

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
55 FARMINGTON AVENUE  
HARTFORD, CT 06105

■■■ ■■■ 2022  
Signature Confirmation

Client ID ■■■■■■■■  
Case ID ■■■■■■■■  
Request #: 192325

**ADMINISTRATIVE DISQUALIFICATION HEARING**  
**NOTICE OF DECISION**

**PARTY**

■■■■■■■■■■  
■■■■■■■■■■  
■■■■■■■■■■

**REASON FOR HEARING**

On ■■■■ ■■■ 2022, the Department of Social Services made a request for an Administrative Disqualification Hearing (“ADH”) to seek disqualification of ■■■■■■■■ (the “Defendant”) from participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (“SNAP”) for twelve (12) months. The Department alleges that the Defendant committed an Intentional Program Violation (“IPV”) by engaging in trafficking of his SNAP benefits. This is the Defendant’s first offense. The Department also seeks to recover overpaid SNAP benefits of \$291.25.

On ■■■■ ■■■ 2022, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) mailed the Defendant a notice of administrative hearing via certified mail scheduling the hearing for ■■■■ ■■■ 2022 in error. The notice did not include the Defendant’s rights under an administrative disqualification hearing.

On ■■■■ ■■■ 2022, the OLCRAH mailed the Defendant notification of the initiation of the ADH process scheduled for ■■■■ ■■■ 2022, which included notification of his rights in these proceedings, the hearing summary prepared by the Department and the Department’s supporting documents, via certified mail.

On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022, the Defendant received the notification of the ADH process and supporting documentation as evidence by the signed domestic return receipt received by OLCRAH.

On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022, OLCRAH conducted the ADH in accordance with section 17b-88 of the Connecticut General Statutes and subsection (e), section 273.16 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

The hearing record remained open through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022 for the submission of additional evidence from the Department and allow the Defendant an opportunity to review the new evidence and comment as appropriate. The Department submitted additional evidence. No additional evidence from the Defendant was received.

### **PRESENT AT THE HEARING**

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] Defendant  
William Carrasquillo, Department Representative  
Lisa Nyren, Hearing Officer

### **STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE**

The issue to be decided is whether the Defendant committed an intentional program violation (“IPV”) of the SNAP and subject to disqualification from participation in the SNAP for 12 months.

A secondary issue to be decided is whether the Department’s proposal to recoup a SNAP overpayment of \$291.25 for the period [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2021 is correct.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The Defendant is a recipient of SNAP benefits. (Hearing Record)
2. The Defendant is a household of one. (Hearing Record)
3. SNAP households access their benefits under the SNAP with an Electronic Benefit Transfer (“EBT”) card issued by the Department. (Hearing Record)

4. The United States Department of Agriculture (“USDA”) Food and Nutrition Service (“FNS”) is the federal agency that manages the SNAP as administered by the Department. (Hearing Record)
5. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2021, FNS completed a site visit at [REDACTED] (the “Market”) located at [REDACTED]. The site visit revealed the Market is open from 7:00 am to 11:00 pm seven days per week with one checkout counter, one cash register and three Point of Sale (POS) devices for Electronic Benefit Transfer (“EBT”) inside the Market. There are no optical scanners at the Market. The Market sells dairy products, juices, fruits and vegetables, breads, cereal, rice, pasta, meat, deli meat, and canned meats, seafood, and eggs. The Market includes a kitchen/food prep area selling hot foods and deli sandwiches. The Market sells tobacco products, household supplies, and alcohol. Nescafe Coffee and Tropicana orange juice both priced at \$6.49 are the highest priced eligible food items under the SNAP in the store. The Market does not provide shopping carts or baskets for their customers nor round up or down transaction totals. (Department Representative’s Testimony and Exhibit 11: General Store Information)
6. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2021, FNS inventoried products sold at the Market. The Market lists twenty or more units of bread, cold and hot cereal, pasta, rice, flour, beef/veal, chicken, pork, sardines, tuna, squid, mackerel, milk, fruits such as apples, bananas, lemons, oranges, peppers, tomatoes, beans, carrots, and nuts. (Exhibit 11: General Store Information)
7. FNS reviewed EBT and Pandemic EBT (“P-EBT”) transactions completed at the Market between [REDACTED] 2021 and [REDACTED] 2021 and determined the Market committed trafficking violations under the SNAP program citing “EBT transactions that establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable activity for your type of firm.” FNS further writes, “In a series of EBT transactions, multiple transactions were made from the accounts of individual households within a set time period. ... In a series of EBT transactions, your store conducted EBT transactions that are large based on the observed store characteristics and recorded food stock.” (Exhibit 5: Notice of Disqualification, Exhibit 6: Notice of Penalty, and Department Representative’s Testimony)
8. Effective [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2021, FNS permanently disqualified the Market from the SNAP because the Market violated federal SNAP regulations by participating in trafficking activities with SNAP recipients. (Exhibit 5: Notice of Disqualification and Exhibit 6: Notice of Penalty)

