

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

Bam African Market,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0192527

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the USDA that there is sufficient evidence to support that the Retailer Operations Division properly imposed a permanent disqualification of Bam African Market 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 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 278, when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Bam African Market.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its 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 conducted an investigation of the compliance of Bam African Market with Federal SNAP law and regulations from January 2017 through April 2017. The investigation report documents that personnel at Bam African Market exchanged SNAP benefits for cash during an undercover compliance visit. 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 the evidence compiled from this investigation, the Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant, in a letter dated March 30, 2018, with trafficking in SNAP benefits. The charge letter noted that the penalty for trafficking is permanent disqualification as provided by 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). The letter stated the Appellant had the right to respond to the charges within 10 days of receipt. The letter also stated that the Appellant could request a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a permanent disqualification within 10 days of receipt under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

In response to the charge letter, the Appellant sent a letter dated April 9, 2018. The letter stated a single employee with limited English skills conducted a small trafficking transaction in disregard of all training previously provided to her by the store. The store requested that the USDA take into account the isolated nature of this incident. The Appellant did not request a trafficking CMP under 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

After giving consideration to the evidence and the Appellant's response, the Retailer Operations Division informed the Appellant, by letter dated April 17, 2018, that Bam African Market was permanently disqualified from participation in the SNAP. The letter also stated that the Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP as the Appellant did not submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP. The Appellant received the determination letter on April 25, 2018.

In a letter postmarked May 3, 2018, the Appellant requested an administrative review of the permanent disqualification determination. The request for administrative review was granted.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, an appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative action should be reversed. That means an appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence which a reasonable mind, considering the record as a whole, might accept as sufficient to support a conclusion that the matter asserted is more likely to be true than not true.

CONTROLLING LAW AND REGULATIONS

The controlling law in this matter is covered in the Food & Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021, and promulgated 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.

7 U.S.C. § 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 that the definition of “coupon” includes:

... an electronic benefit transfer card or personal identification number issued pursuant to the provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, for the purchase of eligible food.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) states:

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

7 CFR § 271.2 defines trafficking, 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

7 CFR § 271.2 defines eligible food, in part, as:

Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot foods and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption

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....

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.]

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

During an investigation from January 2017 through April 2017, the USDA conducted seven (7) undercover compliance visits at Bam African Market. A report of the investigation was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter dated March 30, 2018. The investigation report included Exhibits A through G which provide full details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations occurred during all seven (7) compliance visits. During one (1) compliance visit a clerk exchanged cash for SNAP benefits as documented by Exhibit F. On another visit, the same clerk refused to exchange cash for SNAP benefits as documented by Exhibit G.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its reply to the charge letter and its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

- The store hired a cashier who spoke limited English, but was very familiar with the majority of the customer base for the market. The cashier was trained on the SNAP regulations by the store owner. After it was clear she understood the policies necessary for accepting SNAP benefits she was scheduled to work.
- It was not until the store received the charge letter that they were aware of the fraudulent activities occurring with the cashier. Upon learning of the violations the cashier was fired.
- The store has never been involved with trafficking or accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise prior to this. The store owner requests that USDA take this isolated situation with one employee into consideration.
- The store provides a necessary diversity of food items to residents in the Flint community, especially those with financial limitations.
- The violations in the investigative report were all committed by the same person and the owner is committed to training and monitoring all employees with more intensity and commitment to make sure this is not a recurring situation.
- The store owner is requesting the opportunity to pay for any purchases made that do not align with the SNAP regulations. Upon payment, the owner requests that the USDA reinstate the vendor status of Bam African Market.

The preceding may represent only a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions presented in this matter. Please be assured, however, in reaching a decision, full attention was given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Investigation Report

The Appellant does not refute the findings of the investigation report. 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 under the direction of 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.

