Marler

HEARING DECISION
FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION (TRAFFICKING)

The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS or the Department) requested a hearing alleging that Respondent [REDACTED] committed an intentional program violation (IPV) by trafficking Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits. Pursuant to MDHHS' request for hearing and MCL 400.9, 7 CFR 273.16 and 7 CFR 273.18, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge. After due notice, a hearing was held via telephone conference on March 18, 2021.

Joseph Adcock, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), represented MDHHS.

Respondent appeared and represented himself.

ISSUES

1. Did MDHHS establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an intentional program violation (IPV) by trafficking Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits?
3. Has MDHHS established a recipient claim against Respondent for \$274.60 based on FAP benefits trafficked by Respondent?

FINDINGS OF FACT

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

1. Shortly after Respondent's Application for benefits, the Department provided Respondent with an information sheet titled Important Things To Know and a

pamphlet titled How to Use Your Michigan Bridge Card which explained to Respondent that he could not buy, sell, trade, exchange, or otherwise traffic his FAP benefits.

2. Respondent submitted a Redetermination to the Department on September 17, 2018 to continue his receipt of FAP benefits and acknowledged via his signature that he could view the same documents online at the website provided.
3. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit an understanding of the trafficking prohibition.
4. In October 2018 and January 2019, Respondent's FAP benefits were used at [REDACTED] for purchases totaling \$274.60.
5. Respondent admits that he gave his card to a man named [REDACTED] (Owner), owner of [REDACTED] (Store), in exchange for cash so that Owner could purchase items to stock Store.
6. Respondent has no prior FAP IPV disqualifications.
7. On September 30, 2020, MDHHS' OIG filed a hearing request alleging that Respondent intentionally trafficked FAP benefits in October 2018 and January 2019 (fraud period). OIG requested that (i) Respondent repay MDHHS as a recipient claim the value of trafficked benefits totaling \$274.60 and (ii) Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of 12 months due to committing an IPV by trafficking.
8. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was not returned by the United States Postal Services as undeliverable.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

MDHHS policies are contained in the MDHHS Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM), Bridges Eligibility Manual (BEM), and Reference Tables Manual (RFT).

The Food Assistance Program (FAP) [formerly known as the Food Stamp program] is funded under the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 to 7 USC 2036a. It is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. MDHHS administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 of the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1 *et seq.*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 to R 400.3015.

Trafficking and IPV Disqualification

MDHHS alleges that Respondent committed an IPV by trafficking FAP benefits and requests that Respondent be disqualified from FAP eligibility. IPV is defined, in part, as having intentionally “committed any act that constitutes a violation of [FAP], [FAP federal] regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of [FAP] benefits or EBT [electronic benefit transfer] cards.” 7 CFR 273.16(c)(2) and (e)(6). Trafficking includes buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting, or attempting to buy, sell, steal or otherwise effect, “an exchange of [FAP] benefits issued and accessed via [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” 7 CFR 271.2.

To establish an IPV by trafficking, MDHHS must present clear and convincing evidence that the household member committed, and intended to commit, the IPV. 7 CFR 273.16(e)(6); BAM 720 (October 2017), p. 1. Clear and convincing evidence is evidence sufficient to result in “a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the precise facts in issue.” *Smith v Anonymous Joint Enterprise*, 487 Mich 102, 114-115; 793 NW2d 533 (2010); see also M Civ JI 8.01. The clear and convincing standard is “the most demanding standard applied in civil cases.” *In re Martin*, 450 Mich 204, 227; 538 NW2d 399 (1995).

In this case, MDHHS alleged that Respondent committed an IPV by trafficking FAP benefits when he sold his FAP benefits for cash to Owner so that Owner could stock Store with inventory. Respondent admits that he sold his FAP benefits to Owner for cash and that Owner used his FAP benefits to make purchases at Sam’s Club to stock Store. Respondent sold his benefits to Owner on two occasions, once in October 2018 when Owner spent \$188.60 of Respondent’s benefits at [REDACTED] and again in January 2019 when Owner spent \$86.00 at [REDACTED].

Under the facts presented, MDHHS has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent trafficked FAP benefits by selling his benefits to Owner so that Owner could stock Store. Thus, Respondent committed an IPV. An individual who is found to have committed an IPV by a hearing decision is disqualified from receiving program benefits. 7 CFR 273.16(b). Respondent did not have prior FAP IPV violations; therefore, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from the FAP program. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1).

Repayment

A party is responsible for a recipient claim to MDHHS in an amount equal to the value of trafficked benefits. 7 CFR 273.18(a)(ii). The value of the trafficked benefits is determined by (i) the individual’s admission; (ii) adjudication; or (iii) the documentation that forms the basis for the trafficking determination. 7CFR 273.18(c)(2). Documentation used to establish the trafficking determination can include an affidavit from a store owner or sworn testimony from a federal or state investigator of how much a client could

have reasonably trafficked in that store, which can be established through circumstantial evidence. BAM 720, p. 8.

Here, MDHHS seeks repayment from Respondent of \$274.60, the amount of the alleged trafficked benefits. As discussed previously, Respondent sold his FAP benefits to Respondent on two occasions for a total of \$274.60. The evidence presented by MDHHS was sufficient to establish a valid recipient claim for \$274.60.

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. MDHHS has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV, Respondent is subject to a FAP disqualification.
2. Respondent is responsible to MDHHS for a recipient claim of \$274.60 for trafficked IPV benefits.

IT IS ORDERED that MDHHS initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with MDHHS policy for a FAP recipient claim in the amount of \$274.60, less any amounts already recouped/collected, for the fraud period.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be personally disqualified from FAP for a period of 12 months.

AMTM/cc



Amanda M. T. Marler
Administrative Law Judge
for Elizabeth Hertel, 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

Via Email:

MDHHS-Wayne-55-Hearings
MDHHS-OIG-Hearings
Policy-Recoupment
L. Bengel
MOAHR

Respondent- Via USPS:

