

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

**A.J. Market Inc.,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Office of Retailer Operations and  
Compliance,**

**Respondent.**

**Case Number: C0226717**

**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 (“ROC”) to impose a permanent disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) against A.J. Market Inc. (“Appellant”).

**ISSUE**

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the ROC took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on September 26, 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**

In a letter dated March 27, 2020, the ROC charged Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. This charge was based on a series of SNAP transaction patterns that “establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable activity for your type of firm.” This letter of charges states: “As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for trafficking is permanent disqualification.” The letter also states that “. . . under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) . . . in lieu of a permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

The record reflects that the ROC considered any information provided by Appellant prior to making a determination. The ROC determined that Appellant's contentions, if any, did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the ROC concluded that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The ROC issued a determination letter dated September 26, 2022. This letter informed Appellant that it was permanently disqualified from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP in accordance with Section 278.6 (c) and 278.6(e)(1) for trafficking violations. The letter also states the ROC considered Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. The ROC determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because Appellant had not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

On September 30, 2022, Appellant appealed the ROC's determination and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

### 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)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern in the event that personnel of the firm engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

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** . . . . (Emphasis added.)

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, in part:

Any firm considered for disqualification ... under paragraph (a) of this section... shall have full opportunity to submit to FNS information, explanation, or evidence concerning any instances of noncompliance before FNS makes a final administrative determination. The FNS regional office shall send the firm a letter of charges before making such determination. The letter shall specify the violations or actions which FNS believes constitute a basis for disqualification..... The letter shall inform the firm that it may respond either orally or in writing to the charges contained in the letter within 10 days of receiving the letter . . .

7 CFR § 278.6(c) reads, in part:

The letter of charges, the response, and any other information available to FNS shall be reviewed and considered by the appropriate FNS regional office, which shall then issue the determination. In the case of a firm subject to permanent disqualification under paragraph (e)(1) of this section, the determination shall inform such a firm that action to permanently disqualify the firm shall be effective immediately upon the date of receipt of the notice of determination from FNS, regardless of whether a request for review is filed in accordance with part 279 of this chapter.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) reads, in part:

FNS shall . . . [d]isqualify a firm permanently if ..... personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

Trafficking is defined in 7 CFR § 271.2, in part, as:

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 .....

Also at 7 CFR § 271.2, eligible food is defined as:

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(b)(2)(ii) states, in part:

Firms that request consideration of a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking shall have the opportunity to submit to FNS information and evidence.....that establishes the firm's eligibility for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification in accordance with the criteria included in § 278.6(i). This information and evidence shall be submitted within 10 days, as specified in § 278.6(b)(1).

7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2)(iii) states:

If a firm fails to request consideration for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking and submit documentation and evidence of its eligibility within the 10 days specified in § 278.6(b)(1), the firm shall not be eligible for such a penalty.

### **SUMMARY OF CHARGES**

The charges under review were based on an analysis of SNAP Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) transaction data. This analysis identified the following patterns of SNAP transaction activity that indicate trafficking:

- Multiple transactions made from the same accounts in unusually short time frames; and,
- Unusually large transactions.

The attachments enclosed with the charge letter specify the questionable and unusual SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at Appellant during the review period.

### **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

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

- Appellant has not had any previous issues with SNAP compliance.
- FNS should consider the factors listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(d) before imposing a sanction.
- Appellant denies the allegations.
- Appellant requests a TCMP.
- Appellant is well-stocked.
- Back-to-back transactions are because different family members are using the same EBT card.
- Large transactions occur early in the month when SNAP recipients receive their benefits.
- There have been no investigators who have confirmed the inventory and store characteristics.
- Appellant sells bundles and cases of food at a discount.
- Back-to-back transactions are because customers make small purchases followed by additional purchases after they learn of their remaining benefits balances.
- There are no nearby SNAP-authorized stores.
- Appellant is conveniently located for SNAP participants.
- SNAP participants shop at Appellant for variety.

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 and evidence submitted.

## **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

Regarding Appellant's denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the ROC establishes trafficking occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that that it did not engage in trafficking. 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.

### **Store Characteristics**

Appellant insisted there have been no investigators who have confirmed the inventory and store characteristics. In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROC considered information obtained during a January 15, 2020 store visit conducted by a USDA contractor to observe Appellant's operation, stock, and facilities. This store visit information was used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the firm's irregular SNAP transaction patterns. The store visit report documented the store size, description, and characteristics. The report also described the store's checkout counter space area and noted the effect of any limitations of the available surface area on placing large purchases or processing more than one customer at a time.

Appellant contends it is well-stocked. Appellant's stock overall was typical for a convenience store. There was no indication that SNAP households were inclined to visit the store regularly to purchase large quantities of grocery items. The available food was primarily of a low-dollar value and there was no hint that the firm sold items in bulk. Given the available inventory, there was no sign that Appellant would be likely to have SNAP redemption patterns that differed significantly from those of similarly-sized competitors.

