

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

Easy Mart,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0210575

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the USDA that the record indicates that Easy Mart, (hereinafter Appellant) committed violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). There is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in the 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(c) and (e)(1) in its administration of the SNAP, when it assessed a permanent disqualification against Appellant by letter dated August 29, 2018.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 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

By charge letter dated August 7, 2018, Retailer Operations Division informed ownership that Appellant was in violation of the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 271 – § 278, based on EBT benefit transactions that "establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for your type of firm."

The letter of charges stated, in relevant part: “As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for trafficking is permanent disqualification.”

The record reflects that in an August 8, 2018, and August 14, 2018, telephone conversation, Appellant informed Retailer Operations Division that it would be sending register receipts as part of its formal response. In correspondence dated August 16, 2018, Appellant replied to the charge letter and generally stated that it was sending receipts collected for EBT transactions within the last week. Appellant indicated that their system only saves information up until the last week but they will continue to monitor and track EBT transactions going forward. Appellant provided 58 EBT receipts along with 56 corresponding cash register receipts in support of its position.

Retailer Operations Division gave consideration to the Appellant's replies and evidence of the case, and issued a determination letter dated August 29, 2018. This letter informed Appellant that it was permanently disqualified from the SNAP in accordance with Sections 278.6(c) and 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations. The letter also stated that Retailer Operations Division considered Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. However, Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because it failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Appellant had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter dated September 4, 2018, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In appeals of adverse actions, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative actions should be reversed. That means an 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 & Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021 and 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Part 278.6(a) (c) and (e)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store in the event that personnel of the firm have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, *inter alia*, that "FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store...from further participation in the program 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(c) reads, in part, "*Review of Evidence*. 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)... 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..."

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." Trafficking is defined, in part, in 7 CFR § 271.2, as "the buying or selling of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food."

7 CFR § 271.2 states in part that, "Eligible foods mean: Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption."

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

The charges on review were based on an analysis of SNAP electronic benefit transfer (EBT) transactions dated during the five-month period of February 2018 through June 2018. This involved two patterns of EBT transaction characteristics indicative of trafficking:

1. Multiple transactions were made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time-period.
2. Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

The first issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, it is more likely true than not true that the questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its response to the permanent disqualification letter issued by Retailer Operations Division, and its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

1. It is our position that none of the sales itemized in the allegations of your August 7, 2018 letter are inappropriate or in violation of the SNAP.

Appellant provided 59 EBT/Register receipts for the month of August 2018, in support of its position. No other documentation was provided in support of Appellant's position. An analysis of the receipts provided indicates that the receipts were dated outside of the review period and therefore not considered during this review

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

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The FNS originally authorized the business as a combination grocery/other store on November 24, 2008. Subsequently the store type was changed to a convenience store on June 19, 2014, as part of the reauthorization process. The file indicates that in reaching a disqualification

determination, Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a July 2, 2018, store visit to the business conducted by a FNS contractor to observe the nature and scope of the firm's operation, stock and facilities. This information was then used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the EBT transactions at Appellant that formed patterns indicative of trafficking. The firm review summary documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

1. One cash register, one POS device with a small counter area partially obstructed by other smaller items available for sale and/or displays.
2. Estimated to be approximately 1600 square feet.
3. The contracted reviewer confirmed the store is open 24 hours/7 days a week.
4. No shopping baskets or carts available for customers.
5. Optical scanner at register. No specialty registers.
6. Store does not operate through a night window or plastic barrier with food stock behind the barrier.
7. No evidence of wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers.
8. No pricing structure such as ending most products ending with 00 cents and does not round transaction totals.
9. Some food is stored in an area outside of public view.
10. Store has storage freezers or coolers but not food stored off site.
11. Store is not primarily selling one food type such as meat, poultry, dairy, seafood, fruits, baked goods or vegetables.
12. Store does not take telephone or online orders and does not offer delivery.
13. Highest priced eligible food items were Folgers (\$6.59), Johnson's Sausage (\$9.99), Red Bull (\$7.49), and soda (\$5.99/case).
14. Store stocks a significant amount of non-food items such as but not limited to gasoline, lottery tickets, tobacco products, alcohol products, automotive products, health and beauty aids, cleaning products, and housewares.
15. Eligible food inventory consisted of canned & packaged goods, minimal selection of fresh produce, prepared foods, and some dairy products, no fresh meat or poultry.
16. No kitchen/prepared food area with hot foods sold for onsite consumption. No hot food sold.
17. Food sold for on-site consumption with a microwave available for heating.
18. No deli or prepared food section. Stock not used in preparation of food.
19. No meat or seafood specials, bundles, or fruit/vegetable boxes sold.
20. The store does not offer any promotional specials, packaged or bulk items. The store visit photographs document the lack of advertisements regarding promotions, specials, packaged or bulk items.

The second issue for consideration is whether Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. Each attachment furnished with the charge letter represents the questionable and unusual patterns of SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking, which were conducted at Appellant's store during the review period. As there is more than one pattern of irregular transactions, the case of trafficking becomes more convincing.

