

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

Htoo Family Food Market,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0207874

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 a six month disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) was properly imposed against Htoo Family Food Market by the Retailer Operations Division of FNS.

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 in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a six month period of disqualification against Htoo Family Food Market on September 21, 2018.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its 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 Department of Agriculture conducted an investigation of the compliance of Htoo Family Food Market with Federal SNAP law and regulations during the period April 13, 2018 through August 22, 2018. In a letter dated September 19, 2018, the Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant with accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for merchandise which included ineligible nonfood items in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a). These SNAP violations occurred on

four out of six compliance visits. The letter further informed the Appellant that the violations warranted a disqualification period of six months as provided in 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5).

In a response to the Retailer Operations Division of September 30, 2018, the Appellant replied to the charges therein denying that neither the owner's wife nor her cousin, who are the store's cashiers, have ever sold ineligible items with SNAP benefits. To the best of its knowledge, the Appellant could not find any abuses of accepting SNAP benefits for ineligible items. The Appellant will make sure that SNAP violations do not occur again at the store.

After considering the Appellant's reply and the evidence of this case, the Retailer Operations Division issued a Determination Letter dated September 21, 2018. The Determination Letter informed the Appellant that 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 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 November 30, 2018, the Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. FNS granted the Appellant's request for administrative review by letter dated December 13, 2018. 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, the Appellant bears the burden of proving by a 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, 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 statute in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021, and promulgated through regulations 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, inter alia:

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

7 CFR § 271.2 states, inter alia:

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, inter alia:

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)(5) states, inter alia:

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 nonfood items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management.

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) states, 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 Food Stamp [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 from April 13, 2018 through August 22, 2018, USDA conducted six compliance visits at Htoo Family Food Market. A report of the investigation was provided to the Appellant as an attachment to the Charge Letter dated September 19, 2018. 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 four of the six compliance visits and involved the sale of a variety of items best described in regulatory terms as "common nonfood items". The exchange of these ineligible items for SNAP benefits is in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a).

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

The following represents a brief summary of the Appellant's contentions in this matter. Please be assured, however, that in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration was given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or specifically referenced herein.

In the reply to the Charge Letter, in the administrative review request, and in a subsequent letter to FNS, the Appellant stated the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- The Appellant denies that neither the owner's wife nor her cousin, who are the store's cashiers, have ever sold ineligible items with SNAP benefits. To the best of its knowledge, the Appellant could not find any abuses of accepting SNAP benefits for ineligible items.
- During the past year, the store was operated predominantly by the owner's wife with the assistance from his daughter and various friends and relatives. From May 2018 to August 2018, the owner's wife's pregnancy prevented her from any commitment to the store and the operation was attended by various friends and relatives.
- The Appellant will make sure that SNAP violations do not occur again at the store.
- In its first year of operation, SNAP sales resulted in approximately 50% of its business sales with its customers being predominantly Myanmar refugees. A six month SNAP disqualification will impose a financial hardship on the Appellant and may force the store to close.
- The Appellant provides traditional foods for the Myanmar refugee community in the surrounding area. The majority of the store's customers are Myanmar refugees.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Denial of Charges

The Appellant contends that it denies that neither the owner's wife nor her cousin, who are the store's cashiers, have ever sold ineligible items with SNAP benefits. To the best of its knowledge, the Appellant could not find any abuses of accepting SNAP benefits for ineligible items.

The Appellant bears the burden of demonstrating through a preponderance of the evidence that the violations as charged in fact did not occur and that the sanction imposed by the Retailer Operations Division should therefore be reversed. The Appellant offers statements of denial indicating that the firm did not participate in said violations; such does not constitute compelling evidence that the firm accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for eligible foods only. It is acknowledged that demonstrating that violations did *not* occur does indeed place a difficult burden upon the Appellant; however, that the burden is considerable does not render invalid the evidence of SNAP violations existing in the record or the actions taken by the Retailer Operations Division on the basis of that evidence.

The charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal Department of Agriculture investigation; all transactions cited were conducted under the direct supervision of a Department investigator. All such transactions are fully documented and a review of this documentation has yielded no indication of substantial error or discrepancy in the reported findings; the investigative record is specific and thorough with regard to the dates and other specifics of the violations and in all other critically pertinent detail. Additionally, investigative results are routinely supported by documentation that confirms items purchased at a retail firm in the course of an investigation are donated to and signed for by a charitable organization following the transactions. Such documentation includes the signature and title of the official of the charitable organization accepting the donated item, the name and address of the

organization, the date the donation was made and the official's certification that the items described were in fact received. The record also includes photographs of the items purchased at the store during the investigation, along with the dated receipts clearly showing that they were obtained at the Appellant store. The purchase costs of each of the transactions involved in the investigation are documented on SNAP terminal receipts obtained during each transaction. Moreover, transaction data generated by each investigative purchase at the Appellant's firm is stored in agency data systems.

