FH
[redacted]

STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals

In the Matter of

Oneida County Department of Social Services ,
Petitioner

v.

[redacted], Respondent

DECISION

FOF/143436

PRELIMINARY RECITALS

Pursuant to a petition filed August 28, 2012, under Wis. Admin. Code §HA 3.03, and see, 7 C.F.R. § 273.16, to review a decision by the Oneida County Department of Social Services to disqualify [redacted] from receiving FoodShare benefits (FS) for a period of one year, a hearing was held on November 05, 2012, at Rhinelander, Wisconsin. Petitioner did not arrive on time for the hearing. She failed to provide a reason for this despite this ALJ's request. The hearing was begun on time and on the record in petitioner's absence. The testimony of the Department representative was summarized for her upon her arrival, and further testimony was taken from the respondent and the petitioner.

The issue for determination is whether the respondent committed an Intentional Program Violation (IPV).

There appeared at that time and place the following persons:

PARTIES IN INTEREST:

Petitioner:

Department of Health Services
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability
1 West Wilson Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53703
By: Amy Mayo
Oneida County Department of Social Se rvices
Oneida Avenue
PO Box 400
Rhinelander, WI 54501

Respondent:

[redacted]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:
John P. Tedesco
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner (CARES # [redacted]) was a resident of Oneida County who received FS in Oneida County during the time period of August, 2010 to July, 2012.
2. In early 2010, petitioner was the casehead of her own FoodShare case. [redacted] was the casehead of a separate FoodShare case.
3. In June 2010, the two were married and began living together.
4. From June 2010 until August 2012 there were at least four reviews of the case at which time the agency asked about changes to petitioner's household.
5. Petitioner did not inform her agency of the marriage because she was afraid it would have a negative impact on her FoodShare allotment.
6. On September 28, 2012, the Department sent petitioner an Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice informing her that the Department had determined that she committed and intentional program violation.
7. Petitioner filed a timely appeal.

DISCUSSION

An IPV is defined at 7 C.F.R. §273.16(c) as intentionally: making a false or misleading statement or misrepresenting; concealing or withholding facts; or committing any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, federal regulations or any Wisconsin statute relating to the use, presentation, transfer, acquisition, receipt or possession of food stamp coupons or an authorization to participate (ATP) card.

The Department 's written policy restates federal law, below:

3.14.1 IPV Disqualification
7 CFR 273.16
A person commits an Intentional Program Violation (IPV) when s/he intentionally:

1. makes a false or misleading statement, or misrepresents, conceals or withholds facts; or
2. commits any act that constitutes a violation of the Food Stamp Act, the Food Stamp Program Regulations, or any Wisconsin statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of FoodShare benefits or QUEST cards.

An IPV may be determined by the following means:

1. Federal, state, or local court order,
2. Administrative Disqualification Hearing (ADH) decision,
3. Pre-charge or pretrial diversion agreement initiated by a local district attorney and signed by the FoodShare recipient in accordance with federal requirements, or
4. Waiver of the right to an ADH signed by the FoodShare recipient in accordance with federal requirements.

FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook, § 3.14.1.

Wisconsin statutes provide, in the parts relevant here, as follows:

> (2) No person may misstate or conceal facts in a food stamp program application or report of income, assets or household circumstances with intent to secure or continue to receive food stamp program benefits.

(2m) No person may knowingly fail to report changes in income, assets or other facts as required under 7 USC2015(c)(1) or regulations issued under that provision.

(3) No person may knowingly issue food coupons to a person who is not an eligible person or knowingly issue food coupons to an eligible person in excess of the amount for which the person's household is eligible.

(4) No eligible person may knowingly transfer food coupons except to purchase food from a supplier or knowingly obtain food coupons or use food coupons for which the person's household is not eligible.

(5) No supplier may knowingly obtain food coupons except as payment for food or knowingly obtain food coupons from a person who is not an eligible person.

(6) No unauthorized person may knowingly obtain, possess, transfer or use food coupons.

(7) No person may knowingly alter food coupons.

Wis. Stat. §§ 49.795(2-7).

The county agency may disqualify only the individual who either has been found to have committed the IPV or has signed a waiver or consent agreement, and not the entire household. If disqualified, an individual will be ineligible to participate in the FS program for one year for the first violation, two years for the second violation, and permanently for the third violation. However, any remaining household members must agree to make restitution within 30 days of the date of mailing a written demand letter, or their monthly allotment will be reduced. 7 C.F.R. §273.16(b).

In order for the county agency to establish that an FS recipient has committed an IPV, it has the burden to prove two separate elements by clear and convincing evidence. The recipient must have: 1) committed; and 2) intended to commit an intentional program violation per 7 C.F.R. §273.16(e)(6).

"Clear and convincing evidence" is an intermediate standard of proof which is more than the "preponderance of the evidence" used in most civil cases and less than the "beyond a reasonable doubt" standard used in criminal cases. It is used in civil cases where a higher standard is required because the outcome could result in serious social consequences for, or harsh effects on an individual. See 32A C.J.S., Evidence §1023. While the terminology for this intermediate standard of proof varies from state to state, it is clear that it is what is required by the FS regulations. See Jackson v. State, 546 So.2d 745 (Fla. App. 2 Dist. 1989).

