

**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
Administrative Review Branch**

Johnny Quik Food Store 203,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0249977

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), that there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that a six month disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) was properly imposed against Johnny Quik Food Store 203 (hereinafter “Johnny Quik Food Store 203” or “Appellant”) by the Retailer Operations Division of FNS.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 278 in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a six month period of disqualification against Johnny Quik Food Store 203.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1 provide that “[A] food retailer or wholesale food concern aggrieved by administrative action under § 278.1, § 278.6 or § 278.7 . . . may file a written request for review of the administrative action with FNS.

CASE CHRONOLOGY

The Department of Agriculture conducted an investigation of the compliance of Johnny Quik Food Store 203 with Federal SNAP law and regulations during the period January 1, 2022 through January 12, 2022. In a letter dated February 10, 2022, the Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant with accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for merchandise which included ineligible nonfood items in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a). These SNAP violations occurred on four out of four compliance visits. The letter further informed the Appellant that the violations warranted a disqualification period of six months as provided in 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5). The letter also stated that under certain conditions, FNS may impose a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification as provided in 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1).

The charge letter noted that per SNAP regulations Section 278.6(b), the Appellant has the right to present any information, explanation or evidence regarding the charges and must reply within 10 calendar days of the date of receipt of the charge letter. Per UPS confirmation of delivery, the charge letter was delivered to the Appellant at the store address of record on February 11, 2022.

In responses to the Retailer Operations Division of February 15, 2022 and February 22, 2022, the Appellant replied to the letter of charges. The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

After considering the Appellant's responses and the evidence of this case, the Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated March 1, 2022. The determination letter informed the Appellant that the firm was disqualified from the SNAP for a period of six months in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e). The determination letter also stated that the Retailer Operations Division considered the Appellant's eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1). The Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant was not eligible for the hardship CMP in lieu of the six month disqualification because there were other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

In a letter postmarked March 11, 2022, the Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. FNS granted the Appellant's request for administrative review by letter dated March 17, 2022. Upon acceptance of the administrative review request, implementation of the six month disqualification was held in abeyance pending completion of this review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative actions should be reversed. That means the Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, might accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the matter asserted is more likely to be true than not true.

CONTROLLING LAW AND REGULATIONS

The controlling statute in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021, and promulgated through regulations under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e) establish the authority upon which a disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

7 CFR § 278.2(a) states, inter alia:

Coupons may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households . . . only in exchange for eligible food.

7 CFR § 271.2 states, inter alia:

Eligible foods means: Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, inter alia:

FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store . . . if the firm fails to comply with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, or this part. Such disqualification shall result from a finding of a violation on the basis of evidence that may include facts established through on-site investigations.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) states, inter alia:

Disqualify the firm for 6 months if it is to be the first sanction for the firm and the evidence shows that personnel of the firm have committed violations such as, but not limited to, the sale of common nonfood items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management.

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) states, inter alia:

FNS may impose a civil money penalty as a sanction in lieu of disqualification when . . . the firm's disqualification would cause hardship to Food Stamp [SNAP] households because there is no other authorized retail food store in the area selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices.

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

During an investigation conducted from January 1, 2022 through January 12, 2022, USDA conducted four compliance visits at Johnny Quik Food Store 203. A report of the investigation was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter dated February 10, 2022. The investigation report included Exhibits A through D which provide full details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were recorded during four of the four compliance visits and involved the sale of a variety of items best described in regulatory terms as "common nonfood items". The misuse of SNAP benefits noted in Exhibits A, B, C, and D warrant a disqualification as a SNAP retail food store for a period of six months. The exchange of these ineligible items for SNAP benefits is in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a).

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The following represents a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions in this matter. Please be assured, however, that in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration was given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein.

In the replies to the charge letter and in the administrative review request, the Appellant stated the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- This is the first time that an employee at the Appellant sold an unauthorized item to a customer.
- The new employee was trained on the procedures of what can and cannot be purchased with SNAP benefits and what customers have to pay using another form of payment.