9. Between the period [REDACTED] 2021 and [REDACTED] 2021, the Department deposited the following SNAP benefits, including Pandemic SNAP benefits into the Appellant's EBT account which totals \$329.00 each month. (Exhibit 14: EPPIC Client Benefits Management and Department Representative's Testimony)

Deposit Date	SNAP Type	SNAP Amount Deposited
[REDACTED] 2021	Regular	\$234.00
[REDACTED] 2021	Pandemic	\$95.00
[REDACTED] 2021	Regular	\$234.00
[REDACTED] 2021	Pandemic	\$95.00
[REDACTED] 2021	Regular	\$234.00
[REDACTED] 2021	Pandemic	\$95.00

10. Between [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021, the Appellant did not complete any EBT transactions at the Market. (Exhibit 13: Transaction Detailed Report)
11. Between [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021, the Defendant's EBT Card was used at the Market to access SNAP benefits from the Defendant's account as noted below: (Exhibit 13: Transaction Detailed Report)

Transaction Date	Transaction Time	Transaction Amount
[REDACTED] 2021	11:04 AM	\$39.79
[REDACTED] 2021	9:10 AM	Balance Inquiry
[REDACTED] 2021	9:13 AM	\$33.19
[REDACTED] 2021	9:32 AM	\$18.25
[REDACTED] 2021	11:55 AM	\$46.87
[REDACTED] 2021	10:31 AM	\$39.65
[REDACTED] 2021	9:16 AM	\$40.06
Total spent [REDACTED] 2021		\$217.81

12. Between [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021, the Defendant's EBT Card was used at the Market to access SNAP benefits from the Defendant's account as noted below: (Exhibit 1: Notice of Violation, Exhibit 4: EPPIC Transaction History, Exhibit 13: Transaction Detailed Report)

Transaction Date	Transaction Time	Transaction Amount
[REDACTED] 2021	9:18 AM	\$2.00
[REDACTED] 2021	9:20 AM	\$45.25
[REDACTED] 2021	10:26 AM	\$54.75
[REDACTED] 2021	5.49 PM	\$30.25

██████ 2021	9:46 AM	\$22.50
██████ 2021	9:20 AM	\$22.00
██████ 2021	10:57 AM	\$40.25
██████ 2021	4:20 PM	\$24.00
██████ 2021	7:33 AM	\$52.25
██████ 2021	11:15 AM	\$2.00
Total Spent ██████ 2021		\$295.25

