

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

Best 1 Smoke Shop Corp,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0203258

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 Best 1 Smoke Shop 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 November 24, 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

In a letter dated November 7, 2020, 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.”

Appellant replied to the ROC’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the ROC received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination. The ROC determined that Appellant’s contentions 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 November 24, 2020. 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 December 21, 2020, 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 during the period from June 2017 through September 2017. This analysis identified the following patterns of SNAP transaction activity that indicate trafficking:

- An inordinate number of transactions ending in same-cents values;
- Multiple transactions made from the same accounts in unusually short time frames; 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:

- Appellant denies the allegations.
- Disqualification would pose a severe hardship to Appellant.
- Appellant regularly trained staff in the proper handling of SNAP transactions.
- Appellant has not had any previous issues with SNAP compliance.
- The store is well stocked with large quantities of infant formula.
- Appellant rounds off prices to the nearest dollar.
- Back-to-back transactions are due to customers doing all their shopping at Appellant.
- Large transactions are due to customers making phone orders followed by additional purchases.
- Appellant carries all groceries that a customer would need.
- The determination is based solely on computer generated reports.
- The determination is inequitable and arbitrary.
- The charge letter states after each allegation "other similar transactions occurred during the period in question," but specifics of these transactions are not provided.
- The comparisons to Appellant's type of firm are incorrect.
- Appellant did not receive any warnings.
- Many of Appellant's prices end in 99 cents. Appellant provided ten store pictures.
- There are no affidavits or evidence from inspectors that show trafficking.

- The charge letter does not indicate how the allegations relate to trafficking as defined by the regulations.
- Appellant has no control over how frequently SNAP participants use their benefits.
- FNS must consider the nature and scope of the violations, the existence of prior warnings or notices, and evidence of intent to violate FNS regulations. There is no proof Appellant intended to violate the regulations, as required.
- The 15 sets of back-to-back transactions involving 12 households over four months do not demonstrate a pattern.
- The amounts of the transactions in Attachment 3 represent only 20% of Appellants gross sales during this period. Appellant included a notarized letter signed by the owner, six pages of a quarterly sales tax form, and a one-page document about Appellant’s EBT processing policy.

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

Regarding Appellant’s denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the ROC establishes trafficking occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that that it did not engage in trafficking. 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 insists the charge letter states after each allegation “other similar transactions occurred during the period in question,” but the specifics of these transactions were not provided. This language does not appear in the charge letter. In the attachments to charge letter, Appellant was provided with all of the transactions which supported the charges.

Store Characteristics

In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROC considered information obtained during a May 2, 2017 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 following store size, description, and characteristics:

- Store size is approximately 340 square feet with 81 square feet of food storage outside of public view;
- Available inventory of SNAP-eligible food items showed stock composed predominantly of inexpensive items, which is typical of a convenience store;
- Only one cash register and one electronic SNAP terminal device;

- No shopping carts or hand baskets;
- No scanners or conveyor belts;
- No evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers; and,
- No meat or seafood specials or bundles.

In addition, the store's checkout counter space area was small and surrounded by plastic barriers allowing very little surface area to place large purchases and making it impractical to process more than one customer at a time.

Appellant contends the comparisons to Appellant's type of firm are incorrect and that Appellant carries all groceries that a customer would need. There is no question that Appellant is a convenience store. Appellant is moderately stocked for a convenience store. 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.

Same-Cents Transactions

An interesting characteristic of questionable transactions is that many of them end in a same-cents value. Sets of repeating digits are highly unorthodox and do not regularly occur in legitimate transactions; such transaction structuring is a common hallmark of trafficking activity. In the absence of any compelling rationale to the contrary, these patterns strongly indicate that the firm is trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Attachment 1 to the charge letter documents transactions ending in same-cents values. A review of the store visit record indicates that the store did not promote any specials that could explain the pattern of large numbers of transactions ending in these values. This attachment includes 574 same-cents transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**.