- When the investigator came to the counter with various items, the cashier rang up the transaction as a non-SNAP customer, avoiding any profiling or any unequal treatment.
- In the investigation report, the investigator never explicitly said that he/she was an EBT customer nor that he/she would be paying with an EBT card.
- Therefore, with a quick glance and simultaneously observing the whole store, the clerk overlooked the EBT card.
- When questioned about his actions, the clerk stated that he acted in a moment of pressure and fluster. He was confused about separating the items and separating the transactions into two transactions (one for EBT payment and the other with another form of payment) and did not ask for help. In an effort to deescalate the line of customers waiting to check out groceries and pay for gasoline, the transactions were run as one instead of being split into SNAP-eligible and SNAP-ineligible items.
- The clerk had no malicious intent and did not benefit from these transactions.
- This is a very well run store that normally receives 100% on Chevron site inspections, both their Mystery Shops as well as image inspection.
- The Appellant has enhanced the firm's SNAP training program. The clerk has since been retrained and the firm has implemented a strict SNAP training program for employees.
- The Appellant is located in an underprivileged area of Fresno and many area residents depend upon the SNAP.
- The Appellant requests the imposition of a civil money penalty in lieu of a SNAP disqualification as a SNAP disqualification would impose a hardship on area SNAP customers. The Appellant serves about 50,000 customers a month. Other stores in the area lack the access to a wide variety of SNAP-eligible products that the Appellant offers.
- The surrounding stores have dingy lighting, cracked parking lots with holes, and unstocked shelves. The outside of these stores are unkept and parking spaces are limited and tight.

In support of these contentions, the Appellant submitted the following information for review:

- Beal Developments LLC Customers First Mystery Shop Program Evaluation (1 page); Dated February 18, 2022;
- Beal Developments LLC image inspection (2 pages); Dated February 15, 2022;
- Employee Certification of SNAP training signed by one employee (2 pages); Dated February 13, 2022;
- Unsigned SNAP Training for Employees (5 pages);
- Photos of five area stores (5 photos); and
- Report of population income (2 pages).

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

SNAP Violations

This review is to either validate or to invalidate the determination made by the Retailer Operations Division; it is limited to the facts at the basis of the Retailer Operations Division's determination at the time it was made.

The Appellant contends that in the investigation report, the investigator never explicitly said that he/she was an EBT customer nor that he/she would be paying with an EBT card. Therefore, with a quick glance and simultaneously observing the whole store, the clerk overlooked the EBT card. The

clerk acted in a moment of pressure and fluster. He was confused about separating the items and separating the transactions into two transactions (one for EBT payment and the other with another form of payment) and did not ask for help.

However, when store ownership signed the certification page of the SNAP retailer authorization application to become a SNAP retailer, it confirmed it understood and agreed to abide by program rules and regulatory provisions. It also agreed to accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for SNAP violations including those committed by any of the firm's employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time. The certification is clear that store ownership understood by signing the document that violations of program rules can result in administrative actions such as fines, sanctions, withdrawal, or disqualification from the SNAP.

Regardless of who the store owner utilizes to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions. The regulations establish that an authorized food store may be disqualified from participating in the program when the store fails to comply with the Act or regulations because of the wrongful conduct of an owner, manager, or someone acting on their behalf.

The transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted by a USDA investigator and are thoroughly documented. A complete review of this documentation has yielded no known error or discrepancy. The investigation report is specific and thorough with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific facts related thereto, and is supported by documentation that confirms specific details of the transactions.

The FNS investigative report shows that a male employee working at the Appellant firm accepted SNAP benefits for ineligible nonfood items on four separate occasions during the investigative period indicating an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations as defined by Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. The investigation report documents by a preponderance of the evidence that the store employee engaged in the misuse of SNAP benefits noted in Exhibits A, B, C, and D warranting a disqualification as a SNAP retail food store for a period of six months.

Neither the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, nor the regulations issued pursuant thereto cite any minimum dollar amount of SNAP benefits for transactions involving the sale of ineligible items to be defined as violative. No mention of minimum cost or types of ineligibles is cited in Section 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations, which states that FNS shall disqualify a store for six months if it is to be the first sanction for the firm and the evidence shows that personnel of the firm have committed violations such as, but not limited to, the sale of common nonfood items in exchange for SNAP benefits due to carelessness by store employees or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management.