13. The Department determined the Defendant's multiple ██████ 2021 transactions with the same cent values of zero cents (.00), twenty-five cents (.25), fifty cents (.50), and seventy-five cents (.75) and within a twenty-four (24) hour period were identified as trafficking as supported by the FNS Investigation of the Market. Refer to Finding of Fact ("FOF") #12 for transactions. (Hearing Record)
14. Additional signs or patterns of trafficking include use of same EBT card in a matter of hours at the same store, a store processing multiple transactions in a short time frame which does not reflect product pricing, a household depleting SNAP benefits at the beginning of the month, manual EBT transactions rather than swiped transactions, transactions for excessive amounts that are unreasonable for a store with limited stock and low priced items. (Department Representative's Testimony)
15. Between ██████ 2021 through ██████ 2021, the Defendant's EBT Card was used at ██████ ("Market2") to access SNAP benefits from the Defendant's account as noted below. No EBT transactions were conducted in ██████ 2021 at Market2. (Exhibit 13: Transaction Detailed Report)

Transaction Date	Transaction Time	Transaction Amount
██████ 2021	1:01 PM	3.00
██████ 2021	8:47 PM	\$9.00
██████ 2021	12:39 PM	\$4.00
██████ 2021	10:25 AM	\$6.00
██████ 2021	11:51 AM	\$3.00
██████ 2021	12:45 PM	\$4.50
██████ 2021	7:12 PM	\$30.00
██████ 2021	7:20 PM	\$4.89
██████ 2021	3:52 PM	\$3.00
██████ 2021	2:12 PM	\$3.00
██████ 2021	12:35 PM	\$3.00
██████ 2021	12:10 PM	\$6.00
██████ 2021	2:48 PM	\$4.50
██████ 2021	8:04 PM	\$2.00
██████ 2021	9:32 PM	\$4.50
██████ 2021	9:13 AM	\$6.00
██████ 2021	9:17 AM	\$7.50
██████ 2021	7:23 PM	\$4.00 Insufficient funds

██████ 2021	7:24	\$1.00
-------------	------	--------

16. The Department did not review Market2 transactions under the IPV claim. (Hearing Record)
17. Between ██████ 2021 through ██████ 2021, the Defendant completed two transactions at ██████: ██████ 2021 @ 2:12 PM \$111.37 and ██████ 2021 @ 6:07 PM \$102.54. Between ██████ 2021 through ██████ 2021, the Defendant completed one transaction at ██████: ██████ 2021 @ 4:55 PM \$116.01. (Exhibit 13: Transaction Detailed Report)
18. The Department alleges the Defendant committed trafficking violations under the SNAP by “purchasing a product with SNAP benefits with the intent of obtaining cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food and intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.” (Department Representative’s Testimony and Exhibit 1: Notice of Violation)
19. On ██████ 2022, the Department issued the Defendant a Notice of Violation informing the Defendant of the Department’s investigation into trafficking violations. The notice included the federal definition of trafficking under the Code of Federal Regulations, the list of transactions in which the Department has labeled as trafficking, and the option to schedule an appointment with the Department to review the evidence. (Exhibit 1: Notice of Violation, Exhibit 2: Notice of Prehearing Review, and Exhibit 3: Waiver of Disqualification)
20. On ██████ 2022, the Department issued a W-1448 Notice of Prehearing Interview. The notice informed the Appellant he received \$291.25 more than he should have in SNAP benefits due to trafficking violations at the Market and scheduled an appointment to discuss the allegations of trafficking for ██████ 2022. (Exhibit 1: Notice of Violation, Exhibit 2: Notice of Prehearing Review, and Exhibit 3: Waiver of Disqualification)
21. On ██████ 2022, the Department issued a W-1449 Waiver of Disqualification Hearing SNAP Program notice. The notice informed the Defendant that he broke the rules of the SNAP on purpose and committed an Intentional Program Violation resulting in an overpayment of SNAP benefits totaling \$291.25 in the month of ██████ 2021. The Department proposes to impose a SNAP penalty and disqualify the Defendant from SNAP. The Department proposes to recoup the overpayment of SNAP

benefits. (Exhibit 1: Notice of Violation, Exhibit 2: Notice of Prehearing Review, and Exhibit 3: Waiver of Disqualification)

