



**STATE OF WISCONSIN**  
**Division of Hearings and Appeals**

---

In the Matter of

Milwaukee Enrollment Services, Petitioner

vs.

██████████, Respondent

DECISION  
Case #: FOF - 152772

---

Pursuant to petition filed October 4, 2013, under Wis. Admin. Code §HA 3.03, and 7 C.F.R. § 273.16, to review a decision by the Milwaukee Enrollment Services to disqualify ██████████ from receiving FoodShare benefits (FS) for ten years, a hearing was held on Thursday, December 19, 2013 at 01:00 PM, at Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

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

There appeared at that time the following persons:

**PARTIES IN INTEREST:**

Petitioner:

Milwaukee Enrollment Services  
1220 W Vliet St  
Milwaukee, WI 53205

Respondent:

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

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:**

Debra Bursinger  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

**FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The respondent (CARES # ██████████) is a resident of NA who received FS benefits in Milwaukee County from April 1, 2012 through September 1, 2013.

2. On April 5, 2012, respondent applied for FS in Wisconsin via online ACCESS application. Respondent reported he was homeless and not receiving other FS benefits. The application was processed and the Respondent was found eligible for expedited issuance of benefits for April 5 - 30, 2012.
3. On April 5, 2012, the agency discovered respondent was open for food assistance in the state of Georgia. On April 6, 2012, the agency issued a Notice of Decision informing the Petitioner his benefits would end on May 1, 2012 due to dual issuance of benefits.
4. On April 13, 2012, the respondent submitted a food assistance renewal in Georgia reporting an address of [REDACTED], [REDACTED].
5. On June 11, 2012, the respondent submitted an online ACCESS application. He again reported he was homeless and not receiving other FS benefits. The application was processed and he was found eligible for expedited issuance of benefits for effective June 11, 2012. His FS case was pended for July, 2012.
6. On June 13, 2012, the agency received information from the state of Georgia that respondent had received food assistance benefits from Georgia continuously during the period of December, 2009 – June, 2012. He reported a Georgia address for that period.
7. On August 10, 2012, respondent submitted an online ACCESS application. He again reported he was homeless and not receiving other FS benefits. The application was process and a Notice of Decision was issued on August 13, 2012 informing the respondent that he was denied because he was receiving benefits in another state.
8. On August 20, 2012, respondent contacted the agency. The agency worker found a handwritten note from the respondent requesting closure of his food assistance case in Georgia. On August 21, 2012, the agency issued benefits effective August 10, 2012.
9. On September 22, 2012, the respondent submitted a Georgia COMPASS renewal reporting an address of [REDACTED], [REDACTED].
10. On December 18, 2012, the respondent completed a phone eligibility review at which he reported no other FS benefits. FS benefits were continued.
11. On March 30, 2013, respondent completed another COMPASS renewal in Georgia.
12. On July 8, 2013, the Wisconsin agency determined the respondent was receiving food assistance benefits in Georgia. This was confirmed by the Georgia agency on July 10, 2013.
13. On July 26, 2013 and August 14, 2013, the respondent contacted the agency to complete a renewal. He was advised he could re-apply at the agency with proof of closure of his Georgia food assistance case.
14. On August 26, 2013, respondent submitted an online ACCESS application reporting no other FS benefits. On August 27, 2013, the application was processed and pended for residence and other FS benefits. On September 23, 2013, the respondent contacted the agency to complete his interview. His case was pended.
15. On September 24, 2013, the agency issued expedited FS benefits effective August 26, 2013.
16. On October 1, 2013, respondent's FS case was closed.
17. On October 21, 2013, the petitioner prepared an Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice alleging that respondent intentionally misrepresented eligibility to receive benefits.
18. The respondent failed to appear for the scheduled December 19, 2013 Intentional Program Violation (IPV) hearing and did not provide any good cause for said failure to appear.

### **DISCUSSION**

The Respondent did not appear for this hearing. This circumstance is governed by the regulation in 7 C.F.R. §273.16(e)(4), which states in part:

If the household member or its representative cannot be located or fails to appear at a hearing initiated by the State agency without good cause, the hearing shall be conducted without the household member being represented. Even though the household member is not represented, the

hearing official is required to carefully consider the evidence and determine if intentional Program violation was committed based on clear and convincing evidence. If the household member is found to have committed an intentional program violation but a hearing official later determines that the household member or representative had good cause for not appearing, the previous decision shall no longer remain valid and the State agency shall conduct a new hearing. The hearing official who originally ruled on the case may conduct a new hearing. In instances where the good cause for failure to appear is based upon a showing of nonreceipt of the hearing notice, the household member has 30 days after the date of the written notice of the hearing decision to claim good cause for failure to appear. In all other instances, the household member has 10 days from the date of the scheduled hearing to present reasons indicating a good cause for failure to appear. A hearing official must enter the good cause decision into the record.