### **Repeat Transactions by the Same Household**

An attachment to the charge letter documents the same household conducting back-to-back transactions in unusually short time frames. Violating stores may conduct multiple transactions from the same household account within a 24- or 48-hour period to avoid the detection of single, high-dollar trafficking transactions.

Appellant stated it is conveniently located for SNAP participants and SNAP participants shop at Appellant for variety. While this may be true, the Case Analysis Document shows households conducting rapid, repetitive, and large transactions at Appellant frequently spent SNAP benefits at better-stocked and more competitively-priced grocery stores, sometimes on or about the same day they shopped at Appellant.

Appellant insists there are no nearby SNAP-authorized stores. The Case Analysis Document also identifies much larger stores with more reasonable prices located within one mile of Appellant. There is no basis for unusually high customer attraction to Appellant, there being no great price advantage, profusion of ethnic goods, or special or custom services rendered. Oddly, some SNAP households spent considerably less at the larger stores than at Appellant.

Appellant contends back-to-back transactions are because customers make small purchases followed by additional purchases after they learn of their remaining benefits balances. Appellant has also not provided any explanation for why such behavior of large back-to-back transactions occurs at Appellant but not at nearby stores. An unsubstantiated argument such as this does not provide a valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Appellant contends back-to-back transactions are because different family members are using the same EBT card. While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a convenience store in a short period of time, the examples in the attachment indicate a series of purchases that total to large amounts. SNAP benefits are intended to supplement the food budget for households whose net income is near or below the Federal Poverty Level. It is difficult to believe customers who must rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet prefer to pay higher prices and spend considerable amounts of their benefits at a convenience store. Spending sizable portions of one's SNAP benefit allotment in a convenience store - when there are larger stores at which one also shops that carry more variety of foods at a lower cost - is unreasonable customer behavior. Moreover, households listed in this attachment conducted this strange shopping pattern of making substantial purchases at Appellant multiple times during the review period. Given the common practice of violating retailers breaking up large, suspicious transactions into multiple, smaller transactions to avoid detection, a firm's explanation and evidence for why these transactions are occurring in a 24- or 48-hour period in a convenience store should be both rational and compelling. Appellant's explanation is neither.

### **SNAP Benefit Depletions**

Appellant stated large transactions occur early in the month when SNAP recipients receive their benefits. A government report on SNAP shopping patterns<sup>1</sup> indicates that after the first day of benefit issuance, on average, 80 percent of a household's allotment remains unspent. Even after seven days, 40 percent of benefits still remain unspent. It typically takes 14 days to deplete 80 percent of one's benefits, and 21 days to deplete 90 percent. This report also revealed that households most often redeemed their benefits at supermarkets and supercenters, with only four percent of all households never shopping in a supermarket.

It is extremely doubtful that a SNAP household making a legitimate purchase would choose to spend a large portion of its monthly allotment at a convenience store with likely higher prices and substantially less inventory than what would be found at a supermarket or superstore. Although many SNAP households do shop early in the month as opposed to later in the month, most households do not spend all or a majority of their monthly benefits in only a few transactions or a single day. Depleting a large portion of one's SNAP balance early in the benefit month, leaving little to purchase food for the remainder of the month, is inconsistent with the normal shopping behavior of SNAP households.

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis, *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*, by Laura Castner and Juliette Henke. Project officer: Anita Singh, Alexandria, VA: February 2011.

## **Large Transactions**

The food stock and facilities of Appellant as reported in the store visit documentation do not appear sufficient to provide for all of one's food needs. People generally do not spend large sums at such stores. They usually stop at convenience stores to pick up a few staple food items, such as bread, milk, or a can or two of food that they may consider are not worth a trip to the supermarket to purchase. It is rare for a convenience store such as Appellant's to have purchases like those included in an attachment to the charge letter.

The Case Analysis Document indicates these transactions significantly exceed the county's average SNAP transaction. As previously stated, Appellant has a limited food stock typical of a convenience store and does not have any features that would induce people to spend substantially more than the typical convenience store purchase amount.

Additionally, the Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to SNAP-authorized convenience stores located nearby. Appellant's SNAP redemptions during the analysis period were substantially larger than that of the nearby comparable firms.

Based on the store layout, infrastructure, and available inventory, it is not credible that the Appellant would so frequently conduct large transactions closely resembling those typically found at a supermarket or superstore. It is not plausible that the firm's customers would regularly carry very large amounts of merchandise around the store without the benefit of shopping carts, especially since larger, better-stocked stores are readily available and in the vicinity of the Appellant firm. Appellant is not set up to process high-dollar transactions, as indicated by its lack of equipment to facilitate large transactions and limited counter space. There are no legitimate bases for SNAP customers' unusual attraction to the firm such as a superior selection of staple foods, price advantages, package specials, bulk or promotional items, an extensive variety of otherwise unavailable ethnic food items, or special services rendered. Appellant failed to provide convincing evidence to establish the legitimacy of these excessively large transactions, such as itemized cash register receipts. Based on all of these factors discussed in this section, the large volume of transactions for high-dollar amounts is unlikely to indicate a pattern of legitimate food purchases.