22. The Defendant confirms receipt of SNAP benefits but denies SNAP benefits exceed \$192.00 per month. The Defendant confirms shopping at [REDACTED] and the Market. (Defendant's Testimony)
23. FNS records indicate the Defendant has never received a disqualification penalty under the SNAP. (Exhibit 8: Electronic Disqualified Recipient System)
24. The Department is seeking to disqualify the Defendant from participating in the SNAP for a period of one year and recover \$291.25 in overpaid SNAP benefits due to an IPV of trafficking. (Hearing Record)
25. The issuance of this decision is timely under Title 7 Section 273.16(e)(2)(iv) of the Code of Federal Regulations, which requires that a decision be issued within 90 days of the notice of the initiation of the ADH process. On [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022, the OLCRAH mailed the Defendant notification of the initiation of the ADH process. However, the hearing record remained open through [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022 for the submission of additional evidence resulting in a [REDACTED]-day delay. Therefore, this decision is due not later than [REDACTED] [REDACTED] 2022.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Section 17b-2(7) of the Connecticut General Statutes ("Conn. Gen. Stat.") provides as follows: The Department of Social Services is designated as the state agency for the administration of the supplemental nutrition assistance program pursuant to the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008.
2. Title 7 Section 273.16(e) of the Code of Federal Regulations ("C.F.R.") provides as follows: The State agency shall conduct administrative disqualification hearings for individuals accused of an Intentional Program Violation ("IPV") in accordance with the requirements outlined in this section.

State statute provides as follows:

If a beneficiary of assistance under the state supplement program, medical assistance program, aid to families with dependent children program, temporary family assistance program, state-administered general assistance program, food stamp program or supplemental nutrition assistance program receives any award or grant over the amount

to which he is entitled under the laws governing eligibility, the Department of Social Services (1) shall immediately initiate recoupment action and shall consult with the Division of criminal Justice to determine whether to refer such overpayment, with full supporting information, to the state police, to a prosecuting authority for prosecution or to the Attorney General for civil recovery, or (2) shall take such other action as conforms to federal regulations, including, but not limited to, conducting administrative disqualification hearings for cases involving alleged fraud in the food stamp program, supplemental nutrition assistance program, the aid to families with dependent children program, the temporary family assistance program or the state-administered general assistance program.

Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-88

Federal regulation provides for the Consolidation of administrative disqualification hearing with fair hearing.

The State agency may combine a fair hearing and an administrative disqualification hearing into a single hearing if the factual issues arise out of the same, or related, circumstances and the household receives prior notice that hearings will be combined. If the disqualification hearing and fair hearing are combined, the State agency shall follow the timeframes for conducting disqualification hearings. If the hearings are combined for the purpose of settling the amount of the claim at the same time as determining whether or not intentional Program violation has occurred, the household shall lose its right to a subsequent fair hearing on the amount of the claim. However, the State agency shall, upon household request, allow the household to waive the 30-day advance notice period required by [paragraph \(e\)\(3\)\(i\)](#) of this section when the disqualification hearing and fair hearing are combined.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(1)

**The Department has the authority to conduct administrative disqualification hearings combined with a fair hearing at a single hearing.**

3. Federal regulation provides as follows:

The State agency shall be responsible for investigating any case of alleged intentional Program violation and ensuring that appropriate cases are acted upon either through administrative disqualification hearings or referral to a court of appropriate jurisdiction in accordance with the procedures outlines in this section. Administrative disqualification procedures or referral for prosecution action should be initiated by the State agency in cases in which the State agency has sufficient



documentary evidence to substantiate that an individual has intentionally made one or more acts of intentional Program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section. If the State agency does not initiate administrative disqualification procedures or refer for prosecution a case involving an over issuance caused by a suspected act of intentional Program violation, the State agency shall take action to collect the over issuance by establishing an inadvertent household error claim against the household in accordance with the procedures in § 273.18. The State agency should conduct administrative disqualification hearings in cases in which the State agency believes the facts of the individual case do not warrant civil or criminal prosecution through the appropriate court system, in cases previously referred for prosecution that were declined by the appropriate legal authority, and in previously referred cases where no action was taken within a reasonable period of time and the referral was formally withdrawn by the State agency. The State agency shall not initiate an administrative disqualification hearing against an accused individual whose case is currently being referred for prosecution or subsequent to any action taken against the accused individual by the prosecutor or court of appropriate jurisdiction, if the factual issues of the case arise out of the same, or related, circumstances. The State agency may initiate administrative disqualification procedures or refer a case for prosecution regardless of the current eligibility of the individual.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(a)(1)