Accordingly, the Appellant offers no compelling information or supporting documentation which would constitute evidence that any relevant detail is incorrect in any substantial respect. As such, the Appellant's denial of the charges exerts little force in the context of the considerable information and documentation presented by the Retailer Operations Division, as referenced above, which indicate that the merchandise as described was in fact obtained at the Appellant firm on the dates noted, that the manner in which it was obtained is accurately described and that the clerks in attendance throughout did in fact conduct the transactions described.

SNAP Violations

The Appellant contends that during the past year, the store was operated predominantly by the owner's wife with the assistance from his daughter and various friends and relatives. From May 2018 to August 2018, the owner's wife's pregnancy prevented her from any commitment to the store and the operation was attended by various friends and relatives.

The Appellant's contentions cannot be accepted as a valid basis for dismissing any of the charges, or for mitigating the impact of those charges. As owner of the store, the Appellant is liable for all violative transactions that occur at Htoo Family Food Market. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to handle store business (i.e., regardless of whether a store owner, store manager, store clerk, friend, family member, etc. was involved in the violative transactions), ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

Prior to becoming authorized to participate in the SNAP on September 28, 2017, the Appellant completed and submitted a SNAP Application for Retail Stores. The SNAP Application contained a section indicating that the person(s) signing the Application understood and agreed to ensure that store employees follow the SNAP rules and regulations and that the person(s) accepts responsibility for any SNAP violations that may occur at the store that were committed by any of the store's employees---paid, unpaid, new, temporary, full-time, part-time, etc. The SNAP Application also included a section that contained a statement which acknowledged that the person(s) signing the Application was aware that violations of program rules could result in fines, legal sanctions, withdrawal, or disqualification of the store. In addition, the Appellant was provided with program training and reference materials which reinforced the statements included in the SNAP Application.

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 because of the wrongful conduct of an owner, manager, or someone acting on their behalf. In this case, the individuals

who committed the SNAP violations were not specifically identified during the investigation. A six month disqualification is the appropriate sanction for violations which result from employees not being fully aware of the SNAP rules, the carelessness of employees, or due to inadequate supervision by the store owner. As 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, “Disqualify the firm for six months if ... the evidence shows that personnel of the firm have committed violations ... due to the carelessness or poor supervision by the firm’s ownership or management”. The Appellant’s implied contention that during the past year the subject firm was predominantly operated by the owner’s wife with the assistance from his daughter and various friends and relatives cannot be accepted as a valid basis for diminishing the penalty. 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 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA.

Corrective Action

The Appellant contends that it will make sure that SNAP violations do not occur again at the store.

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 the authority of this review to consider what subsequent remedial actions may have been taken so that the store may begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in the SNAP regulations or internal agency policy directives for waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of after-the-fact corrective action implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, the Appellant’s contention that it has taken or will take corrective actions, though they would have been valuable towards preventing future program violations, does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

Financial Hardship

The Appellant contends that it in its first year of operation, SNAP sales resulted in approximately 50% of its business sales with its customers being predominantly Myanmar refugees. A six month SNAP disqualification will impose a financial hardship on the Appellant and may force the store to close.

However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations or internal agency policy directives for 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 allow store ownership from being excused 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, the Appellant's contention that the firm may 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 imposed.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The Appellant contends that it provides traditional foods for the Myanmar refugee community in the surrounding area. The majority of the store's customers are Myanmar refugees.

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a hardship civil money penalty (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." [Emphasis added]. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(7)(E).**

Based on the evidence, the disqualification of Htoo Family Food Market would not cause a hardship to SNAP recipients in the area, as opposed to a mere inconvenience; therefore, the Retailer Operations Division's 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 therefore established that the violations as described in the letter of charges did in fact occur at Htoo Family Food Market 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 nonfood 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 Htoo Family Food Market, the Appellant firm, is appropriate and the action is sustained.

In accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the regulations there under, the six month period of disqualification shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. A new application for participation may be submitted by the firm ten (10) days prior to the expiration of this six month period.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act (7 U.S.C. 2023) and to Section 279.7 of the Regulations (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, FNS is 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.

LORIE L. CONNEEN
Administrative Review Officer

March 4, 2019