

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

Bravo Bargain,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0192029

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the USDA that there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the six-month disqualification of Bravo Bargain (Bravo Bargain or Appellant) from participation as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, 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(f)(1) and 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e)(5) in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a six-month period of disqualification against Appellant.

AUTHORITY

7 USC § 2023 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

The USDA conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of August 24, 2016, through November 18, 2016. The investigative report documented that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on six separate occasions. As

a result of evidence compiled during this investigation, by letter dated November 13, 2017, the Retailer Operations Division charged ownership with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.2(a) and noted the violations warranted a six-month disqualification period. The letter also stated that under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification.

Appellant replied to the charges by fax on November 17, 2017, and apologized for the violations. After giving consideration to the retailer's reply and the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated December 5, 2017, that the violations cited in the charge letter occurred at the firm and that a six-month period of disqualification was warranted. The letter stated that eligibility for a hardship CMP was not applicable as there were other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

In a letter postmarked December 14, 2017, Appellant requested an administrative review of the Retailer Operations Division's determination. The appeal was granted, and implementation of the sanction was held in abeyance pending completion of this review.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a clear 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). 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) specifies in relevant 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, inter alia, that “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)

Section 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.”

In addition, 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) provides for civil money penalty (CMP) assessments in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause “hardship” to SNAP households benefit because of the unavailability of a comparable participating food store in the area to meet their shopping needs. It reads, inter alia, “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 benefit because there is no other authorized retail food store in the area selling as large a variety of staple food items.”

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

Bravo Bargain is a convenience store, originally authorized by FNS on March 7, 2008. During an investigation conducted between August 24, 2016, and November 18, 2017, a USDA investigator conducted six compliance visits at Appellant. A report of the investigation dated October 24, 2017, was provided to Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter. The investigation report included Exhibits A through F which provide full details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were recorded during each of the six compliance visits and involved the sale of common ineligible items including pens, a soap dispensing brush, a lantern, elastic hairbands, laundry soap, a juicer, food bag clips, hair gel, ear headset, and lotion. Upon review, the evidence indicates that Appellant established a record of selling non-food items, as defined by Section 271.2 of the regulations, on multiple occasions as noted in Exhibits A ,B, C, D, E, and F furnished with the charge letter.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its request for review postmarked December 14, 2017, in relevant part:

- Appellant apologizes for the mistakes.
- This is the store's first violation.
- Appellant diligently trained its employees.
- Appellant tried to improve and re-educate workers.
- Customers will be devastated if it is not allowed to accept SNAP.
- This is a family business and it would cause financial distress if it is disqualified.
- There are other stores in the area but their prices are higher.

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

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 provides through a preponderance of the evidence that the violations as reported occurred at the Appellant firm.

Corrective Action

Appellant apologizes for the mistakes and explains that it has worked to improve and re-educate its employees. 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. It is not within the authority of this review to consider what subsequent remedial actions may have been taken or will be taken in the future so that a store may begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in the SNAP regulations for waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of corrective actions implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it took corrective action to prevent future violations does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

No Previous Violations

Appellant contends that it has not had any previous SNAP violations. 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 the violations upon which they are based. There is no provision in the Act or regulations that reverses or reduces a sanction based upon a lack of prior violations by a firm and its owners, managers and/or employees.

Economic Hardship

Appellant states that the disqualification will be a hardship. 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

Appellant explains that it will be a hardship on its customers if it is disqualified. 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." The Retailer Operations Division determined that there are 27 authorized stores with a one-mile radius of Appellant, including a super store located .04 miles from Appellant. Thus, in its letter dated November 21, 2017, the Retailer Operations Division determined that a hardship CMP would not be appropriate, as there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

Appellant contends that its prices are better than the nearby stores. There was no evidence submitted to support this contention. The regulation is specific to the firm's stock of staple food items. According to the store visit photos, Appellant has a

limited stock of staple food items including milk, ice cream, juice, canned good (vegetables, fruit, meat, and fish), pasta, rice, and cereal. Thus, the evidence does not support that it will be a hardship for customers if Appellant is disqualified.

Some degree of inconvenience to SNAP customers is inherent whenever any SNAP authorized retailer is disqualified. For example, the normal shopping pattern of SNAP customers may be temporarily altered during the period of disqualification. Nevertheless, the determination of the Retailer Operations Division that the six-month disqualification of Bravo Bargain from the SNAP would not create a hardship to customers, as differentiated from potential inconvenience, is sustained and a civil money penalty in lieu of disqualification is not appropriate in this case.

CONCLUSION

A review of the evidence in this case confirms that the Retailer Operations Division's initial determination to impose a six-month disqualification in lieu of a CMP was proper. The record documents that the Retailer Operations Division properly considered Appellant's eligibility for a hardship CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations. Appellant is located in an area where there are other authorized SNAP retailers, selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices. Given the evidence under review, the CMP was appropriately denied. Therefore, the six-month disqualification of Appellant from participating as an authorized retailer in the SNAP is 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 owner resides or is 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 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

March 29, 2018