

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

**Soundview 99 Plus Inc.,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.**

Case Number: C0248020

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 Retailer Operations Division to impose a one-year disqualification against Soundview 99 Plus Inc. (Appellant) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The decision is reversed.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) and 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e)(5) in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a one year period of disqualification against Appellant.

AUTHORITY

7 USC § 2023 and the 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.”

CASE CHRONOLOGY

The USDA investigated the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of February 2, 2022, through February 7, 2022. The investigative report documented that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on three separate occasions. As a result of evidence compiled during this investigation, by letter dated February 23, 2022, the Retailer Operations Division charged ownership with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.2(a)

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer and lender.

and noted the violations warranted a six-month disqualification period. The letter also stated that under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification. The store owner replied by phone on February 15, 2022, and indicated that there were some acquaintances that were working at the store during the time of the violations.

After considering the retailer's reply and the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated March 10, 2022, that the violations cited in the charge letter occurred at the firm and that a one-year period of disqualification was warranted. The letter stated that eligibility for a hardship CMP was not applicable as there were other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

By letter dated March 24, 2022, Appellant, through counsel, requested an administrative review of the Retailer Operations Division's determination. The appeal was granted and implementation of the disqualification has been held in abeyance pending completion of this review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative actions should be reversed. That means the 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

The controlling statute in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC § 2021 and § 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). 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 § 278.6(a) states, *inter alia*:

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 . . .

Section 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, that a firm is to be disqualified for six months:

[I]f 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(e)(5) and (6) states, in part, when a firm is to be disqualified for one year:

[I]f 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.
(6) Double the appropriate period of disqualification prescribed in paragraphs (e)(2) through (5) of this section as warranted by the evidence of violations if the same firm has once before been assigned a sanction.

In addition, 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) provides for civil money penalty (CMP) assessments in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause "hardship" to SNAP households benefit because of the unavailability of a comparable participating food store in the area to meet their shopping needs. It reads:

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 benefit because there is no other authorized retail food store in the area selling as large a variety of staple food items.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A review of the Retailer Operation Division's case file indicated the determination is not supported based on the evidence. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to address Appellant's contentions in this matter.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a disqualification of one year against Soundview 99 Plus 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.

MARY KATE KARAGIORGOS
Administrative Review Officer

October 6, 2022