Owner Accountability

The Appellant store owner states he had no knowledge and did not approve of any SNAP violations. Although the owner was not involved in the violations, it cannot be accepted as a valid basis for dismissing any of the charges, or for mitigating the impact of those charges. Regardless of whom the owner of a store may utilize to handle store business, the owner is accountable for the proper training of staff and the monitoring and handling of SNAP benefit transactions. To allow store ownership to disclaim accountability for the acts of persons whom the ownership chooses to utilize to handle store business would render virtually meaningless the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA.

In addition, the owner signed the SNAP reauthorization application for the store on May 9, 2014 and acknowledged that he was aware of the SNAP regulations and understood those regulations. That application included a certification and confirmation that the owner 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 include accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for cash, otherwise known as trafficking, and other violations such as accepting SNAP benefits for ineligible non-food items.

First Violation

The Appellant states that the store has never been involved with trafficking or accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise prior to this. The store owner requests that USDA take this isolated situation with one employee into consideration.

With regard to this contention, a record of participation in the SNAP with no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating the impact of those charges. Trafficking in SNAP benefits is an extremely serious violation and both 7 U.S.C. §2021(b)(3)(B) and 7 CFR §278.6(e)(1)(i) state that a first time violation warrants a permanent disqualification.

Corrective Action

The Appellant notes that the violations in the investigative report were all committed by the same person and the owner is committed to training and

monitoring all employees with more intensity and commitment to make sure this is not a recurring situation.

It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier determination of the Retailer Operations Division. This review is limited to what circumstances existed at the time that was the basis of the Retailer Operations Division's action. It is not within the authority of this review to consider what subsequent remedial actions may have been taken so that a store may begin to comply with program requirements.

In addition, there are no provisions in the SNAP regulations for a waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of alleged or planned corrective actions implemented subsequent to findings of program violations. Therefore, the Appellant's contention that corrective action has taken place, or will take place, does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Hardship to the Community

The Appellant states that the store provides a necessary diversity of food items to residents in the Flint community, especially those with financial limitations. Regarding this contention, there is no provision in the SNAP statute or regulations that would negate, waive or reduce a permanent disqualification for trafficking due to a purported hardship to SNAP customers.

Where there is a hardship to SNAP households due to a lack of authorized stores in the area, FNS may impose a hardship CMP on a firm in lieu of a less than permanent disqualification. However, the regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) clearly state that "a civil money penalty for hardship to [SNAP] households may not be imposed in lieu of a **permanent** disqualification." [Emphasis added.] Because the Retailer Operations Division has taken action to permanently disqualify the Appellant firm, a hardship CMP in lieu of disqualification cannot be granted.

Dollar Amount of Violations and Settlement Offers

The Appellant notes the minimal amount of cash involved in the transaction in comparison to the serious impact a permanent determination will have upon the business. Regarding this contention, 7 CFR §278.6(e)(1)(i) states that "FNS **shall** disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked" Clearly, there is no required minimum dollar threshold contemplated by the regulation. FNS considers trafficking to be the most egregious SNAP violation that a firm can commit and permanent disqualification is mandated by the regulations.

The Appellant also states it and that it is willing to reimburse the USDA for the amount of the violations. However, it is not within the authority of this administrative review to consider settlement offers. Settlement offers would more appropriately be in addressed in conjunction with a judicial review before a court of law

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The Appellant did not timely 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. SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2)(iii) states that “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 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1), the firm **shall not be eligible** for such a penalty.” [Emphasis added.]

Even if a timely request had been submitted, the 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 SNAP compliance policy and program prior to the 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

Trafficking is defined, in part, in 7 CFR § 271.2, as “the buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits ... for cash or consideration other than eligible food” The SNAP regulation at 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) reads, in part, “FNS shall ... disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.” The law and regulations do not provide for a lesser period of disqualification for this violation.

Based on a full review of the evidence in this case, there is no question that a trafficking violation did occur during a USDA investigation. Based on the analysis above, the decision to impose a permanent disqualification against Bam African Market, Appellant, is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 279.7 (7 CFR § 279.7) addresses your right to a judicial review of this determination. Please note that 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 you 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, FNS is 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.

RONALD C. GWINN
Administrative Review Officer

June 27, 2018