While the Appellant contends that the new employee was trained on the procedures of what can and cannot be purchased with SNAP benefits and what customers have to pay using another form of payment, no documentation was submitted verifying that SNAP training had been given to employees prior to the Appellant's receipt of the charge letter. The submitted Employee Certification of SNAP training is dated February 13, 2022 which is after the Appellant's receipt of the charge letter. Had an effective compliance policy and program been in effect at the firm, it is unlikely that the employee would have made such obvious mistakes. The more likely explanation is that store ownership and/or management failed to properly train and subsequently supervise the employee. Additionally, had store ownership and/or management been supervising the employee

through occasionally monitoring him using videotape, if available, or in person, it would have readily noticed that he was allowing the sale of ineligible nonfood items in exchange for SNAP benefits.

It also would have been immediately evident to store ownership and/or management that the employee was deficient in his knowledge of SNAP rules and regulations had it periodically spot checked the employee's knowledge and abilities by asking questions about SNAP eligible/ineligible items. Either of these basic supervisory techniques would have provided a no cost method for store ownership and/or management to ensure that store employees were not putting the firm's SNAP authorization at risk.

These are clear signs of poor or no supervision by store ownership and/or management. It is highly improbable, based on the willingness of the employee to exchange SNAP benefits for ineligible nonfood items, that the only instances of SNAP violations were those transactions identified as part of the FNS undercover investigation. These actions more likely than not represent an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations at the Appellant firm. Under SNAP regulations, the penalty for allowing the purchase of ineligible nonfood items using SNAP benefits as the result of poor supervision by ownership or management is a six month disqualification. The regulations do allow SNAP retailers to pay a hardship CMP, if eligible, as explained in the Civil Money Penalty section of this Final Agency Decision.

The Appellant is correct that the firm has not been cited for prior SNAP violations. However, a record of participation in the SNAP with no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating the impact of those charges.

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative actions should be reversed. That means the Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, might accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the matter asserted is more likely to be true than not true. The Appellant did not provide any evidence that the violations cited in the charge letter did not occur.

Based on this discussion, the decision by the Retailer Operations Division to disqualify the firm for a six month period was the appropriate penalty and there is no valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Corrective Action

The Appellant contends that the firm has enhanced the firm's SNAP training program. The clerk has since been retrained and the firm has implemented a strict SNAP training program for employees. In support thereof, the Appellant submitted an Employee Certification of SNAP training signed by one employee and an unsigned SNAP Training for Employees.

However, it is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Retailer Operations Division. This review is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of the Retailer Operations Division action at the time such action was made. It is not the authority of this review to consider what subsequent remedial actions may have been taken so that the store may begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in the SNAP regulations or internal agency policy directives for waiver or reduction of an

administrative penalty assessment on the basis of after-the-fact corrective action implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, the Appellant's contention that it has taken or will take corrective actions, though they would have been valuable towards preventing future program violations, does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The Appellant requests the imposition of a civil money penalty in lieu of a SNAP disqualification as a SNAP disqualification would impose a hardship on area SNAP customers. In support thereof, the Appellant submitted photos of five area stores and a report of population income.

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1). That regulation reads, in part, "FNS may impose a civil money penalty as a sanction in lieu of disqualification when . . . the firm's disqualification would cause hardship to [SNAP] households because there is no other authorized retail food store in the area selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices." [Emphasis added]. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).**

Based on the evidence, the disqualification of Johnny Quik Food Store 203 would not cause a hardship to SNAP recipients in the area, as opposed to a mere inconvenience; therefore, the Retailer Operations Division's decision not to assess a hardship CMP in lieu of a six month disqualification is sustained as appropriate under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1).

CONCLUSION

It is therefore established that the violations as described in the letter of charges did in fact occur at Johnny Quik Food Store 203 warranting a disqualification of six months in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5). That regulation states that FNS shall "disqualify the firm for 6 months if it is to be the first sanction for the firm and the evidence shows that personnel of the firm have committed violations such as, but not limited to, the sale of common nonfood items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management". Therefore, the decision to impose a six month disqualification, the least severe penalty allowed by regulation, against Johnny Quik Food Store 203, the Appellant firm, is appropriate and the action is sustained.

In accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the regulations there under, the six month period of disqualification shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. A new application for participation may be submitted by the firm ten (10) days prior to the expiration of this six month period.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2023) and to Section 279.7 of the Regulations (7 CFR § 279.7) with respect to your right to a judicial review of this determination. Please note that if a judicial review is desired, the Complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which you reside or are engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. If any Complaint is filed, it must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this Decision.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, FNS is releasing this information in a redacted format as appropriate. FNS will protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information that could constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

LORIE L. CONNEEN
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

May 10, 2022