There were a total of 978 SNAP transactions that met the parameters of this attachment. Of these transactions, a total of 574 (59%) ended in "99" cents. Same-cents values comprised ~59% of all these SNAP transactions conducted by the firm during the four-month review period. In other words, more than nearly three out of every five of these transactions was a transaction ending in "99" cents.

A number of households whose transactions were cited in other attachments to the charge letter also consistently made transactions that ended in same-cents values. Transactions appearing in more than one attachment to the charge letter are more suspicious as they display multiple patterns common to trafficking transactions.

Appellant contends that many of its prices end in 99 cents. The prices evident in the store visit documentation show a pricing structure typical of convenience stores, where items are often

priced to end in “.x9” cents. With such a pricing structure, it is unlikely for transactions to naturally end in 99 cents with the frequency they occurred during the review period. Even if many of Appellant’s prices ended in 99 cents, the purchase of even a single additional item that was not priced at an even-dollar amount would rule out a transaction ending in 99 cents.

It is Appellant's contention that the inordinate number of transactions ending in same-cents values are due to the normal practice of the firm to round off transactions to the nearest dollar. The assertion that the firm rounds off transaction amounts is not supported by the evidence. The store visit interview with the owner confirmed Appellant does not round off transactions. The majority of the transactions were for 99 cents, not even-dollar amounts. Even if Appellant chose to regularly arbitrarily round off to the nearest 99 cents, this would not explain the high frequency of transactions that did not end in 99 cents.

Patterns of transactions ending in same-cents amounts indicate that SNAP transaction amounts are contrived. Random data, which legitimate transaction activity approximates, is extremely difficult to produce intentionally; it is very difficult to avoid repetitive patterns when attempting to create the appearance of normal, near-random transactions. That various customers each repeatedly had totals with identical cents values during the review period strains the credibility of Appellant’s declaration that this activity reflected the acceptance of SNAP benefits in exchange for eligible food items. As Appellant has offered no rational explanation for why such patterns might exist, it is reasonable to conclude that these same-cents transactions are the result of trafficking.

Repeat Transactions by the Same Household

Attachment 2 to the charge letter documents the same household conducting back-to-back transactions in unusually short time frames. Violating stores may conduct multiple transactions from the same household account 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) to avoid the detection of single, high-dollar trafficking transactions. Appellant contends the 15 sets of back-to-back transactions involving 12 households over four months do not demonstrate a pattern. There are 37 repeat transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) included in this document, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). These back-to-back transactions do demonstrate a pattern.

Appellant insists back-to-back transactions are due to customers doing all their shopping at Appellant. The record reflects that customers 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 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.

The following examples from the ROC's Case Analysis Document show households shopped at better stocked firms on or about the same day as conducting large transactions at Appellant:

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

SNAP Household #2

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a convenience store in a short period of time, the examples in Attachment 2 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 convenience store. Spending sizable portions of one's SNAP benefit allotment in a convenience 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 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in a convenience store should be both rational and compelling. Appellant's explanation is neither.

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 convenience 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 convenience store such as Appellant's to have purchases like those included in Attachment 3 to the charge letter. This attachment cites 230 EBT transactions during the four-month period of investigation 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Additionally, many of the charge letter transactions arrive at, or cluster around, certain dollar amounts in \$5 increments (5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)). 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.

These transactions significantly exceed the county's average SNAP transaction, which was \$8.65 for this type of store during the four months of the review period.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). Appellant's average transaction is significantly higher than the county's average transaction. As previously stated, Appellant has a limited food stock typical of a convenience store and does not have any features that would induce people to spend substantially more than the typical convenience store purchase amount.

Additionally, the Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to two SNAP-authorized convenience stores located nearby. Appellant's SNAP transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) during the analysis period were more than three times more frequent than that of the nearby comparable firms.

Appellant contends large transactions are due to customers making phone orders followed by additional purchases. During the store visit interview, the owner stated that Appellant does not accept phone orders.

