

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

Liberty Food Mart,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0195446

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) that the record supports that Liberty Food Mart (Appellant) committed violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). There is sufficient evidence to sustain a six month disqualification from the SNAP as imposed by the Retailer Operations Division (Retailer Operations).

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether Retailer Operations took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1), 7 CFR § 278.6(a), and 7 CFR § 278.6(e) in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a six month period of disqualification against Appellant.

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 USDA conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of July 18, 2017 through August 9, 2017. The investigative report documented that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on multiple separate occasions that warrant a six month disqualification period. The items sold are best described in regulatory terms as common nonfood items.

As a result of evidence compiled during this investigation, by letter dated January 16, 2018, Retailer Operations charged the owners with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.2(a). Misuse of SNAP benefits was noted in Exhibits A, D and E that warrants a disqualification as a SNAP retail food store for a period of six months. The letter also states that under certain conditions FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification.

The owners replied to the Charge letter in writing on January 30, 2018. Retailer Operations informed the owners by Determination letter dated February 8, 2018, that the violations cited in the Charge letter occurred at the firm and that a six month period of disqualification was warranted. The letter also stated that eligibility for a hardship CMP was not applicable as there are other authorized retail food stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

Appellant appealed Retailer Operations' determination by letter dated February 12, 2018, and requested administrative review. The appeal was granted by letter dated February 26, 2018.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In an appeal of an adverse action, the Appellant 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 argument 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 § 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 § 278.2(a) states: "Coupons may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households or the households' authorized representative, and only in exchange for eligible food."

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) states 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."

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...”

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) provides for civil money penalty assessments in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause “hardship” to SNAP benefit households because of the unavailability of a comparable participating food store in the area to meet their shopping needs. It states: “FNS may impose a civil money penalty as a sanction in lieu of disqualification when ... the firm’s disqualification would cause hardship to SNAP benefit 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

A report of the investigation was provided to the Appellant as Exhibits with the Charge letter. The investigative report documents that SNAP violations were recorded during three store visits that warrant a six month disqualification. The violations involved the sale of nonfood items for SNAP benefits in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a).

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

Consideration of all contentions was made whether recapitulated here or not.

- I do not agree with the decision to discontinue the program.
- Only one of three employees failed to comply with the program rules and sold ineligible items.
- The individual was trained but decided to act on their own. This is not evidence of neglation [sic] on our part nor is this intentional, but what has happened was a wrong done by a single individual.
- We have a long history of compliance and wouldn’t allow or condone any selling that was not permitted by the USDA.
- This proves that we are not in the wrong and that a second review should be considered.
- During the time period in question we were in California. We were not aware that any employee sold ineligible items until we received your correspondence approximately six months after the transactions were completed.
- None of the employees recall the transactions and the video was not able to be retrieved.
- None of our employees have accepted responsibility for what occurred, we do accept responsibility for complying and have retrained all our employees.
- We have instructed them that they are subject to discipline including termination should they not fully comply with SNAP regulations.
- We have never violated in the past.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the determination made by Retailer Operations. The review is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of Retailer Operations' determination at the time such action was taken. Upon review, the evidence supports that Appellant established a record of selling nonfood items as defined by Section 271.2 of the regulations on multiple occasions. Exhibits A, D and E, furnished with the Charge letter warrant a disqualification period of six months. 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) specifies that FNS shall "disqualify the firm 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 nonfood items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management." Three violations are considered evidence of carelessness. Therefore, the violations in this case are not too limited to warrant a disqualification.

Regardless of who the store owner utilizes to handle store business, the owner(s) is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions. The regulations establish that an authorized food store may be disqualified from participating in SNAP 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. A record of participation in the SNAP with no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of or mitigate the current charges of violations. 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.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

The record supports that there are other authorized stores within a nearby radius of Appellant that stock a variety of comparable staple foods at comparable prices. The evidence does not support that it will cause hardship for SNAP recipients if Appellant is disqualified. Therefore, Retailer Operations rendered a finding that it was not appropriate to impose a CMP in lieu of a six month period of disqualification.

CONCLUSION

Based on a review of the evidence, the record supports that the program violations charged did occur at Appellant. The USDA investigative record is specific, thorough, and fully documented with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific ineligible merchandise sold in exchange for SNAP benefits, and in other critically pertinent detail. The record documents that Retailer Operations considered Appellant's eligibility for a hardship CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) and properly denied it. Therefore, the six month disqualification of Appellant from participation as an authorized retail food store in the SNAP is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

This penalty shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this decision. A new application for participation in the SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six month period of disqualification. Please contact the Retailer Center at 877-823-4369 with any questions regarding the SNAP application process.

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (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. 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 owners reside or are engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction.

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.

M. Viens
Administrative Review Officer

April 6, 2018