

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

Jude Ny Inc,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0224935

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is sufficient evidence to support the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a six-month disqualification against Jude Ny Inc (“Appellant”) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(5) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a six-month period of disqualification against Appellant on February 3, 2022.

AUTHORITY

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1, “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

USDA conducted an investigation of Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of February 4, 2020 through February 18, 2020. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on four separate occasions. These items sold during these impermissible transactions are best described in regulatory terms as “common ineligible nonfood items.” The investigation revealed that four unidentified clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions. As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance informed Appellant, in a letter dated June 19, 2020, that the firm

was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.2(a). The letter states, in part, that the violations “. . . warrant a disqualification period of six months (Section 278.6(e)(5)). Under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification (Section 278.6(f)(1)).”

Appellant replied to the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated February 3, 2022 that the firm was being disqualified for six months from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This determination letter also stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . you are not eligible for the CMP because there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.”

On February 3, 2022, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s decision to impose a six-month disqualification and requested an administrative review of the action. The appeal was granted, and implementation of the sanction has been on hold pending completion of this review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In an appeal of an adverse action, Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. That means Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence that a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the argument asserted is more likely to be true than untrue.

CONTROLLING LAW

The controlling law in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2021), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e)(5) establish the authority upon which a six-month disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

Section 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, when a firm is to be disqualified 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 due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, in part:

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, inconsistent redemption data, evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

Appellant's responses regarding this matter are essentially as follows:

- Appellant is the only SNAP-authorized within a mile radius.
- An undercover investigation showed no violations.
- The owner denies the allegations, denies that receipts were not provided to the investigator, and denies that no price was indicated for items available for sale.
- Appellant did not secure the name of the clerks who allegedly committed the infractions. The descriptions of the clerks do not describe any clerks employed at Appellant.
- The value of the ineligible items is insignificant.
- The time of the entry and exit from the store was not included in the investigative report.
- The name of the investigator was not disclosed.
- There is no proof of sale of any ineligible items.
- On one occasion, a clerk refused a trafficking transaction with SNAP benefits.
- Appellant requests a Civil Money Penalty.
- Appellant did not receive a warning letter. Disqualification without issuance of a warning letter is a denial of due process.
- The penalty is unduly harsh, inappropriate, and cruel and unusual punishment.
- Appellant meets the criteria for a Trafficking CMP as listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).
- A six-month disqualification would pose a hardship to the business, ownership, and the employees who work at the firm.
- Appellant has not had any prior issues with SNAP compliance.
- Appellant regularly provides training to staff on the proper handling of SNAP transactions. Appellant described its training program.
- Disqualification would pose a hardship to SNAP participants who rely on the firm.
- Appellant would not knowingly permit these violations.
- FNS has failed to establish intent as required to establish a violation.

These explanations may represent only a brief summary of Appellant's contentions. However, in reaching a decision, full consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any others that have not been specifically listed here.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

As to Appellant's denial of violations, denial that receipts were not provided to the investigator, and denial that no price was indicated for items available for sale, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance establishes a violation occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant

evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that the permanent disqualification should be reversed. If this is not demonstrated, the case will be sustained. Without supporting evidence and rationale, assertions that the firm has not violated program rules do not constitute valid grounds for overturning the determination.

Appellant asserts an undercover investigation showed no violations. Appellant is incorrect. The charges in this case are based on an undercover investigation.

Appellant contends that the owner would not have knowingly permitted these violations. Appellant also insists that it regularly provides training to staff on the proper handling of SNAP transactions. Appellant further contends that it did not receive any warnings, which violates due process. When ownership signed the FNS application to become a SNAP authorized retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that Appellant would “accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP regulations, including those committed by any of the firm’s employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time.” The violations listed on this certification document include selling ineligible non-food items. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may use to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions. To allow store ownership to disclaim accountability for the acts of persons chosen to handle store business, or requiring warnings of violations during an ongoing investigation, would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Appellant asserts that the descriptions of the clerks in the investigative report do not accurately describe firm employees. Appellant did not provide any evidence in support of this contention. In this regard, the matter of descriptions is often subjective in nature and may involve descriptive features that are relative with respect to the point of view of the observer.

Appellant argues it meets the criteria for a Trafficking CMP as listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(i). As trafficking was not charged in this case, Appellant’s eligibility for a Trafficking CMP is not relevant.

