

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

**3460 Boston Gourmet Deli Grocery Inc.,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Office of Retailer Operations and  
Compliance,**

**Respondent.**

**Case Number: C0202516**

**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 to impose a six-month disqualification against 3460 Boston Gourmet Deli Grocery Inc. (“Appellant”) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

**ISSUE**

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(5) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a six-month period of disqualification against Appellant on November 3, 2020.

**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**

USDA conducted an investigation of Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of October 3, 2017 through October 17, 2017. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on four separate occasions. These items sold during these impermissible

transactions are best described in regulatory terms as “common ineligible nonfood items.” The investigation revealed that two unidentified clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions. As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance informed Appellant, in a letter dated January 2, 2018, 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)). Under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification (Section 278.6(f)(1)).”

Appellant replied to the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated November 3, 2020 that the firm was being disqualified for six months from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This determination letter also stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . 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.”

On November 6, 2020, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s decision to impose a six-month disqualification, and requested an administrative review of the action. The appeal was granted and implementation of the sanction has been on hold pending completion of this review.

## **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)(5) establish the authority upon which a six-month disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

Section 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, when 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(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 . . . .

### **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

Appellant's responses regarding this matter are essentially as follows:

- Appellant denies the allegations.
- The investigative report shows refusals of impermissible transactions.
- Appellant has trained staff in the proper handling of SNAP transactions.
- Other firms were provided with a warning letter or chance to pay a monetary fine.
- This is the first time the firm has had a problem with SNAP compliance.
- Disqualification would pose a hardship to SNAP participants who rely on the firm.

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, including any others that have not been specifically listed here.

### **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

As to Appellant's denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance establishes a violation occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that the permanent disqualification should be reversed. If this is not demonstrated, the case will be sustained. Without supporting evidence and rationale, assertions that the firm has not violated program rules do not constitute valid grounds for overturning the determination.

Appellant contends that it has trained staff in the proper handling of SNAP transactions. When ownership signed the FNS application to become a SNAP authorized retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that Appellant would "accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP regulations, including those committed by any of the firm's employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time." The violations listed on this certification document include selling ineligible non-food items. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store

may use to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

This review is limited to considering the circumstances at the time the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance's decision was made. It is not within this review's scope to consider actions that Appellant may have taken subsequent to this decision to begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of corrective actions implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, Appellant's staff training and termination of the offending employee, while positive steps, do not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

### **First SNAP Violation**

Appellant's maintains that this is the first time there has been an issue related to SNAP. A record of program participation with no documented previous violations, however, does not constitute valid grounds for mitigating the impact of the present charges of sale of nonfood items. Appellant is correct that a non-food violation was refused on one occasion. The investigation report shows that of the five times that nonfood violations were attempted, store personnel permitted them four times. On another occasion, trafficking was refused which carries a much more severe penalty.

Repeatedly entrusting an unsupervised, inexperienced and/or untrained clerk(s) to handle SNAP benefits is reasonably viewed as careless or the exercise of poor supervision. Accordingly, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance attributed violations to "carelessness, or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management," pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations, which results in a disqualification of six months. This penalty is only permitted if the firm has not been previously sanctioned. Therefore, a six-month disqualification for the violations committed, the minimum, is the appropriate sanction in this case.

### **Other Firms Treated Differently**

Appellant stated that competitors with similar violations have been were provided with warning letters or chances to pay monetary fines. Appellant provided no details in support of these contentions. Firms with lesser violations have been issued warning letters, and firms whose disqualification would pose a hardship to SNAP participants who rely on the firm have been offered civil money penalties. These circumstances were not present in this case. This administrative review is limited solely to those circumstances concerning Appellant's violations and, therefore, the firm's contention regarding the other firms cannot be used to reverse the decision.

### **Investigative Record**

Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue did, in fact, occur as charged. As noted previously, the charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal USDA investigation. All transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted under the supervision of a USDA investigator and all are fully documented. The investigative record is specific and accurate with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific ineligible merchandise sold in exchange for SNAP benefits, and in all other critically pertinent detail.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

Appellant requested a fine in lieu of the six-month disqualification. A CMP as an optional penalty in lieu of a six-month disqualification was considered in this case. Such a finding is appropriate only if: 1) a store sells a substantial variety of staple food items, and; 2) its disqualification would create a 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.

In this regard, some degree of inconvenience to SNAP benefit users is inherent in the disqualification from the SNAP of any participating food store, since the normal shopping pattern of such SNAP benefit holders may temporarily be altered during that period. In this case, however, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance has rendered a finding pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(f) that it would not be appropriate to impose a CMP in lieu of a period of disqualification. The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance has determined that Appellant is not the only authorized retail food store in the area "selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices." In addition, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notes that the subject store is classified in the FNS SNAP retailer database as a convenience store. That database also shows two supermarkets and one superstore located within a one-mile radius. All of these stores are easily accessible to customers and offer a variety and quality of staple foods comparable to, or better than, those offered by Appellant. Appellant does not carry any unique items or foods that cannot be found at other stores. Therefore, the earlier determination that Appellant's disqualification would not create a hardship to customers, as differentiated from potential inconvenience, is sustained, and a CMP in lieu of disqualification is not appropriate in this case.

### **CONCLUSION**

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a disqualification of six months against 3460 Boston Gourmet Deli Grocery Inc. from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

In accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act, and the regulations thereunder, this penalty shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. A new application for participation in SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six-month disqualification period.

## **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

January 25, 2021