

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

Asunan Inc,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0253433

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is insufficient evidence to support the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against Asunan 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)(1)(i) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Appellant on August 11, 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

The USDA conducted an investigation Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of May 31, 2013 through July 12, 2013. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted a total of \$100 in SNAP benefits in exchange for cash (trafficking) in the amount of \$70 on one occasion, as well as permitting the purchase of other non-food items with SNAP benefits. The investigation revealed that one unidentified clerk was 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 August 7, 2022, that its firm was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). This letter stated, in part, “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.”

Appellant replied to the charges in a subsequent letter to the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance. The record reflects that the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance received and considered this information prior to making a determination.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated August 11, 2022 that the firm was being 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. This determination letter also stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . you are not eligible for the CMP because you failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that your firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.”

On August 12, 2022, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s assessment 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(e)(1)(i) establishes 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 have engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

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 part, in 7 CFR § 271.2, as “the buying or selling of [SNAP benefits] or other benefit instruments for cash or consideration other than eligible food.”

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A review of the evidence does not support the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s determination in this case. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to address Appellant’s contentions in this matter.

This administrative review decision is based on the specific circumstances of this case as documented by materials provided by Appellant and the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance. In addition, this administrative review decision does not establish policy or supersede federal law or regulations.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against Asunan Inc from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is reversed.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

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

January 23, 2023