There is no litmus test to show the trier of facts when properly admitted evidence is of a sufficient degree to be clear and convincing. In Smith v. Department of Health and Rehab. Serv., 522 So.2d 956 (Fla. App. 1 Dist. 1988), the court discussed this issue as it relates to a FS IPV:

In Slomowirtz v. Walker, 429 So.2d 797, 800 (Fla. 4th. DCA 1983), the court held that: Clear and convincing evidence requires that the evidence must be found to be credible; the facts to which the witnesses testify must be precise and explicit and the witnesses must be lacking in confusion as to the facts in issue. The evidence must be of such weight that it produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction, without hesitancy, as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established.

Smith, 522 So.2d at 958. The Wisconsin Supreme Court viewed the various standards of proof as degrees of certitude. In Kuehn v. Kuehn, 11 Wis.2d 15 (1959), the court held that:

> Defined in terms of quantity of proof, reasonable certitude or reasonable certainty in ordinary civil cases may be attained by or be based on a mere or fair preponderance of the evidence. Such certainty need not necessarily exclude the probability that the contrary conclusion may be true. In fraud cases it has been stated the preponderance of the evidence should be clear and satisfactory to indicate or sustain a greater degree of certitude. Such degree of certitude has also been defined as being produced by clear, satisfactory, and convincing evidence. Such evidence, however, need not eliminate a reasonable doubt that the alternative or opposite conclusion may be true. In criminal cases, while not normally stated in terms of preponderance, the necessary certitude is universally stated as being beyond a reasonable doubt.

Kuehn, 11 Wis.2d at 26. Thus, in order to find that an IPV was committed, the trier of fact must derive from the evidence, a firm conviction as to the existence of each of the two elements even though there may exist a reasonable doubt that the opposite is true.

What is needed to prove the first element, that an IPV as defined in 7 C.F.R. §273.16(c) was committed, is clear. In order to prove the second element, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient intended to commit the IPV. The question of intent is generally one to be determined by the trier of fact. State v. Lossman, 118 Wis.2d 526 (1984). There is a general rule that a person is presumed to know and intend the probable and natural consequences of his or her own voluntary words or acts. See John F. Jelke Co. v. Beck, 208 Wis. 650 (1932); 31A C.J.S. Evidence §131. Intention is a subjective state of mind to be determined upon all the facts. Lecus v. American Mut. Ins. Co. of Boston, 81 Wis.2d 183 (1977). Thus, there must be clear and convincing evidence that the FS recipient knew that the act or omission was a violation of the FS Program but committed the violation anyway.

At hearing, petitioner's demeanor was aggressive and inappropriate. Her testimony reflected a person who believes that rules are flexible and may be selectively followed. I would find petitioner to not be credible, but I do not need to do so as petitioner ultimately and boldly admitted that she did not disclose the marriage because she believed that it would have an effect on her FS, and the FS of her husband in his separate FS case. This intentional and knowing omission of the fact of the marriage and cohabitation is all that is required to establish the IPV. I must affirm the Department action.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Petitioner committed an IPV by intentionally failing to inform the Department of her marriage and the fact that she was living in a household with her husband from June 2010 onward.

THEREFORE, it is **ORDERED**

That this appeal is dismissed.

REQUEST FOR A REHEARING

This is a final administrative decision. If you think this decision is based on a serious mistake in the facts or the law, you may request a rehearing. You may also ask for a rehearing if you have found new evidence which would change the decision. Your request must explain what mistake the Administrative Law Judge made and why it is important or you must describe your new evidence and tell why you did not have it at your first hearing. If you do not explain these things, your request will have to be denied.

To ask for a rehearing, send a written request to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875. Send a copy of your request to the other people named in this decision as "PARTIES IN INTEREST." Your request for a rehearing must be received no later than 20 days after the date of the decision. See also, 7 C.F.R. sec. 273.16(e)(4) for the specific time limits for claiming good cause for missing the scheduled hearing. Late requests cannot be granted.

The process for asking for a rehearing is in Wis. Stat. § 227.49. A copy of the statutes can be found at your local library or courthouse.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be served and filed with the appropriate court no more than 30 days after the date of this hearing decision (or 30 days after a denial of rehearing, if you ask for one).

For purposes of appeal to circuit court, the Respondent in this matter is the Department of Health Services. After filing the appeal with the appropriate court, it must be served on the Secretary of that Department, either personally or by certified mail. The address of the Department is: 1 West Wilson Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703. A copy should also be sent to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, 5005 University Avenue, Suite 201, Madison, WI 53705-5400.

The appeal must also be served on the other "PARTIES IN INTEREST" named in this decision. The process for appeals to the Circuit Court is in Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53.

Given under my hand at the City of Madison,
Wisconsin, this 6th day of November, 2012

_____

John P. Tedesco
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals

State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS

David H. Schwarz
Suite 201
5005 University Avenue
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096
FAX: (608) 264-9885
email: DHAmail@wisconsin.gov
Internet: http://dha.state.wi.us

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on November 6, 2012.

Oneida County Department of Social Services
Public Assistance Collection Unit
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability