



STATE OF WISCONSIN
Division of Hearings and Appeals

In the Matter of

Office of the Inspector General, Petitioner

REHEARING DECISION

vs.

██████████, Respondent

DECISION

Case #: FOF - 172608

Pursuant to petition filed March 9, 2016, under Wis. Admin. Code §HA 3.03, and 7 C.F.R. § 273.16, to review a decision by the Office of the Inspector General to disqualify ██████████ from receiving FoodShare benefits (FS) for a period of ten years, a hearing was held on Tuesday, July 12, 2016 at 11:45 AM by telephone from Madison, Wisconsin. A hearing was originally held May 19, 2016; the respondent failed to appear, and a decision was issued on May 23, 2016. The respondent subsequently filed a request for a rehearing, which was granted.

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:

Office of the Inspector General
Department of Health Services - OIG
PO Box 309
Madison, WI 53701

Respondent:

██████████
██████████
██████████

Administrative Law Judge:

Peter McCombs
Division of Hearings and Appeals

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The respondent (CARES # ██████████) is a resident of Milwaukee County who received FS benefits in Milwaukee County from at least July 23, 2012 through November 30, 2012.

2. The respondent applied for FS in Milwaukee County on July 16, 2012, reporting a Milwaukee, Wisconsin address. She specifically reported that she did not receive FS from any other agency. FS benefits were granted and issued to her from at least July 23, 2012, through November 30, 2012.
3. The respondent received and redeemed FS benefits from the State of Indiana from June, 2012, through November, 2012. Exhibits 12 and 13.
4. On March 14, 2016, the petitioner prepared an Administrative Disqualification Hearing Notice alleging that the respondent provided false information in order to receive duplicate FS benefits.

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 be a reasonable doubt as to their existence.

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 petitioner established that the respondent received duplicate benefits, that the respondent indicated on her Wisconsin application that she was not receiving other FS benefits at that time, and that the respondent accessed her Indiana FS benefits while she had an open FS case in Wisconsin. See, Exhibits 1-13. The petitioner established a prima facie case that the respondent made a fraudulent statement or representation in order to receive multiple food stamp benefits simultaneously.

The respondent testified to explain that she assumed that applying for FS in Wisconsin would automatically close her Indiana FS case. She stated that she relocated to Wisconsin before she even learned that she had been approved for FS in Indiana. She further testified that, during the time period in question, she was working two jobs, and her children were accessing her FS card to purchase food for the household. She credibly testified that she did not intentionally seek duplicate benefits.

Based upon the record before me, I find that the petitioner has failed to establish by clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intentionally violated FS program rules. The Office of Inspector General’s burden of proof is important in this matter because it must do more than show that it is simply more likely than not that the respondent violated the FoodShare program’s rules. The violation has to be intentional. Although the evidence raises skepticism about the respondent’s asserted defense, the petitioner’s evidence has not established that the most damning evidence, use of the Indiana FS benefits, provides clear and convincing proof that the respondent specifically utilized or condoned the use of the Indiana FS benefits by her children. Therefore, the petitioner’s determination is reversed.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

For the reasons discussed above, there is no clear and convincing evidence that the respondent intended to commit an IPV.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is

ORDERED

That the petitioner's determination of an intentional program violation is reversed, and the petition for review is hereby dismissed.

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 27th day of July, 2016

\sPeter McCombs
Administrative Law Judge
Division of Hearings and Appeals

- c: Office of the Inspector General - email
- Public Assistance Collection Unit - email
- Division of Health Care Access and Accountability - email
- ██████████ - 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 July 27, 2016.

Office of the Inspector General
Public Assistance Collection Unit
Division of Health Care Access and Accountability

