

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

1621A E1 Tepeyac Corp,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0250638

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 assess a civil money penalty against 1621A E1 Tepeyac Corp (“Appellant”) in the amount of \$4,818 in lieu of a six-month disqualification 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) and (f)(1) in its administration of SNAP when it assessed a civil money penalty in the amount of \$4,818 in lieu of a six-month disqualification against Appellant on May 18, 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 January 27, 2022 through February 15, 2022. 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 April 20, 2022, 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)).”

Although afforded the opportunity to do so, Appellant did not reply 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 May 18, 2022 that the firm was being disqualified for six months from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This determination letter also stated that an assessment of a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) was appropriate. Therefore, a civil money penalty in the amount of \$4,818, in lieu of a six-month disqualification, was offered as an option to Appellant.

On May 27, 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

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) 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.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

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

- The investigators paid cash for the ineligible items using cash benefits on the EBT card.
- The charges are inadequate and lack evidence.
- Appellant denies the allegations.

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, 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.

Investigative Record

Appellant contends the investigators paid cash for the ineligible items using cash benefits on the EBT card and that the charges are inadequate and lack evidence. Appellant provided no support for its contentions. Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue occurred 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 register receipts, EBT receipts, and investigative report are consistent. 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.

Installment Plan

The regulations do provide the option of an installment plan for paying the CMP over the period of disqualification. The regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(h), state the following:

A firm has 15 days from the date the FNS regional office notifies the firm in writing in which to pay the civil money penalty or to notify the regional office in writing of its intent to pay in installments as specified by the regional officeThe civil money penalty must be paid in full by the end of the period for which the firm would have been disqualified.

Appellant can contact Financial Management at 703-305-2830 to discuss payment of this penalty in installment payments or online in one lump sum.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to assess a civil money penalty against 1621A E1 Tepeyac Corp of \$4,818 in lieu of a six-month period of disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

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. To pay the civil money penalty, Appellant should refer to the information provided in the determination letter dated April 20, 2022. Should Appellant choose to accept disqualification rather than pay the civil money penalty, a new application for participation in the SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six-month period of disqualification.

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

October 20, 2022