## **Consideration of Factors for a Sanction**

Appellant stated that FNS should consider the factors listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(d) before imposing a sanction: the nature and scope of the violations; whether the firm was warned violations were occurring; and any evidence of intent to violate the regulations. 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). Trafficking is the most serious violation, and a single instance carries the penalty of permanent disqualification.

### **Expensive Offerings**

Appellant asserts it sells bundles and cases of food at a discount. The evidence does not support this contention. During the store visit, the store clerk identified the most expensive items at Appellant, which were then recorded and photographed by the store reviewer. None of these items Appellant now alleges it sells were identified by the store clerk. The store review report also documented that the firm did not have meat or seafood specials or bundles.

It is more likely true than not true that the sale of expensive items does not explain the large SNAP transactions that occurred at Appellant. Trafficking is a more likely explanation for the unusual and irregular pattern of high-dollar transactions.

### **Invoices**

Appellant submitted invoices to establish that the store purchased enough inventory to support the total of its SNAP sales. However, the invoices are insufficient to demonstrate this. There is not enough information to determine whether they account for the sum of Appellant's SNAP and non-SNAP transaction activity. While the overall dollar amount of SNAP activity is relevant, the charge letter did not cite as evidence Appellant's SNAP sales total. Rather, the ROC identified a series of different suspicious transaction patterns.

### **Customer Statements**

With regard to customer statements provided by the Appellant that purport to establish that the transactions in the charge letter were legitimate purchases of eligible food, the truth of such statements cannot be verified. Written affidavits or declarations, by themselves and without supporting documentation relative to the specific transactions in question, offer little to no insight into the actions that occurred between the customer and the store clerk at the point of sale. Unsubstantiated statements are insufficient to rebut the trafficking determination.

### **Summary**

The ROC determined that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The charges of violations were based on the ROC's assessment that substantial evidence exists that the questionable transactions occurring during the review period displayed patterns inconsistent with legitimate sales of eligible food to SNAP participants. The evidence the ROC considered in support of its determination included:

- The irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to similar stores;
- Observations made during a store visit by a USDA contractor, including the inadequacy of the firm's staple food stock to support such large transactions;
- The availability and characteristics of other SNAP-authorized stores located close to Appellant; and,



- Shopping behaviors of Appellant's customers.

The transaction data and overall firm record demonstrate the patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this firm is likely the result of trafficking.

Upon review, Appellant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. Appellant provided inadequate explanations for the suspicious transactions and insufficient evidence to legitimize its transaction data. It has not convincingly rebutted the ROC's determination that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The SNAP regulations are specific with regard to the action that must be taken if personnel of the firm have trafficked, which is that FNS must disqualify the firm permanently.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

Appellant requested a civil money penalty (CMP) contending that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations. According to 7 CFR § 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations, FNS may impose a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification for trafficking.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) sets forth the eligibility requirements for a CMP:

The firm shall, at a minimum, establish by substantial evidence its fulfillment of each of the following criteria:

Criterion 1: The firm shall have developed an effective compliance policy as specified in Section 278.6(i)(1); and,

Criterion 2: The firm shall establish that both its compliance policy and program were in operation at the location where the violation(s) occurred prior to the occurrence of violations cited in the charge letter sent to the firm; and,

Criterion 3: The firm had developed and instituted an effective personnel training program as specified in Section 278.6(i)(2); and,

Criterion 4: Firm ownership was not aware of, did not approve, did not benefit from, or was not in any way involved in the conduct or approval of trafficking violations; or it is the first occasion in which a member of firm management was aware of, approved, benefited from, or was involved in the conduct of any trafficking violations by the firm . .

. .

In support of Appellant's contention that it is eligible for a CMP, it provided four training documents. In this regard, the various documentation provided by Appellant is not "substantial evidence" that fulfills each of the four criteria of 7 CFR § 278.6(i), demonstrating "that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations." While Appellant provided a training log, this log did not provide support that the recurring training covered topics related to SNAP integrity.

The standards of eligibility for a trafficking CMP are high. They require substantial proof that a compliance policy and program was established and implemented prior to the occurrence of violations. These standards exist to thwart attempts to falsely present compliance policies and programs that were not actually implemented prior to violations. As Appellant did not provide the required supporting documentation, the ROC did not assess a CMP. According to the requirements stated in 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1), § 278.6(b)(2)(ii and iii), and § 278.6(i), Appellant is not eligible for a CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. The determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to deny Appellant a civil money penalty is sustained.

### **CONCLUSION**

The record has yielded no indication of error in the finding by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance that Appellant trafficked in SNAP benefits. A review of the evidence supports that it is more likely true than not true that program violations occurred as charged. Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against A.J. Market Inc. from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

### **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 15, 2023