

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

3 Kids Nutritional Care,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0215660

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) that there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification of 3 Kids Nutritional Care (Appellant) from participation as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), as initially imposed by the Retailer Operations Division, was appropriate.

ISSUE

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

AUTHORITY

7 USC § 2021 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

USDA conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period from March 25, 2019, through August 20, 2019. The investigation report documents that personnel at 3 Kids Nutritional Care exchanged cash for SNAP benefits. This occurred on two separate occasions. The store employee also sold ineligible non-food items in exchange for SNAP benefits. The buying or selling of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food is trafficking as defined under 7 CFR §271.2.

As a result of evidence compiled from the investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated September 10, 2019, that it was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations. Appellant replied to the charges by e-mail on September 11, 2019, and apologized for the transactions and requested another chance.

After considering the retailer's reply and the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated September 24, 2019, that the firm 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. This determination letter further stated that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP because it failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter dated October 1, 2019, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review. The appeal was granted.

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). Part 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1) 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 have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 USC § 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 § 271.2 states, in part, 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 § 271.2 defines trafficking, in part, as:

- (1) 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.
- (2) The exchange of firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances, as defined in section 802 of title 21, United States Code, for SNAP benefits;
- (3) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits that has a container requiring a return deposit with the intent of obtaining cash by discarding the product and returning the container for the deposit amount, intentionally discarding the product, and intentionally returning the container for the deposit amount;
- (4) Purchasing a product with SNAP benefits with the intent of obtaining cash or consideration other than eligible food by reselling the product, and subsequently intentionally reselling the product purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food; or
- (5) Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.
- (6) Attempting to buy, sell, steal, or otherwise affect 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 signatures, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states:

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)(1) reads, in part:

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

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 § 278.6(b)(2) states, in part:

(ii) 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 as specified in § 278.6(i), 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).** [Emphasis added.]

(iii) **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. [Emphasis added.]

INVESTIGATION DETAILS

A USDA investigator conducted seven compliance visits at 3 Kids Nutritional Care from March 25, 2019, through August 20, 2019. The investigation report dated August 22, 2019, was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter, and included Exhibits A through G which provide details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were committed during five of the compliance visits.

The investigation reported that personnel exchanged **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** in cash for an unknown amount of SNAP benefits on two occasions (Exhibit F and Exhibit G). Transactions of this nature are referred to in the regulations as "trafficking". During the visits, Appellant also exchanged ineligible non-food items, including dryer sheets, paper towels, laundry detergent, paper plates, paper bowls, plastic spoons, and toilet paper.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

In its October 1, 2019, administrative review request, Appellant provided the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- Appellant has lost many sleepless nights worried that its only source of income will be closed.
- Appellant requests reconsideration.
- It was never the owner's intent to defraud the government.

The preceding may represent only a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions presented in this matter. However, in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A full review of the case record shows that the charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal USDA investigation. The transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted by a USDA investigator and are thoroughly documented. A complete review of this documentation has yielded no error or discrepancy. The investigation report is specific and thorough with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific facts related thereto, and is supported by

documentation that confirms specific details of the transactions. The documentation presented by the Retailer Operations Division establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the violations as reported occurred at the Appellant store.

Intent to violate is not applicable in this case as the definition of trafficking at 7 CFR §271.2 does not require an element of intent on the part of the violator. Trafficking in SNAP benefits is a very serious violation and warrants a permanent disqualification on the first violation. Trafficking is always considered to be extremely serious, even when the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash is dollar-for-dollar or is conducted by a non-managerial store clerk. Both 7 USC § 2021(b)(3)(B) and 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) mandate that the penalty for trafficking is a permanent disqualification and does not provide for a lesser period of disqualification or a warning letter.

Appellant Hardship

Appellant states that the business is its only source of income. It is recognized that economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is disqualified from participation in SNAP. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for a waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from imposition of such penalty. To excuse ownership from assessed administrative penalties based on purported economic hardship to the firm would render virtually meaningless the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA.

Moreover, giving special consideration to economic hardship to the firm would forsake fairness and equity, not only to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, but also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that the firm will incur economic hardship based on the assessment of an administrative penalty does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposition.

Civil Money Penalty

In the charge letter, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant of its right to request a trafficking CMP under 7 CFR § 278.6(i). Appellant was informed that it would need to provide both the request and supporting evidence within ten calendar days of receiving the charge letter and that no extension of time could be granted for making the request or for providing the required evidence. Appellant did not request consideration for a trafficking CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification under 7 CFR § 278.6(i), even though it was informed of the right to do so in the charge letter.

Even if a timely request had been submitted, Appellant would likely not have been eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification because there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy to prevent SNAP violations. Therefore, the Retailer Operations Division's decision not to impose

a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification is sustained as appropriate pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

CONCLUSION

A review of the evidence in this case, supports by a preponderance that program violations did occur during a USDA investigation. Therefore, the decision to impose a permanent disqualification against Appellant is sustained. The determination that Appellant is not eligible for a CMP is also sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 USC § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. If a judicial review is desired, the Complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which the Appellant's owners reside or are engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. If any Complaint is filed, it 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.

MARY KATE KARAGIORGOS
Administrative Review Officer

February 27, 2020