Attachment 1 of the Charge letter - Multiple transactions were made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time-period.

There were 18 sets of 52 SNAP transactions that met the parameters of this attachment. Multiple transactions conducted by the same household account within a set time-period is a method which violating stores use to avoid the detection of single high dollar transactions that cannot be supported by the retailer's inventory and structure. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). In 14 of the 18 sets, the transaction amount in the subsequent transaction(s) nearly equaled or exceeded the dollar amount of the initial transaction. The record reflects that clients shopping at Appellant's store were also shopping at other area grocery stores as well as full-line supermarkets and superstores that offer a much larger quantity and variety of eligible food items at better prices. The store visit report does not indicate any compelling reason for SNAP households to make cumulative purchases, within a set time-period, resulting in large amounts.

Appellant, through counsel, did not offer, with its review request, any explanation or related evidence in an attempt to clarify or justify the specific transactional behavior noted in the Attachment 1 of the Charge letter. Therefore, based on the analysis above and in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, the irregular and unusual transaction pattern cited in the charge letter is unlikely and a strong indicator of trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Attachment 2 of the Charge letter - Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

There were 109 SNAP transactions that met the parameters of this attachment. Based on the results of the contracted store visit, the large transaction amounts are not consistent with the store's inventory of low priced foods. The firm does not offer food in bulk or any ethnic or specialty foods that sell for a high price. Therefore, the substantial number of high dollar purchases calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions. The record reflects that there are 12 comparably or better stocked retailers within a one mile radius of Appellant's store, to include 3 combination grocery stores, 7 convenience stores, 1 medium grocery store, and 1 superstore. Of the 36 households reviewed in this attachment, 25 or 69 percent conducted SNAP transactions at a superstore. In this Attachment, Appellant's transactions ranged from 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C), yet the average transaction amount for this store type in Clackamas County was \$7.35.

Appellant, through counsel, did not offer, with its review request, any explanation or related evidence in an attempt to clarify or justify the specific transactional behavior noted in the Attachment 2 of the Charge letter. Therefore, based on the analysis above and in the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, the irregular and unusual transaction pattern cited in the charge letter is unlikely and a strong indicator of trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of sufficient evidence as to the legitimacy of such transactions, a conclusion can be drawn, through a preponderance of evidence that the "unusual, irregular, and inexplicable" transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation. In this case, ownership did not provide sufficient evidence to legitimize Appellant's transaction data as outlined in the Attachments.

Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking and concluded, through a preponderance of evidence, that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions in the Charge letter.

The transaction data and overall firm record convincingly demonstrate repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this type of firm indicative of trafficking. Once Retailer Operations Division established the convincing case against Appellant, ownership bears the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the administrative action 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. If this is not demonstrated, the case is to be sustained.

As noted, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) states 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 inconsistent redemption data, and evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system.

Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant has likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. This is evidenced by: the suspicious patterns in two attachments of EBT transaction data, the inadequacy of the firm's eligible food stock as observed and recorded during the onsite visit to support such large transactions, the lack of evidence of invoices of food in inventory to cover Appellant's reasoning for the SNAP transaction totals for the review months, the lack of explanation for customer spending habits given that there are other SNAP authorized stores located within proximity to Appellant, and the irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to other convenience stores in the State.

While ownership was afforded the opportunity to provide valid explanations and evidence that support that the questionable transactions were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items, Retailer Operations determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence in the record.

The purpose of the administrative review process is to ensure that firms aggrieved by Retailer Operations Division's adverse actions have the opportunity to have their position fairly considered by an impartial review authority prior to that adverse action becoming final. Appellant has been duly given, and has taken the opportunity to present to USDA through the administrative review process whatever evidence and information it deemed pertinent in support of its position that Retailer Operations Division's adverse action should be reversed. Therefore, any evidence and information that Appellant presented to Retailer Operations Division, as well as any such information submitted subsequently, have now been considered in this administrative review in rendering the final agency administrative decision in this case. The record does not indicate any departure from established policy or procedures with regard to Appellant's right to a fair and thorough review.

Ownership has not provided sufficient evidence to rebut the convincing case that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. As such, 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 shall disqualify the firm permanently.

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 dated July 6, 2017. 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' decision, not to impose a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification, is sustained as appropriate pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

CONCLUSION

Retailer Operations Division's analysis of Appellant's EBT transaction record was the primary basis for its determination to permanently disqualify Easy Mart from participation in the SNAP. This data provided substantial evidence that the questionable transactions during the review period had characteristics that are consistent with trafficking in SNAP benefits. Therefore, based on a review of all the evidence in this case, it is more likely true than not true that program violations did, in fact, occur as charged by Retailer Operations Division. Based on the discussion herein, the determination to impose a permanent disqualification against Easy Mart is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and to Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 279.7 (7 CFR § 279.7) with respect to 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 (FOIA), 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.

Monique Brooks
Administrative Review Officer

March 12, 2019