

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

Carniceria Los Tapatios Inc,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0208688

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) that there is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification of Carniceria Los Tapatios Inc. (Carniceria Los Tapatios or Appellant) from participation as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), 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(a), (c) and (e)(1) in its administration of the SNAP, when it assessed a permanent disqualification against Appellant.

AUTHORITY

7 USC § 2021 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

USDA conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period from June 5, 2018, through October 16, 2018. The investigation report documents that personnel at Carniceria Los Tapatios exchanged SNAP benefits for cash during two of the compliance visits. The store employee also sold ineligible non-food items in exchange for SNAP benefits. 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 evidence compiled from the investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated November 15, 2018, that it was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations. The letter stated, in relevant part, that:

...[Y]our firm is charged with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for the trafficking violation(s) . . . is permanent disqualification.

The charge letter also stated that:

The SNAP regulations also provide that under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) of up to \$59,000.00 in lieu of permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking. The SNAP regulations, Section 278.6(i), list the criteria that you must meet in order to be considered for a CMP. If you request a CMP, you must meet each of the four criteria listed and provide the documentation as specified within 10 calendar days of your receipt of this letter.

Appellant replied to the charges by phone on November 16, 2018, and explained that the transactions were conducted by an employee that had been only working for eight months. After considering the retailer's reply and the evidence, the Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated December 3, 2018, that the firm 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. This determination letter further stated that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP because it failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter dated December 14, 2018, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review. The appeal was granted.

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). Part 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1) 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 have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 USC § 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 § 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 § 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 § 278.6(a) states:

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(e)(1) reads, in part:

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

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.]

INVESTIGATION DETAILS

During an investigation conducted from June 5, 2018, through October 16, 2018, a USDA investigator conducted seven compliance visits at Carniceria Los Tapatios. The investigation report dated October 19, 2018, was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter, and included Exhibits A through G which provide full details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were committed during six of the compliance visits. The investigation reported that personnel at Carniceria Los Tapatios exchanged 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in cash for 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits on one occasion and 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in cash for 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits on a second occasion. Transactions of this nature are referred to in regulatory terms as “trafficking”. During six of the visits, Appellant also exchanged ineligible non-food items, including sandwich bags, plastic spoons, plastic forks, crat sticks, plastic wrap, and aluminum foil, for SNAP benefits.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

In its December 14, 2018, administrative review request, Appellant provided the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- Appellant request that the determination be reconsidered.
- The store was broken into recently and the computer system failed causing Appellant to start from scratch with a new system.
- The owner’s daughter suffered with some medical issues and ownership neglected the business.
- When the owner’s daughter was in intensive care and needed therapy, someone was hired

to help around the store.

- Not all of the employees understood the requirements.
- Appellant hired an inexperienced cashier and takes full responsibility.
- Appellant has been authorized for four years and never had any issues.

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

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 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 establishes by a preponderance of the evidence that the violations as reported occurred at the Appellant store.

Appellant disputes that the violations in the charge letter should lead to permanent disqualification. Neither the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, nor the regulations issued pursuant thereto 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 the most serious violation, even when the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash is dollar-for-dollar. 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, Section 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the SNAP regulations states that FNS shall 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.

Ownership Involvement

Appellant states that an employee was responsible for the transactions. Although ownership was allegedly 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 ownership of a store may utilize to handle store business, the ownership 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.

Ownership signed the FNS application to become a SNAP authorized retailer on May 1, 2015, which 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 for cash and as payment for ineligible items, a violation of the SNAP rules and regulations. The regulations establish that an authorized food store may be disqualified from participating in the program when the store fails to comply with the Act or regulations.

No Previous Violations

Appellant contends that it has been participating in the SNAP for four years without any issues. 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.

Civil Money Penalty

Appellant did not 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. Even if a timely request had been submitted, 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

Based on a review of the evidence in this case, there is no question that program violations did occur during a USDA investigation. Therefore, the decision to impose a permanent disqualification against Appellant, Carniceria Los Tapatios, is sustained. The determination that Appellant is not eligible for a CMP is also 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 (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.

MARY KATE KARAGIORGOS
Administrative Review Officer

May 15, 2019