

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

7 Deli Grocery Inc,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0195566

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

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 Retailer Operations Division to impose a six month disqualification against 7 Deli Grocery Inc (hereinafter Appellant) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division 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 Appellant on March 8, 2018.

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 the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period August 31, 2017, through September 18, 2017. The investigation determined that personnel at the Appellant business accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on four separate occasions. All four 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 and included items such as foam cups, party cups, paper towels, toilet tissue, cleanser, and a sponge. The investigative report indicates that these

violative transactions were handled by the same clerk. The investigative report also notes that the business refused to exchange SNAP benefits for cash on one occasion (Exhibit D).

As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated November 30, 2017, 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 responded to the charges via a faxed letter dated December 5, 2017, and in a telephone call on December 11, 2017. After giving consideration to the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated March 8, 2018, that it determined that violations had occurred at the establishment, 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 dated March 10, 2018, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division’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. Subsequent correspondence dated April 8, 2018, was also 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, 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 § 278.2(a) states, in part, “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 . . . or for any other nonfood use.”

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. . . .”

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, 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) reads, in part, “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.”

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

The following may represent a summary of Appellant’s contentions 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 herein:

- The business was disqualified for six months because there were other stores selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices;
- The owner’s father had medical issues and recently passed away from prostate cancer. The owner was traveling back and forth to Korea while he was sick. Because of these circumstances, the owner was not able to provide the family store with proper leadership and guidance to adhere to regulations. The owner had left her aunt and an assistant manager in charge of the day-to-day operations while she was gone;
- The employee who committed the violations was her elderly aunt who does not speak English and did not realize what she had done. As a result of the violations, she has now been fired;
- The neighborhood around the store predominantly uses SNAP and the current disqualification will cause the store to close. The owner is decreasing the amount of food classified as accessory foods and increasing staple foods and will ensure the store has at least, if not more than, 36 staple food items with six or more being perishable. The owner is also making changes to have more varieties of foods in all four categories.

Appellant submitted a listing of the items carried in the four staple food categories along with 16 undated color photographs of store stock in support of these contentions.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Retailer Operations Division. This review is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of the Retailer Operations Division action at the time such action was made. While store ownership may not have personally conducted the violative transactions, SNAP rules and regulations state that regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to handle store business or their degree of involvement in store operations, the ownership is accountable for the proper training of staff and the monitoring and handling of all SNAP benefit transactions. Both the FNS SNAP retailer application and retailer reauthorization application contain a certification page whereby applicants must confirm their understanding of and agreement with SNAP retailer requirements in order to complete the application/reauthorization process. Store ownership did certify its understanding and agreement to abide by program rules and regulatory provisions when it initially applied to become a SNAP retailer in 2008 and again when it applied for reauthorization as a SNAP retailer in 2013. The owner remains liable for all violative transactions handled by store personnel, whether paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time regardless of the amount of time the owner is present at the subject firm.

The Report of Investigation shows that one clerk working at the Appellant business during the period under review transacted SNAP benefits for ineligible items on four separate occasions indicating an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations as defined by Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. The transactions from the investigative report, including the store EBT POS receipts, have been matched to SNAP transactions posted by the Appellant business on the dates in question with no discrepancies. The acceptance of SNAP benefits for ineligible items is a violation of SNAP rules and regulations. The ineligible items sold were obvious nonfood items and would not readily be confused with eligible edible food items. SNAP regulations state that FNS shall disqualify a store for a six month period 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 the sale of common nonfood items in exchange for SNAP benefits due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management. The fact that the multiple, violative transactions conducted by this clerk span nearly a three week window is further indication of poor supervision by ownership or management. There was no indication of involvement by the firm's ownership or management.

The Report shows that the nature and scope of the violations under review do violate SNAP regulations, and the transaction amounts cited also match FNS transaction records for the dates in question. Additionally, a review of the Report shows no errors or discrepancies. There is no regulatory threshold for the dollar value of the ineligible items purchased. While a firm that has previously received warnings of possible violations or that has been sanctioned before could receive a more severe penalty, SNAP regulations do not provide any grounds for dismissing or reducing penalties for those firms that have not received warnings or previously been sanctioned. The record shows no evidence that the Appellant firm received any prior warnings or has been sanctioned and there is no evidence that the firm's ownership or management intentionally violated SNAP regulations. Therefore, the decision to disqualify the firm for a six month period is the appropriate penalty. Based on the discussion above, there is not any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

The store owner admits that she was unable to provide proper leadership and guidance which resulted in an employee allowing the purchase of ineligible nonfood items using SNAP benefits because the employee did not realize what she was doing. It is highly improbable, based on the willingness of this employee to exchange SNAP benefits for ineligible items, that the only instances of SNAP violations were those identified as part of the FNS undercover investigation and more likely than not that this represented an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations at the Appellant business. As previously stated, store ownership is responsible for all SNAP transactions at the firm and therefore a certain minimal level of oversight and training on the part of ownership to ensure employees are not violating SNAP laws or regulations is expected. It would be unusual and irresponsible for store owners to not be monitoring all transactions, including those involving SNAP, and reviewing daily balance sheets to ensure store employees were not stealing from the business or conducting other activities that would jeopardize the licenses and income that the business is dependent upon. Under SNAP regulations, the penalty for allowing the purchase of ineligible nonfood items using SNAP benefits as the result of poor supervision by ownership or management is a six month disqualification. The regulations do allow SNAP retailers to pay a hardship CMP as explained in the next section. Stocking additional staple food items has no bearing on the eligibility for this CMP.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

Appellant is not eligible for a trafficking CMP as these only apply in cases of permanent disqualifications.

A hardship CMP as an optional penalty in lieu of a six month disqualification was considered in this case. Such a finding is appropriate only if a store sells a substantial variety of staple food items and 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. FNS records show there are 19 other comparably sized or larger SNAP retail stores located within a 1.00 mile radius of the Appellant business that includes medium grocery stores and a supermarket. All of the comparable or larger stores stock adequate varieties of food in all four staple food categories and in perishables as required by FNS.

It is recognized that some degree of 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 waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm or to ownership resulting from imposition of such penalty. To allow ownership to be excused from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship to the firm would render virtually meaningless the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and the enforcement efforts of the USDA. Furthermore, 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, ownership's contention that the firm may 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 imposed.

CONCLUSION

A review of the evidence in this case supports that the program violations at issue did 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 by a USDA special agent and signed under penalty of perjury. A review of this documentation has yielded no indication of error or discrepancy in any of the reported findings. Rather, 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. Accordingly, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a disqualification of six months against the Appellant business from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained. Furthermore, the Retailer Operations Division properly determined that Appellant was not eligible for a hardship CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations as there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

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. When eligible, Appellant may reapply for SNAP authorization using the application instructions contained on the FNS web site at <https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/apply-to-accept>.

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 a judicial review is desired, 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.

ROBERT T. DEEGAN
Administrative Review Officer

May 25, 2018