The hearing in this case took place on December 19, 2013. The Respondent was instructed via the hearing notice to appear at 1220 W. Vliet St., Milwaukee, WI for the hearing. The respondent did not appear or contact the administrative law judge with a phone number where he could be reached. The OIG indicated that the Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice was sent to respondent at his last known address, with no returned mail. Consequently, the hearing was held in the Respondent's absence.

The Respondent should note that pursuant to the Federal Regulation cited above, he has ten days from the December 19, 2013 date to contact the Division of Hearings and Appeals and provide a claim of good cause for his failure to be available for the hearing.

An intentional program violation of the FoodShare program occurs when a recipient intentionally does the following:

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.

*FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1; *see also* 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(c) and Wis. Stat. §§ 49.795(2-7).

An intentional program violation can be proven by a court order, a diversion agreement entered into with the local district attorney, a waiver of a right to a hearing, or an administrative disqualification hearing, *FoodShare Wisconsin Handbook*, § 3.14.1. The petitioner can disqualify only the individual found to have committed the intentional violation; it cannot disqualify the entire household. Those disqualified on grounds involving the improper transfer of FS benefits are ineligible to participate in the FoodShare program for one year for the first violation, two years for the second violation, and permanently for the third violation. Although other family members cannot be disqualified, their monthly allotments will be reduced unless they agree to make restitution within 30 days of the date that the FS program mails a written demand letter. 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(b).

7 C.F.R. §273.16(e)(4) provides that the hearing shall proceed if the respondent cannot be located or fails to appear without good cause. The respondent did not appear or claim a good cause reason for not attending the

hearing. Therefore, I must determine whether the respondent committed an IPV based solely on the evidence that the petitioner presented at hearing.

In order for the petitioner 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 a program violation per 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(6). 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. ...

*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.

In order to prove the second element, i.e., intention, 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.

Based upon the record before me, I find that the petitioner has established by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally violated FS program rules, and that this violation was the first such violation committed by the respondent. The evidence that respondent received benefits in both Georgia and Wisconsin is clear. The respondent clearly misrepresented his residency to the Wisconsin agency and clearly misrepresented the status of his food assistance case in Georgia over an extended period of time. Therefore, the petitioner correctly seeks to disqualify the respondent from the FS program for ten years.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. The respondent violated, and intended to violate, the FS program rule specifying that an applicant/recipient must provide accurate and truthful information.
2. The violation specified in Conclusion of Law No. 1 is the first such violation committed by the respondent.

**NOW, THEREFORE,** it is

**ORDERED**

That the petitioner's determination is sustained, and that the petitioner may make a finding that the respondent committed a first IPV of the FoodShare program and disqualify the respondent from the program for ten years, effective the first month following the date of receipt of this decision.

**REQUEST FOR A REHEARING ON GROUNDS OF GOOD CAUSE FOR FAILURE TO APPEAR**

In instances where the good cause for failure to appear is based upon a showing of non-receipt of the hearing notice, the respondent has 30 days after the date of the written notice of the hearing decision to claim good cause for failure to appear. See 7 C.F.R. sec. 273.16(e)(4).

**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 Petitioner 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, Room 651, Madison, WI 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 225.53.

Given under my hand at the City of Milwaukee,  
Wisconsin, this 20th day of December, 2013

---

\sDebra Bursinger  
Administrative Law Judge  
Division of Hearings and Appeals

- c: Miles - email
- Public Assistance Collection Unit - email
- Division of Health Care Access and Accountability - email
- Pamela Hazley - email



**State of Wisconsin\DIVISION OF HEARINGS AND APPEALS**

Brian Hayes, Administrator  
Suite 201  
5005 University Avenue  
Madison, WI 53705-5400

Telephone: (608) 266-3096  
FAX: (608) 264-9885  
email: [DHAMail@wisconsin.gov](mailto:DHAMail@wisconsin.gov)  
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on December 20, 2013.

Milwaukee Enrollment Services  
Public Assistance Collection Unit  
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability  
[Pamela.Hazley@dhs.wisconsin.gov](mailto:Pamela.Hazley@dhs.wisconsin.gov)