



GRETCHEN WHITMER  
GOVERNOR

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

MARLON I. BROWN, DPA  
DIRECTOR

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Date Mailed: April 17, 2024  
MOAHR Docket No.: 23-004492  
Agency No.: [REDACTED]  
Petitioner: OIG  
Respondent: [REDACTED] [REDACTED]

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE: Colleen Lack**

**HEARING DECISION FOR INTENTIONAL PROGRAM VIOLATION**

The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS or the Department) requested a hearing alleging that Respondent Marcus Davis committed an intentional program violation (IPV). Pursuant to MDHHS' request and in accordance with MCL 400.9, 7 CFR 273.16, 42 CFR 431.230(b), and 45 CFR 235.110, and Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130 and R 400.3178, this matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge. After due notice, a hearing was held via telephone conference on March 19, 2024.

Mark Mandreky, Regulation Agent of the Office of Inspector General (OIG), represented MDHHS.

Respondent did not appear at the hearing, and it was held in Respondent's absence pursuant to 7 CFR 273.16(e)(4); Mich Admin Code, R 400.3130(5); or Mich Admin Code, R 400.3178(5).

**ISSUES**

1. Did MDHHS establish, by clear and convincing evidence, that Respondent committed an IPV concerning Food Assistance Program (FAP) benefits?
2. Should Respondent be disqualified from receiving benefits for FAP?
3. Did Respondent receive an overissuance (OI) of FAP benefits that MDHHS is entitled to recoup and/or collect as a recipient claim?

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

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

1. From November 1, 2021 to February 28, 2022, Respondent received FAP benefits for a household size of one. (Exhibit A, p. 67)
2. On August [REDACTED] 2021, Respondent submitted an Assistance Application. Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application certified that he read and understood the rights and responsibilities. This would include timely reporting changes and ensuring that FAP benefits are not used by unauthorized persons and must only be used to purchase eligible food for the FAP household members. (Exhibit A, pp. 9-55 and 88-105)
3. Respondent did not have an alternate payee for his FAP benefits. (Exhibit A, p. 75)
4. The Department confirmed that Respondent was incarcerated from December [REDACTED] 2021 to April [REDACTED] 2022. (Exhibit A, p. 77)
5. On August [REDACTED] 2021 Respondent was issued an electronic benefit transfer (EBT) card ending in [REDACTED] and the PIN was last changed September 30, 2021. (Exhibit A, p. 81)
6. From January 3, 2022 to March 8, 2022, Respondent's EBT card ending in [REDACTED] was utilized for numerous transactions totaling \$[REDACTED] (Exhibit A, pp. 79-80 and 82-86)
7. During a July [REDACTED] 2023 interview, Respondent acknowledged the dates he was incarcerated and indicated he would sometimes allow food to be purchased for his son who is on his mother's case. (Exhibit A, p. 4)
8. Respondent was aware of the responsibilities to timely report changes and to ensure that FAP benefits are not used by unauthorized persons and must only be used to purchase eligible food for the FAP household members. (Exhibit A, pp. 9-55 and 88-105)
9. Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the ability to understand or fulfill the FAP responsibilities. (Exhibit A, pp. 43 and 71-73)
10. Respondent has no prior FAP IPV disqualifications. (Exhibit A, pp. 1 and 64-65)
11. On August 1, 2023, MDHHS' OIG filed a hearing request alleging that Respondent intentionally allowed his benefits to be used while he was incarcerated to purchase food for someone who was not a member of his FAP household and as a result,

Respondent is responsible for the unauthorized use of FAP benefits from January 1, 2022 to March 30, 2022 (fraud period). OIG requested that (i) Respondent repay \$██████ to MDHHS for unauthorized FAP transactions and (ii) Respondent be disqualified from receiving FAP benefits for a period of 12 months due to committing an IPV. (Exhibit A, pp. 1-110)

12. A notice of hearing was mailed to Respondent at the last known address and was 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), Adult Services Manual (ASM), 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 400.3031.

#### **Intentional Program Violation**

An IPV occurs when a recipient of MDHHS benefits intentionally made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed, or withheld facts. 7 CFR 273.16(c)(1). Effective October 1, 2014, MDHHS's OIG requests IPV hearings for cases where (1) the total repayment amount sought from Respondent for all programs combined is \$500 or more or (2) the total repayment amount sought from Respondent for all programs combined is less than \$500 but the group has a previous IPV, the matter involves concurrent receipt of assistance, the IPV involves FAP trafficking, or the alleged fraud is committed by a state government employee. BAM 720 (October 1, 2017), p. 12-13.

To establish an IPV, 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, 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. Evidence may be uncontroverted and yet not be clear and convincing; conversely, evidence may be clear and convincing despite the fact that it has been contradicted. *Smith* at 115. The clear and convincing standard is "the most demanding standard applied in civil cases." *In re Martin*, 450 Mich

In this case, MDHHS alleges that Respondent committed an IPV based on allowing his benefits to be used while he was incarcerated to purchase food for someone who was

not a member of his FAP household and as a result, Respondent is responsible for the unauthorized use of FAP benefits from January 1, 2022 to March 30, 2022 (fraud period).

The Department has established that Respondent was aware of the responsibilities to timely report changes to the Department and to ensure that FAP benefits are not used by unauthorized persons and must only be used to purchase eligible food for the FAP household members. Households are required to report changes in residence and the resulting change in shelter costs. 7 CFR 273.12(a)(1)(i)(D)(iii). Department policy requires clients to report any change in circumstances that will affect eligibility or benefit amount within 10 days. BAM 105, (October 1, 2021), pp. 11-13. Further, food program benefits may only be used by the household, or other persons the household selects, to purchase eligible food for the household. 2 CFR 274.4(a). Respondent's signature on the Assistance Application certified that he read and understood the rights and responsibilities. This would include timely reporting changes and ensuring that FAP benefits are not used by unauthorized persons and must only be used to purchase eligible food for the FAP household members. (Exhibit A, pp. 9-55 and 88-105). Respondent did not have an apparent physical or mental impairment that would limit the ability to understand or fulfill the FAP responsibilities. (Exhibit A, pp. 43 and 71-73).

The Department asserted that Respondent intentionally allowed his benefits to be used while he was incarcerated to purchase food for someone who was not a member of his FAP household and as a result, Respondent is responsible for the unauthorized use of FAP benefits from January 1, 2022 to March 30, 2022 (fraud period). From November 1, 2021 to February 28, 2022, Respondent received FAP benefits for a household size of one. (Exhibit A, p. 67). The Department confirmed that Respondent was incarcerated from December [REDACTED] 2021 to April [REDACTED] 2022. (Exhibit A, p. 77). There was no evidence that Respondent reported that he was incarcerated to the Department. Between January 3, 2022 to March 8, 2022, Respondent's EBT card ending in [REDACTED] was utilized for numerous transactions totaling \$[REDACTED] (Exhibit A, pp. 79-80 and 82-86). During a July [REDACTED] 2023 interview, Respondent acknowledged the dates he was incarcerated and indicated he would sometimes allow food to be purchased for his son who is on his mother's case. (Exhibit A, p. 4).

Respondent's failure to timely report the incarceration resulted in an OI of FAP benefits. Respondent was not eligible for FAP while he was incarcerated. Further, the food purchased while Respondent was incarcerated was not for Respondent's use. Therefore, MDHHS has presented clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV.

### **IPV Disqualification**

An individual who is found pursuant to an IPV disqualification hearing to have committed a FAP IPV is disqualified from receiving benefits for the same program for 12 months for the first IPV, 24 months for the second IPV, and lifetime for the third IPV. 7 CFR 273.16(b)(1); BAM 720, p. 16. As discussed above, MDHHS has established by clear and convincing evidence that Respondent committed an IPV. Respondent has no

prior FAP IPV disqualifications. (Exhibit A, pp. 1 and 64-65). Because this was Respondent's first IPV for FAP, Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from receipt of FAP benefits.

### **Overissuance**

When a client group receives more benefits than entitled to receive, MDHHS must attempt to recoup the OI as a recipient claim. 7 CFR 273.18(a)(2); BAM 700, (October 1, 2018), p. 1. The amount of a FAP OI is the benefit amount the client actually received minus the amount the client was eligible to receive. 7 CFR 273.18(c)(1); BAM 720, p. 8; BAM 715 (October 1, 2017), p. 6; BAM 705 (October 1, 2018), p. 6.

In this case, MDHHS alleged that Respondent was overissued FAP benefits totaling \$██████ during the fraud period. From November 1, 2021 to February 28, 2022, Respondent received FAP benefits for a household size of one. (Exhibit A, p. 67). The Department confirmed that Respondent was incarcerated from December ██████ 2021 to April ██████ 2022. (Exhibit A, p. 77). Respondent was not eligible for FAP benefits while he was incarcerated. Additionally, from January 3, 2022 to March 8, 2022, Respondent's EBT card ending in ██████ was utilized for numerous transactions totaling \$██████ (Exhibit A, pp. 79-80 and 82-86). During a July ██████ 2023 interview, Respondent acknowledged the dates he was incarcerated and indicated he would sometimes allow food to be purchased for his son who is on his mother's case. (Exhibit A, p. 4). The food purchased while Respondent was incarcerated was not for Respondent's use.

Therefore, MDHHS is entitled to repayment from Respondent of \$██████ in overissued FAP benefits.

**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.
2. Respondent is subject to a 12-month disqualification from FAP.
3. Respondent did receive an OI of FAP benefits in the amount of \$ [REDACTED]

**IT IS ORDERED** that MDHHS initiate recoupment and/or collection procedures in accordance with MDHHS policy for a FAP OI in the amount of \$ [REDACTED] 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.

CL/dm

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**Colleen Lack**  
Administrative Law Judge

**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**  
Tara Roland 82-17  
Wayne-Greenfield/Joy-DHHS  
**MDHHS-Wayne-17-  
hearings@michigan.gov**

**StebbinsN**

**Policy-Recoupment**

**BSC4HearingDecisions**

**MOAHR**

**Via-First Class Mail :**

**Respondent**

██████████  
██████████  
██████████