Federal regulation provides as follows:

The State agency shall base administrative disqualifications for intentional Program Violations (“IPV”) on the determinations of hearing authorities arrived at through administrative disqualification hearings in accordance with paragraph (e) of this section or on determinations reached by courts of appropriate jurisdiction in accordance with paragraph (g) of this section. However, any State agency has the option of allowing accused individual either to waive their rights to administrative disqualification hearings in accordance with paragraph (f) of this section or to sign disqualification consent agreements for cases of deferred adjudication in accordance with paragraph (h) of this section. Any State agency which chooses either of these options may base administrative disqualifications for intentional Program violation on the waived right to an administrative disqualification hearing or on the signed disqualification consent agreement in cases of deferred adjudication.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(a)(3)

Federal regulation provides as follows:

Intentional Program violations (“IPV”) shall consist of having:

1. Made a false or misleading statement, or misrepresented, concealed or withheld facts; or
2. Committed any act that constitutes a violation of SNAP, SNAP regulations, or any State statute for the purpose of using, presenting, transferring, acquiring, receiving, possessing or trafficking of SNAP benefits or EBT cards.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(c)

Federal regulation defines trafficking as:

1. The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINS), or by manual voucher and signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone;
2. The exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances, as defined in section 802 or title 21, United States Code, for SNAP benefits;
3. Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits that has a container requiring a return deposit with the intent of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intentionally returning the container for the deposit amount;
4. Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits with the intent of obtaining cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food; or
5. Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
6. Attempting to buy, sell, steal or otherwise affect an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefits Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by annual voucher and signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.

7 C.F.R. § 271.2

“The hearing authority shall base the determination of intentional program violation on clear and convincing evidence that demonstrates that the household member(s) committed, and intended to commit, intentional

Program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section.” 7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(6)

**The Department incorrectly determined the Defendant committed trafficking violations under the SNAP during the period [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021. The Department failed to provide clear and convincing evidence the transactions completed by the Defendant at the Market in [REDACTED] 2021 were a result of trafficking. The Department did not satisfy their burden to prove trafficking occurred rather relying on data from FNS to support the Department’s allegation of trafficking. Federal regulation states that “the State agency shall be responsible for investigating any case of alleged intentional Program violation, and ensuring that appropriate cases are acted upon either through administrative disqualification hearings or referral to a court of appropriate jurisdiction in accordance with the procedures outlines in this section. Administrative disqualification procedures or referral for prosecution action should be initiated by the State agency in cases in which the State agency has sufficient documentary evidence to substantiate that an individual has intentionally made one or more acts of intentional Program violation as defined in paragraph (c) of this section.” The Department limited their review to [REDACTED] 2021, failing to review prior transactions at the Market for [REDACTED] 2021 and failing to review transactions, if any, after [REDACTED] 2021. Based on [REDACTED] 2021 transactions, the Defendant used his EBT card at the Market on several occasions for various dollar amounts throughout the month and continued to shop at the Market in [REDACTED] 2021. Although it may not be cost effective, the store inventory which includes numerous units of meats, poultry, fish and fruits and vegetables, may make it possible to spend a higher dollar amount. Additionally, based on the Department’s explanation of transactions ending in the same dollar or cent value, the Defendant’s transactions at the [REDACTED] appear to fall under a trafficking violation as all transactions equal a small dollar amount and zero cents. The Department failed to provide sufficient documentary evidence to substantiate the Defendant’s [REDACTED] 2021 EBT transactions at the Market as trafficking violations.**

