

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

**Dollar Store of Clinton Twp,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Case Number: C0246277**

**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 insufficient evidence to support the determination by FNS's Retailer Operations Division to permanently disqualify Dollar Store of Clinton Twp (hereinafter "Appellant") from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

**ISSUE**

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division, in its administration of SNAP, took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 278, when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Dollar Store of Clinton Twp.

**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."

**SUMMARY OF CHARGES**

The Appellant was charged with trafficking and subsequently permanently disqualified from SNAP based on an analysis of EBT transaction data from December 2020 through April 2021. This involved the following transaction patterns, which are common trafficking indicators:

- There were multiple transactions made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time period.
- The store conducted EBT transactions that were large based on observed store characteristics and recorded food stock.

## **CASE CHRONOLOGY**

The agency's record shows that FNS initially authorized Dollar Store of Clinton Twp for SNAP participation as a convenience store on July 14, 2014. In a letter dated August 5, 2021, the Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations, based on a series of irregular SNAP transaction patterns that occurred between the months of December 2020 and April 2021. The letter noted that the penalty for trafficking is permanent disqualification as provided by 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). The letter also stated that the Appellant could request a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of permanent disqualification for trafficking, but noted that such a request must be made and supporting documentation submitted within 10 days of receipt of the charge letter under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

The record shows that the Appellant and its accountant responded to the allegations in a number of telephone calls and e-mails between August 16, 2021, and February 22, 2022. In its response, the Appellant argued that it had done nothing wrong or illegal and claimed that the transactions were the result of the store being located in the center of a trailer park, an apartment complex, and residential homes. It further argued that the store had been in business since 2008 and had long-lasting relationships with the residents of the area.

In support of its reply, the Appellant submitted several hundred pages of inventory invoices and store photographs in an effort to show that the transactions in the charge letter were legitimate.

After considering the Appellant's responses and documentation and further evaluating the evidence in the case, the Retailer Operations Division concluded that trafficking had occurred as charged and issued a determination letter dated April 29, 2022. This letter informed the Appellant that it would be permanently disqualified from SNAP upon receipt of the letter in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(c) and § 278.6(e)(1). The letter also stated that the Retailer Operations Division considered the Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations, but found that a CMP was not appropriate because the Appellant failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

In an e-mail dated May 5, 2021, the Appellant, through counsel, appealed the agency's determination by requesting an administrative review. The request was granted.

In subsequent correspondence, Appellant's counsel submitted a five-page letter detailing its contentions in this matter, along with income statements, inventory invoices and receipts, and two short videos showing the store and its inventory.

## **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

In an appeal of adverse action, such as disqualification from SNAP participation, an appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. This means that an appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence

which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, would 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 law in this matter is found in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2021), and promulgated 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.

7 U.S.C. § 2021(b)(3)(B) states, in part:

...[A] disqualification under subsection (a) shall be...permanent upon...the first occasion or any subsequent occasion of a disqualification based on the purchase of coupons or trafficking in coupons or authorization cards by a retail food store or wholesale food concern or a finding of the unauthorized redemption, use, transfer, acquisition, alteration, or possession of EBT cards...

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, [or] evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system....

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) states:

FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part:

Trafficking means: 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...

7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part:

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(b)(1) 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) states, 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(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.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) states, in part:

FNS may impose a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking ... if the firm timely submits to FNS substantial evidence which demonstrates that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the Program...

7 CFR § 279.4(a) states, in part:

Upon receipt of a request for review of administrative action, the administrative action shall be held in abeyance until the designated reviewer has made a determination. However, permanent disqualifications for trafficking shall not be held in abeyance and shall be effective immediately as specified in 278.6(b) (2) of this chapter. If the disqualification is reversed through administrative or judicial review, the Secretary shall not be held liable for the value of any sales lost during the disqualification period...

### **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

A review of the evidence does not support the Retailer Operations Division's determination in this matter. Accordingly, the permanent disqualification is dismissed, and it is unnecessary to list or address the Appellant's contentions.

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

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against Dollar Store of Clinton Twp is reversed.

### **RELEASE OF INFORMATION**

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.

JON YORGASON  
Administrative Review Officer

November 17, 2022