

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

**Garden Gourmet Corp,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Case Number: C0185323**

**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 six-month disqualification from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) as initially imposed by the Retailer Operations Division.

**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 six-month disqualification against Garden Gourmet Corp.

**AUTHORITY**

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its implementing regulation at 7 CFR § 279.1 provides 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 Garden Gourmet Corp. with Federal SNAP law and regulations in March 2017 and April 2017. In a letter dated March 19, 2018, the Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant store with accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for merchandise which included ineligible non-food items in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a). These SNAP violations

occurred on three (3) out of four (4) compliance visits. The letter further informed the Appellant that the chargeable violations warranted a disqualification period of six months as provided in 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5). The Appellant was informed it could respond to the charges within ten (10) calendar days following delivery of the charge letter. The charge letter was delivered to the store via UPS on March 20, 2018. The Appellant did not respond to the charge letter.

The Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated April 9, 2018. The determination letter informed the Appellant it was disqualified from the SNAP for a period of six months in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e). The determination letter also stated that the Retailer Operations Division considered the Appellant's eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1). The Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant was not eligible for the hardship CMP in lieu of the six-month disqualification because there were other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

In a letter postmarked April 12, 2018, the Appellant, through counsel, requested an administrative review of the Retailer Operations Division's determination. The request for review was granted. Upon acceptance of the administrative review request, implementation of the six-month disqualification was held in abeyance pending completion of this review.

## **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

In appeals of adverse actions, an 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, 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) establish the authority upon which a disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

7 CFR § 278.2(a) states, in part:

Coupons may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households ... and only in exchange for eligible food.

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:

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 § 278.6(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....

7 CFR § 278.6(e) states, in part:

FNS **shall** take action as follows against any firm determined to have violated the Act or regulations ... (5) **Disqualify the firm for 6 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 non-food items** due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm’s ownership or management. [Emphasis added.]

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) states, 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.

## SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

During an investigation conducted in March 2017 and April 2017, the USDA conducted four (4) compliance visits at Garden Gourmet Corp. A report of the investigation was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the charge letter dated March 19, 2018. The investigation report included Exhibits A through D which provide full details on the results of each compliance visit.

The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were recorded during three (3) of the four (4) compliance visits. The chargeable violations involved the sale of six (6) ineligible items in exchange for SNAP benefits in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a). These ineligible items included two (2) bars of soap, dishwashing liquid, air freshener, a box of cutlery, and a candle as documented by Exhibits B, C and D. These violations were conducted by a single clerk. This same clerk refused to

exchange SNAP benefits for paper towels and glass cleaner in Exhibit A and cash in Exhibit D.

### **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

The Appellant, through counsel, made the following summarized contentions in its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

- There is no evidence to support the charges and the six-month disqualification should be overturned as the agency action was arbitrary and capricious.
- The government must show by admissible evidence that SNAP benefits were accepted by the Appellant as payment for ineligible items.
- The store owner has no history of prior violations and this is the first allegation ever brought against the store owner.
- The store owner is dependent on the income from this business and has no intention of ever benefiting from any SNAP violations.

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 states that there is no evidence to support the charges and the six-month disqualification should be overturned as the agency action was arbitrary and capricious. The Appellant further states that the government must show by admissible evidence that SNAP benefits were accepted by the Appellant as payment for ineligible items.

The Appellant's contention that there is no evidence is rejected. The investigation report documents 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 known 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 investigation report documents by a preponderance of the evidence that personnel at the store exchanged ineligible items for SNAP benefits.

## Owner Responsibility

The store owner signed the SNAP application for Garden Gourmet Corp. on November 19, 2014. That application included a signed certification 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 including accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible non-food items.

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 a store owner to disclaim accountability for the acts of persons whom the owner 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.

## First Violation

The Appellant states that the owner has never had any prior violations. 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.

## Violations Warrant a Six-Month Disqualification

The SNAP regulation at 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) states, in part that “FNS shall take action as follows against any firm determined to have violated the Act or regulations ... **Disqualify the firm for 6 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 non-food items due to carelessness or poor supervision** by the firm’s ownership or management.” [Emphasis added.] FNS considers the sale of a total of three (3) inexpensive non-food items over one, two or three transactions to equate to carelessness and the lack of thorough supervision on the part of ownership or management.

The investigation report documents that the chargeable violations in this case consisted of six (6) non-food items exchanged for SNAP benefits over three (3) transactions. Although the same clerk refused to exchange SNAP benefits for ineligible items in Exhibit A and cash in Exhibit D, this does not ameliorate or mitigate the penalty for exchanging SNAP benefits for non-food items as

documented by Exhibits B, C and D. Therefore, the Retailer Operations Division correctly determined that the violations warranted a six-month disqualification.

The Appellant claims that there was no intent to violate any SNAP regulations. In response to this contention, please note that the violation of exchanging ineligible non-food items in exchange for SNAP benefits as defined in 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) does not require an element of intent on the part of the violator. Therefore, whether or not the Appellant firm, its owner, or its employees intended to violate SNAP regulations is irrelevant.

### **Hardship to Firm**

The Appellant claims that the owner is dependent on the income from this business. With regard to this contention, it is recognized that some degree of economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is disqualified from participation in the 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 either the owner personally or the firm resulting from the imposition of such penalty. To allow stores to be excused from assessed administrative penalties based on a purported economic hardship would render virtually meaningless the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a hardship CMP under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1). That regulation 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 case record documents that the Retailer Operations Division determined that a six-month disqualification of Garden Gourmet Corp., a small grocery store, would not cause a hardship to SNAP households as there are other comparable or larger SNAP authorized stores located within a one-mile radius of the Appellant store. In total, there are 184 SNAP authorized stores located within a one-mile radius of Garden Gourmet Corp. These include 34 other small grocery stores, two (2) large grocery stores, ten (10) supermarkets and 15 superstores.

Based on this evidence, a six-month disqualification of Garden Gourmet Corp. would not cause a hardship to SNAP recipients in the area, as opposed to a mere inconvenience; therefore, the Retailer Operations Division decision not to assess a

hardship CMP in lieu of a six-month disqualification is sustained as appropriate under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1).

## CONCLUSION

It is established that the violations as described in the letter of charges did in fact occur at Garden Gourmet Corp. warranting a disqualification of six months in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5). That regulation states that FNS **shall** “disqualify the firm for 6 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 non-food items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm’s ownership or management.” Therefore, the decision to impose a six-month disqualification, **the least severe penalty** allowed by regulation, against Garden Gourmet Corp., Appellant, is appropriate and the action is sustained.

In accordance with the Act and regulations, the six-month period of disqualification shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. The Appellant may submit a new application for SNAP authorization ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six-month disqualification period.

## 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, 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.

RONALD C. GWINN  
Administrative Review Officer

June 26, 2018