

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

**Reemy's Inc,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Office of Retailer Operations and  
Compliance,**

**Respondent.**

**Case Number: C0251439**

**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 six month disqualification against Reemy's Inc (hereinafter Appellant) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Therefore, the determination is reversed.

**ISSUE**

The issue accepted for review is whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), § 278.6(e)(5 and 6), and § 278.6(f)(1) in its administration of the SNAP when it imposed a six month period of disqualification against the Appellant.

**AUTHORITY**

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and the 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**

A USDA investigator conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period March 4, 2022, through March 17, 2022. The investigation determined that personnel at the Appellant firm accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on three separate occasions. All three transactions were deemed clearly violative and warrant a six month disqualification period. The items sold are best described in regulatory terms as common nonfood items such as boxes of steel wool pads, boxes

of scrubbing sponges, plastic snack bags, and stainless steel scrubbers. The investigative report indicated that these violative transactions were handled by the same clerk. The report noted that a second clerk refused the exchange of two ineligible items using SNAP benefits in Exhibit C and the violative clerk refused to exchange SNAP benefits for cash in Exhibit E, but did allow the purchase of ineligible items in Exhibits A, B, and E.

As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance informed Appellant, in a letter dated May 4, 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)). The letter also states that under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification (Section 278.6(f)(1)).”

Appellant failed to respond to the charges. After giving consideration to the evidence, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated June 14, 2022, that it determined that violations had occurred at the firm, and that a six month period of disqualification from participating as an authorized firm in SNAP was warranted. This determination letter also states that Appellant’s eligibility for a hardship CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated “. . . 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.”

By letter sent via email on June 20, 2022, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s decision and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted and implementation of the sanction has been held in abeyance pending completion of this review. No subsequent correspondence was received.

## **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 Section 278. In particular, Sections 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.

7 CFR § 271.2 states that: 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 § 278.2(a) states that: Coupons [SNAP benefits] may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households, and only in exchange for eligible food. Further, the citation specifies that coupons may not be accepted in exchange for cash, in payment of interest on loans, or for any other nonfood use.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states that: 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.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) states that: 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(f)(1) states that, “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. FNS may disqualify a store which meets the criteria for a CMP if the store had previously been assigned a sanction. A CMP for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification.

### **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 six month disqualification against the Appellant firm 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.

ROBERT T. DEEGAN  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

April 26, 2023