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 or shopping baskets, 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.

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 convenience stores and are indicative of trafficking.

Appellant's Responsibilities

Appellant insists that the owner regularly trained staff in the proper handling of SNAP transactions. When ownership signed the FNS application to become an authorized SNAP retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that the owner(s) 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 trafficking. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may choose to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

No Applicable Mitigating Factors

Appellant asserts that this is the first time there has been an issue related to SNAP and that it did not receive prior warnings. A record of program participation with no documented previous violations, however, does not constitute valid grounds for mitigating the impact of the present serious determination of trafficking. To require Appellant to receive a warning of violations before administrative action can be taken would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Appellant stated that FNS should consider the factors listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(d) before imposing a sanction: the nature and scope of the violations; whether the firm was warned violations were occurring; and, any evidence of intent to violate the regulations. Appellant argues there is no evidence that Appellant intended to violate the regulations, which is required to impose a sanction. This argument is based on an incorrect understanding of the regulations. The severity of the penalties, set forth in the subsequent paragraph 7 CFR § 278.6(e), are based on the factors listed in 7 CFR § 278.6(d). For example, permitting the sale of cigarettes with SNAP benefits results in a three-year disqualification, but this becomes five years if the firm had been previously warned. Other sanctions consider intent, such as whether false information on an application was “knowingly submitted” or whether the sale of nonfood items were “the firm’s practice” (which carries a three-year disqualification) rather than “due to carelessness or poor supervision” (which results in a six-month disqualification). However, in this case, the ROC determined the firm engaged in trafficking.

Appellant argued that the amounts of the transactions in Attachment 3 represent only 20% of Appellants gross sales during this period. Neither the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, nor the accompanying regulations cite any minimum dollar amount of cash or SNAP benefits, or number of occurrences, for such exchanges to be defined as trafficking. Nor do they cite any degrees of seriousness pertaining to trafficking of SNAP benefits. 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. This is reflected in the Food and Nutrition Act, which reads, in part, that disqualification “shall be permanent upon . . . the first occasion of a disqualification based on . . . trafficking . . . by a retail food store.” In keeping with this legislative mandate, § 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the SNAP regulations states that FNS must disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked. There is no agency discretion in the matter of what sanction is to be imposed when trafficking is involved.

Infant Formula

Appellant contends that high transaction amounts are due in part to selling expensive infant formula. It would be unusual for a SNAP household to purchase baby formula with SNAP

benefits, as households who participate in SNAP are eligible to participate in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC). WIC has a more lenient income threshold for participation - and a higher participation rate of eligible participants - than SNAP. WIC provides participants with vouchers for baby formula as well as other staple items, such as orange juice and cereal. WIC participants would likely purchase all their infant formula, as well as other expensive staple goods, with their WIC benefits.

No Undue Hardship to Appellant

Appellant maintains that disqualification would pose an extreme hardship to the firm. Economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is permanently disqualified from SNAP participation. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from such a penalty. To excuse Appellant from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship to the firm would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

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

Evidence of Trafficking

Appellant argues the charge letter does not indicate how the allegations relate to trafficking as defined by the regulations. Appellant contends the determination is inequitable and arbitrary and is based solely on computer generated reports. Further, Appellant insists there are no affidavits or evidence from inspectors that show trafficking. 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.

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

For a firm to have the opportunity to be considered for a civil money penalty (CMP), it must request that FNS consider a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification and submit supporting documentation within ten days of receipt of the charge letter. Appellant was advised of these provisions in the charge letter of November 7, 2020. The regulations specify that such supporting documentation must demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective SNAP compliance policy and training program prior to the occurrence of violations. A review of the administrative record indicates Appellant did not, at any time, request a CMP. Appellant also did not submit any documentation to support its eligibility for this alternative sanction, before or after the deadline.

In the absence of a request for a CMP and any supporting documentation, a CMP was not assessed by the ROC. 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 Best 1 Smoke Shop 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

January 25, 2021