4. Federal regulation provides as follows:

If the hearing authority rules that the individual has committed an intentional program violation, the household member must be disqualified in accordance with the disqualification periods and procedure in paragraph (b) of this section. The same act of intentional Program violation repeated over a period of time must not be separated so that separate penalties can be imposed.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(e)(8)(i)

Federal regulation provides as follows:

Individuals found to have committed an intentional Program violation either through an administrative disqualification hearing or by a Federal, State or local court, or who have signed either a waiver of right to an administrative disqualification hearing or a disqualification consent agreement in cases referred for prosecution, shall be ineligible to participate in the Program; for a period of twelve months for the first intentional Program violation, except as provided under paragraphs (b)(2), (b)(3), (b)(4), and (b)(5) of this section.

7 C.F.R. § 273.16(b)(1)(i)

**The Department incorrectly determined the Defendant subject to a SNAP disqualification penalty for a period of twelve months because the Department failed to establish that the Defendant is guilty of committing an IPV due to trafficking violations.**

5. "There are three types of claims: an intentional Program violation (IPV) claim is any claim for an overpayment or trafficking resulting from an individual committing an IPV. An IPV is defined in § 273.16." 7 C.F.R. § 273.18(b)(1)

"A recipient claim is an amount owed because of benefits that are trafficked. Trafficking is defined in 7 CFR 271.2." 7 CFR § 273.18(a)(1)(ii)

"This claim is a federal debt subject to this and other regulations governing Federal debts. The State agency must establish and collect any claim by following these regulations." 7 C.F.R. § 273.18(a)(2)

"Claims arising from trafficking-related offenses will be the value of the trafficked benefits as determined by: the documentation that forms the basis for the trafficking determination." 7 C.F.R. § 273.18(c)(2)(iii)

**The Department incorrectly determined the Defendant incurred a SNAP overpayment claim due to trafficking violations totaling \$291.25 for the period [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021.**

6. "The following are responsible for paying a claim: each person who was an adult member of the household when the overpayment or trafficking occurred." 7 C.F.R. § 273.18(a)(4)(i)

**The Department is incorrect to seek recoupment from the Defendant of \$291.25 due to trafficking violations.**

**DECISION**

The Defendant is found not guilty of trafficking SNAP benefits and committing an Intentional Program Violation under the SNAP and therefore not subject to a 12-month IPV disqualification penalty.

Regarding the Department's request to recover the overpayment of \$291.25 under the SNAP, the Department's appeal is denied.

**ORDER**

1. The Department is ordered to rescind its proposal to disqualify the Defendant from participating in the SNAP program for a period of one year.
2. The department is ordered to rescind its proposal to recover the SNAP overpayment of benefits for the period [REDACTED] 2021 through [REDACTED] 2021 of \$291.25.
3. Compliance is due 14-days from the date of this decision.

*Lisa A. Nyren*  
Lisa A. Nyren  
Fair Hearing Officer

CC: [OLCRAH.QA.DSS@ct.gov](mailto:OLCRAH.QA.DSS@ct.gov)  
William Carasquillo, RO #30

### **RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The defendant has the right to appeal this decision to Superior Court within 45 days of the mailing of this decision. The right to appeal is based on §4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes. To appeal, a petition must be filed at Superior Court. A copy of the petition must be served upon the Office of the Attorney General, 55 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106 or the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, 55 Farmington Avenue, Hartford, CT 06105. A copy of the petition must also be served on all parties to the hearing.

The **45** day appeal period may be extended in certain instances if there is good cause. The extension request must be filed with the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services in writing no later than **90** days from the mailing of the decision. Good cause circumstances are evaluated by the Commissioner or his designee in accordance with §17b-61 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Agency's decision to grant an extension is final and is not subject to review or appeal.

The appeal should be filed with the clerk of the Superior Court in the Judicial District of New Britain or the Judicial District in which the defendant resides.