No Applicable Mitigating Factors

Appellant argues there is no evidence that Appellant intended to violate the regulations, which is required to impose a sanction. This argument is based on an incorrect understanding of the regulations. The severity of the penalties, set forth in the subsequent paragraph 7 CFR § 278.6(e), are based on the factors listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(d). For example, permitting the sale of cigarettes with SNAP benefits results in a three-year disqualification, but this becomes five years if the firm had been previously warned. Other sanctions consider intent, such as whether false information on an application was “knowingly submitted” or whether the sale of nonfood items was “the firm’s practice” (which carries a three-year disqualification) rather than “due to carelessness or poor supervision” (which results in a six-month disqualification). While intent is not necessary to establish a violation, whether Appellant intended to violate the regulations was considered when establishing the severity of the penalty in this case.

First SNAP Violation

Appellant is correct that on one occasion a clerk refused to traffic. Trafficking is a much more serious violation that carries a more severe penalty. Appellant argues that the value of the ineligible items is insignificant. Allowing the purchase of more expensive ineligible items is also a more serious violation with a more severe penalty.

Appellant maintains that this is the first time there has been an issue related to SNAP. A record of program participation with no documented previous violations, however, does not constitute valid grounds for mitigating the impact of the present charges of sale of nonfood items.

It is Appellant's contention that the sanction is cruel and unusual. The investigation report shows that of the four times that nonfood violations were attempted, store personnel permitted them four times. Repeatedly entrusting an unsupervised, inexperienced and/or untrained clerk(s) to handle SNAP benefits is reasonably viewed as careless or the exercise of poor supervision. Accordingly, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance attributed violations to "carelessness, or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management," pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations, which results in a disqualification of six months. This penalty is only permitted if the firm has not been previously sanctioned. Therefore, a six-month disqualification for the violations committed, the minimum, is the appropriate sanction in this case.

No Undue Hardship to Appellant

Appellant maintains that disqualification would pose an extreme hardship to the firm. Economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is disqualified from SNAP participation. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from such a penalty. To excuse Appellant from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Moreover, giving special consideration to the firm for economic hardship would forsake fairness and equity to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, and also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it will incur economic hardship due to an administrative penalty does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Investigative Record

Appellant contends there is no proof of sale of any ineligible items. Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue did, in fact, occur as charged. As noted previously, the charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal USDA investigation. All transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted under the supervision of a USDA investigator and all are fully documented. The investigative record is specific and accurate with

regard to the dates of the violations, the specific ineligible merchandise sold in exchange for SNAP benefits, and in all other critically pertinent detail.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

Appellant requested a fine in lieu of the six-month disqualification. Appellant contends it is the only SNAP-authorized within a mile radius. A CMP as an optional penalty in lieu of a six-month disqualification was considered in this case. Such a finding is appropriate only if: 1) a store sells a substantial variety of staple food items, and; 2) its disqualification would create a 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.

In this regard, some degree of inconvenience to SNAP benefit users is inherent in the disqualification from the SNAP of any participating food store since the normal shopping pattern of such SNAP benefit holders may temporarily be altered during that period. In this case, however, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance has rendered a finding pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(f) that it would not be appropriate to impose a CMP in lieu of a period of disqualification. The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance has determined that Appellant is not the only authorized retail food store in the area "selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices." In addition, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notes that the subject store is classified in the FNS SNAP retailer database as a convenience store. That database also shows 135 stores located within a one-mile radius, including a supermarket located .02 miles from Appellant. The larger stores located nearby are easily accessible to customers and offer a variety and quality of staple foods comparable to, or better than, those offered by Appellant. Appellant does not carry any unique items or foods that cannot be found at other stores. Therefore, the earlier determination that Appellant's disqualification would not create a hardship to customers, as differentiated from potential inconvenience, is sustained, and a CMP in lieu of disqualification is not appropriate in this case.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a disqualification of six months against Jude Ny Inc from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

Appellant stated the name of the investigator was not disclosed nor the time of the investigator's entry and exit from the store. Information that could compromise the identity of the undercover investigator is not provided to Appellant. Appellant argued that the investigator did not secure the name of the clerk who allegedly committed the infractions. Undercover investigators typically do not behave in ways that are atypical for customers, such as asking for the name of the store clerks handling their transactions.

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

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. If Appellant desires a judicial review, the complaint must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which Appellant's owner resides, is engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. This complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, must be filed within thirty (30) days of receipt of this decision.

Under the Freedom of Information Act, we are 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.

RICH PROULX
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

May 5, 2022