

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

Tu Mundo Deli Grocery Corp,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0251099

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 Tu Mundo Deli Grocery Corp (“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 July 29, 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 May 24, 2022, 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 July 29, 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 August 8, 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;
- A large number of manual (key-entered) transactions; 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:

- There was no undercover investigation of Appellant.
- The suspicious transactions were not reviewed.
- The back-to-back transactions were not unusual.
- Large transactions are due to purchases by large families and because groceries are expensive.
- Large transactions are because households shopped locally during the pandemic.
- Appellant has trained staff in the proper handling of SNAP transactions.
- Due process demands that a hearing occur prior to Appellant's disqualification.
- Appellant requests a CMP.
- Large transactions were due to the sale of sandwiches.

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

Store Characteristics

In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROC considered information obtained during a September 22, 2021 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.

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. Appellant contends the back-to-back transactions were not unusual. 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.

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.

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.

While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a small grocery 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 small grocery store. Spending sizable portions of one's SNAP benefit allotment in a small grocery 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 small grocery store should be both rational and compelling. Appellant's explanation is neither.

Manual Transactions

An attachment to the charge letter documents a significant number of EBT manual (key-entered) transactions made at Appellant. The rate of manual transactions for high dollar amounts was much higher than for SNAP transactions overall.

Appellant contends that the transactions contained in this attachment are due to card failure. While some of these transactions may be due to card failure, a number of these transactions reflect instances in which cards that were key-entered for one transaction were later swiped during subsequent transactions, demonstrating that the cards were not malfunctioning. (When new cards are issued, the last few numbers are changed; thus, these instances do not involve new cards).

The ROC also compared Appellant with five other small grocery stores in the area. Appellant had the highest percentage of manually key-entered transactions of all these stores.

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 small grocery 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 small grocery store such as Appellant's to have purchases like those included in an attachment to the charge letter.

Additionally, many of the charge letter transactions arrive at, or cluster around, certain dollar amounts in \$5 increments. Households typically shop to obtain a certain mix of food items, irrespective of the total cost (other than to remain within allotment balances), and do not strive to achieve a particular total. The purchase amount of eligible food items typically approximates a random total. In contrast, firms facilitating trafficking tend to concentrate transactions at particular dollar amounts. In the absence of any compelling rationale to the contrary, the pattern of clustering transactions around certain dollar levels is implausible and indicative of transaction structuring and SNAP-benefit trafficking.

Appellant contends large transactions are because households shopped locally during the pandemic, because of purchases by large families, and because groceries are expensive. Appellant also contends large transactions were due to the sale of sandwiches. The Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to SNAP-authorized small grocery stores located nearby. Appellant's SNAP redemptions during the analysis period were substantially larger than that of the nearby comparable firms, many of which also have delis.

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.

Credit Accounts

Appellant maintains that one of the reasons for the large transactions is that credit is extended to loyal customers, and their tabs are paid in full when they receive their SNAP benefits. When a retailer attempts to refute charges of trafficking by claiming it maintains credit accounts, the retailer must provide adequate proof that credit accounts existed at the time the suspicious transactions occurred so that the ROC can compare such proof with transactions outlined in the letter of charges. This is because it is not uncommon for retailers to make false admissions of credit in an attempt to obtain a lesser penalty after committing the more egregious violation of trafficking. Without substantial documentation that credit was extended to SNAP customers, it is impossible to compare against any specific transactions outlined in the letter of charges dated May 24, 2022, or substantiate that such transactions were indeed the result of credit account repayments.

Credit repayments also do not explain why SNAP households made several large dollar transactions over one or two day periods adding up to hundreds of dollars.

No Control Over Benefit Use

Appellant insists that it has no control over how and when SNAP customers spend their benefits. In truth, SNAP households have no limits on the number of times they may use their SNAP cards or how much eligible food they may purchase. The SNAP transactions of Appellant are questionable not because they exceed any limits for use. Rather, they display characteristics not typically found at small grocery stores and are indicative of trafficking.

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.

Evidence of Trafficking

Appellant argues there was no undercover investigation of Appellant and the suspicious transactions were not reviewed. As previously stated, 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.)

FNS employs a computerized fraud detection tool to identify EBT transactions that form patterns having characteristics indicative of trafficking. This tool does not determine that trafficking has occurred. The ROC must still analyze the transaction patterns, along with other information such as store visit observations, customer shopping patterns, and comparative data from nearby stores. Only then does the ROC conclude whether questionable transactions were, more likely than not, the result of trafficking. Transactions with these patterns sometimes have valid explanations that support the idea they were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items, which is why opportunities are given to charged retailers to explain the questionable transactions cited. In this case, based on the suspicious patterns displayed and the other supporting evidence in the file - and in the absence of any reasonable explanations for such transaction patterns - the preponderance of the evidence supports that the “unusual, irregular, and inexplicable” transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges are the result of trafficking.

No Denial of Due Process

Appellant contends that it has been denied due process. In this regard, the permanent disqualification of Appellant by the ROC is neither a criminal nor a civil action, but rather an administrative action imposed against the firm as a result of trafficking violations.

FNS’s due process procedures include two levels of review. First, the retailer is afforded an opportunity to reply to the charges leveled by the ROC. The regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(c) state:

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.

After the determination letter is issued, the second level of due process involves an administrative review.

Appellant availed itself of this option and in the process of which Appellant was granted 21 days to provide additional information in support of the request for review. Appellant took advantage of this opportunity and provided additional information.

The purpose of the administrative review process is to ensure that a firm aggrieved by FNS's adverse actions has the opportunity for their position to be fairly considered by an impartial reviewing authority prior to that adverse action becoming final. Through the administrative review process, Appellant has been duly given, and has taken, the opportunity to present any evidence and information it deemed as pertinent in support of its position that the ROC's adverse action should be reversed. All evidence and information that Appellant presented to the ROC, as well as any such information submitted subsequently, have now been considered in this administrative review prior to rendering the final agency decision. The firm provided no additional records during the administrative review that would establish that the suspicious transactions were legitimate purchases. The record does not indicate any departure from established procedures with regard to Appellant's right to a fair and thorough review. Appellant has exercised its opportunity to reply to the charge letter and its administrative review rights. By doing so, it has availed itself of the full complement of the agency's statutory obligations with regard to due process.

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 an 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.

For an Appellant's request for a CMP to be considered, the regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2) require that Appellant submit supporting documentation within ten days of receipt of the charge letter. Appellant was advised of this provision in the charge letter of May 24, 2022. A review of the administrative record indicates Appellant did not submit documentation to support its eligibility for this alternative sanction by this deadline.

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 described its compliance policy and training program. In this regard, the various statements made 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."

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 Tu Mundo Deli Grocery Corp 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

March 21, 2023