



STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals

In the Matter of

Dane County Department of Human [REDACTED], Petitioner

vs.

DECISION

Case #: FOF - 156196

[REDACTED] [REDACTED], Respondent

Pursuant to petition filed March 20, 2014, under Wis. Admin. Code §HA 3.03, and 7 C.F.R. § 273.16, to review a decision by the Dane County Department of Human [REDACTED] to disqualify [REDACTED] [REDACTED] from receiving FoodShare benefits (FS) for one year, a hearing was held on Thursday, June 19, 2014 at 01:30 PM, at Madison, 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:

Dane County Department of Human [REDACTED]
1819 Aberg Avenue
Suite D
Madison, WI 53704-6343

Respondent:

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE:

Nancy Gagnon
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The respondent (CARES # [REDACTED]) is a resident of Dane County who received FS benefits in Dane County from May 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014.
2. The respondent is [REDACTED] [REDACTED] and he is the only person in the household with a household size of one.

3. From May 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014 the respondent received \$925.00 in FS benefits. Exhibit 1.
4. From May 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014 the respondent, [REDACTED] [REDACTED], was employed at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Corporation with an hourly rate of pay of \$10.00 per hour. Exhibit 3.
5. From May 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014 the respondent consistently had a gross biweekly income in excess of \$600.00, and at one point as high as \$900.00. Exhibit 3.
6. The respondent's income between May 1, 2013 and January 31, 2014 made him ineligible for FS benefits.
7. On or about August 26, 2013 the respondent reported that he was no longer earning income nor working with [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Corporation. Exhibit 5.
8. This respondent's monthly FS benefit increased from \$42.00 to \$200.00 in September 2013. Exhibit 6.
9. A notice was mailed to the respondent stating his change in September 2013 FS benefit. The notice also stated, "if your household's total monthly income (before taxes) goes over \$1,211.00, you must report it by the 10th day of the next month." Exhibit 6.
10. The respondent's monthly FS benefit was reduced from \$200.00 to \$189.00 starting November 1, 2013. Exhibit 6.
11. The respondent was mailed a notice in October 2013 stating this decrease in benefits from \$200.00 to \$189.00. This notice listed his income at \$0, and stated that the respondent was required to report a new source of income or change in a job within ten days. Exhibit 6.
12. On or about March 25, 2014 the petitioner sent the respondent a notice for an Administrative Disqualification Hearing via certified mail. Exhibit 1.
13. The respondent received this notice for an Administrative Disqualification Hearing. Exhibit 1.

DISCUSSION

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. §§ 946.92(2).

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).

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.

Wisconsin Jury Instruction – Civil 205 is also instructive. It provides:

Clear, satisfactory and convincing evidence is evidence which when weighed against that opposed to it clearly has more convincing power. It is evidence which satisfies and convinces you that “yes” should be the answer because of its greater weight and clear convincing power. “Reasonable certainty” means that you are persuaded based upon a rational consideration of the evidence. Absolute certainty is not required, but a guess is not enough to meet the burden of proof. This burden of proof is known as the “middle burden.” The evidence required to meet this burden of proof must be more convincing than merely the greater weight of the credible evidence but may be less than beyond a reasonable doubt.

Further, the *McCormick* treatise states that “it has been persuasively suggested that [the clear and convincing evidence standard of proof] could be more simply and intelligibly translated to the jury if they were instructed that they must be persuaded that the truth of the contention is highly probable.” 2 *McCormick on Evidence* § 340 (John W. Strong gen. ed., 4th ed. 1992).

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.

The respondent testified that he was aware that his hours, and therefore wages were increasing between May 1, 2013 and January 31, 2014. The respondent did not dispute the income as established in Exhibit 2. The petitioner testified and demonstrated through exhibit 5 that the respondent reported that he lost his job in August 2013. The respondent’s pay stubs from his employer ██████████ ██████████ Corporation demonstrate that the respondent’s gross income was in excess approximately \$700.00 per bi-weekly pay period in August 2013. Following this false report the respondent received two notices stating that he must report any change in his income or employment within ten days. Exhibit 6. Despite receiving these notices the respondent did not report at any point between May 1, 2013 and January 31, 2014 that his income had increased. The respondent’s statements that this under and false report was not intentional is not credible.

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. Therefore, the petitioner correctly seeks to disqualify the respondent from the FS program for one year.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The respondent violated, and intended to violate, the FS program rule willfully specifying that he had a loss of a job resulting in an increase in his FS benefits when in fact his hours and income were increasing. He never reported this increase despite notices stating he was required to report this increase within ten days.
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 one year, 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). Such a claim should be made in writing to the Division of Hearings and Appeals, P.O. Box 7875, Madison, WI 53707-7875.

APPEAL TO COURT

You may also appeal this decision to Circuit Court in the county where you live. Appeals must be filed with the Court **and** served either personally or by certified mail on the Secretary of the Department of Health Services, 1 West Wilson Street, Room 651, Madison, WI 53703, **and** on those identified in this decision as “PARTIES IN INTEREST” **no more than 30 days after the date of this decision** or 30 days after a denial of a timely rehearing request (if you request one).

The process for Circuit Court Appeals may be found at Wis. Stat. §§ 227.52 and 227.53. A copy of the statutes may be found online or at your local library or courthouse.

Given under my hand at the City of Madison,
Wisconsin, this 23rd day of June, 2014

\sNancy Gagnon
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals

- c: Capital Consortium - email
- Public Assistance Collection Unit - email
- Division of Health Care Access and Accountability - email
- Alex Premo - 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
Internet: <http://dha.state.wi.us>

The preceding decision was sent to the following parties on June 23, 2014.

Dane County Department of Human [REDACTED]
Public Assistance Collection Unit
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability
premo@countyofdane.com