



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

MARLON BROWN  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: May 31, 2024  
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-007043  
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, a telephone hearing was held on May 23, 2024, from Lansing, Michigan. The Department was represented by Mark Mandreky, 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).

**ISSUES**

1. Did the Department establish by clear and convincing evidence that the Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV)?
2. 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 January [REDACTED] 2022, the Respondent acknowledged his 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, pp 35-52.

2. Respondent reported to the Department on his January █ 2022, application for assistance that he was a household of one. Exhibit A, p 36.
3. Department records indicate that Respondent told the Department's investigator that he would sometimes give his Food Assistance Program (FAP) EBT card to others to make purchases for him without reporting to the Department that he wanted an authorized representative, and that he would allow other to make purchases for their own needs using his benefits.
4. Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits granted to respondent were used to make purchases from January 28, 2022, through August 19, 2022. Exhibit A, pp 63-65.
5. On October █ 2020, a person not part of Respondent's household was arrested and found to in possession of Respondent's Food Assistance Program (FAP) EBT card. Exhibit A, p 61.
6. The Department's OIG filed a hearing request on October █ 2023, to establish that Respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV). Exhibit A, p 3.
7. On October █ 2023, the Department sent Respondent a Request for Waiver of Disqualification Hearing (DHS-826). Exhibit A, pp 6-7.
8. This was Respondent's first established IPV.
9. 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) is funded under the federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) established by the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC 2011 through 7 USC 2036a. It is implemented by the federal regulations contained in 7 CFR 273. The Department administers FAP pursuant to MCL 400.10 of the Social Welfare Act, MCL 400.1 *et seq*, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3001 through 400.3011.

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.

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).

Respondent acknowledged his 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 January ■■■ 2022. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the understanding or ability to fulfill this requirement.

The hearing record supports a finding that Respondent transferred his FAP EBT card to a person outside his household without reporting to the Department that he wanted an authorized representative on his case. Department records indicate that Respondent reported to an investigator that he sometimes allows others to use his FAP benefits for their own purchases in exchange for buying his food because he does not have a car to go shopping. Transferring FAP benefits to a person outside the household that has not been identified as an authorized representative is an unauthorized use of FAP benefits and fits the Department's definition of FAP trafficking.

In this case, the hearing record does not clearly establish the amount of Respondent's FAP benefits was transferred to a person outside Respondent's household.

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.*

Trafficking includes the buying, selling, or stealing or otherwise effecting an exchange of FAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (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. Trafficking also includes attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect an exchange of FAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone. BAM 700, p 2.

The hearing record does not contain any direct evidence, in the form of witness statements, video or photographic evidence, or admissions from the Respondent, that the Respondent trafficked in FAP benefits. Instead, the Department's case rests wholly on circumstantial evidence.

FAP trafficking is a fraudulent transfer of benefits that must be established by clear and convincing evidence and must never be presumed. Fraud may be established by circumstantial evidence and can be inferred from the evidence with facts which are inconsistent with an honest person. See *Foodland Distributors v Al-Naimi*, 220 Mich App 453 (1996), p 381.

The Department's representative presented as a knowledgeable witness who provided a credible account of an investigation of a FAP EBT card that was found in the possession of a person not part of Respondent's household and without legal authorization to make purchases with those benefits. No evidence was presented on the record that Respondent reported his EBT card as stolen and Petitioner did not claim his EBT card was stolen when interviewed by a Department investigator.

As there was no credible and persuasive explanation to the contrary, and inferring the Respondent's intent from the hearing record, this Administrative Law Judge finds that Respondent committed, and intended to commit FAP trafficking, which is an intentional program violation.

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 recipient 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. Department of Health and Human Services Bridges Administrative Manual (BAM) 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 Intentional Program Violation (IPV).
2. It is FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent be disqualified from the Food Assistance Program (FAP) for a period of 12 months.

KS/dm

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Kevin Scully**  
Administrative Law Judge  
Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings  
and Rules (MOAHR)

**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-Electronic Mail :**

**Petitioner**  
OIG  
**MDHHS-OIG-  
HEARINGS@michigan.gov**  
**DHHS**  
Jennipher Wheeler  
Muskegon County DHHS  
**MDHHS-Muskegon-  
Hearing@michigan.gov**

**Policy-Recoupment**

**StebbinsN**

**MOAHR**

**Via-First Class Mail :**

**Respondent**

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████████████████████████