

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

Magic Korner,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0220289

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is sufficient evidence to support the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance (“ROC”) to impose a permanent disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) against Magic Korner (“Appellant”).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the ROC took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on December 12, 2019.

AUTHORITY

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1, “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

In a letter dated September 10, 2019, the ROC charged Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. This charge was based on a series of SNAP transaction patterns that “establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable activity for your type of firm.” This letter of charges states: “As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for trafficking is permanent disqualification.” The letter also states that “. . . under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) . . . in lieu of a permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

Appellant replied to the ROC's charges in writing. The record reflects that the ROC received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination. The ROC determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the ROC concluded that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The ROC issued a determination letter dated December 12, 2019. This letter informed Appellant that it 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. The letter also states the ROC considered Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. The ROC determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because Appellant had not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

On December 24, 2019, Appellant appealed the ROC's determination and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

In an appeal of an adverse action, Appellant bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. That means Appellant has the burden of providing relevant evidence that 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 untrue.

CONTROLLING LAW

The controlling law in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2021), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e)(1)(i) 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 engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

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, inconsistent redemption data, evidence obtained through a transaction report under an **electronic benefit transfer system** (Emphasis added.)

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, in part:

Any firm considered for disqualification ... under paragraph (a) of this section... shall have full opportunity to submit to FNS information, explanation, or evidence concerning any instances of noncompliance before FNS makes a final administrative determination. The FNS regional office shall send the firm a letter of charges before making such determination. The letter shall specify the violations or actions which FNS believes constitute a basis for disqualification The letter shall inform the firm that it may respond either orally or in writing to the charges contained in the letter within 10 days of receiving the letter . . .

7 CFR § 278.6(c) reads, in part:

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) of this section, 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, regardless of whether a request for review is filed in accordance with part 279 of this chapter.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) reads, in part:

FNS shall [d]isqualify a firm permanently if . . . personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

Trafficking is defined in 7 CFR § 271.2, 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”

Also at 7 CFR § 271.2, eligible food is defined as:

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(b)(2)(ii) states, in part:

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 ... 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).

7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2)(iii) states:

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.

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

The charges under review were based on an analysis of SNAP Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) transaction data during the period from February 2019 through July 2019. This analysis identified the following patterns of SNAP transaction activity that indicate trafficking:

- An inordinate number of transactions in repeated dollar values;
- Consecutive transactions made too rapidly to be credible;
- Multiple transactions made from the same accounts in unusually short time frames;
- Transactions that depleted the majority or all of a recipient's monthly SNAP benefits made in unusually short timeframes; and,
- Unusually large transactions.

The attachments enclosed with the charge letter specify the questionable and unusual SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at Appellant during the review period.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

Appellant's responses regarding this matter are essentially as follows:

- Appellant denies the allegations.
- There is no evidence of trafficking. Unusual transaction patterns cannot establish a violation of the SNAP regulations that prohibit trafficking.
- The charge letter is unconstitutionally vague and violates procedural and due process rights.
- Appellant is located in an area with many SNAP participants.
- Appellant's customers do not have access to transportation.
- There are no large grocery stores located near Appellant.
- Appellant does not have to provide evidence showing its transactions were for eligible food items.
- The determination is arbitrary and capricious.

These explanations may represent only a brief summary of Appellant's contentions. However, in reaching a decision, full consideration has been given to all contentions presented, including any others that have not been specifically listed here.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Appellant denies the allegations, and states it does not have to provide evidence showing its transactions were for eligible food items. Regarding Appellant's denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the ROC establishes trafficking occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that it did not engage in trafficking. If this is not demonstrated, the case will be sustained. Without supporting evidence and rationale, assertions that the firm has not violated program rules do not constitute valid grounds for overturning the determination.

Store Characteristics

In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROC considered information obtained during a August 15, 2019 store visit conducted by a USDA contractor to observe Appellant's operation, stock, and facilities. This store visit information was used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the firm's irregular SNAP transaction patterns. The store visit report documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- Store size is approximately 2,000 square feet with no area of food storage outside of public view;
- Available inventory of SNAP-eligible food items showed stock composed predominantly of inexpensive items, which is typical of a convenience store;
- Only one cash register and one electronic SNAP terminal device;
- No shopping carts and three hand baskets;
- Scanner and no conveyor belts;
- No evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers; and,
- No meat or seafood specials or bundles.

In addition, the store's checkout counter space area was extremely small allowing very little surface area to place large purchases and making it impractical to process more than one customer at a time.

There was no indication that SNAP households were inclined to visit the store regularly to purchase large quantities of grocery items. The available food was primarily of a low-dollar value and there was no hint that the firm regularly sold items in bulk. Given the available inventory, there was no sign that Appellant would be likely to have SNAP redemption patterns that differed significantly from those of similarly-sized competitors.

Same-Dollar Values Transactions

Attachment 1 to the charge letter documents large transactions made for repeated dollar values. These large transactions are also included in Attachment 4. There is insufficient evidence to support that the same-dollar transactions in this case constitute a pattern of trafficking that is different from the pattern included Attachment 4.

Rapid Transactions

Attachment 2 to the charge letter documents back-to-back transactions made in rapid order at the same terminal. There are 408 sets of transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) included in this document.

These transactions were conducted with implausible speed. Frequent and large transactions conducted quickly to purchase eligible foods at Appellant are highly unlikely given Appellant's low-dollar inventory and limited counter space. The firm does not maintain the logistical wherewithal required to rapidly process these transactions. The steps required to process a legitimate SNAP purchase include the following:

- 1) Waiting for the customer to load the items onto the counter space near the cash register. (Due to the large dollar amounts of the transactions and considering how many low-priced items it would take to reach the amounts listed in this attachment, it is unclear how customers, without the use of shopping carts or baskets, were able transport their items to the register and then out the door to waiting transportation);
- 2) Separating eligible items from ineligible items;
- 3) Manually entering the cost of each item;
- 4) If applicable, weighing any individual items sold by weight, such as fresh meat or fruits and vegetables;
- 5) Inputting manufacturers cents-off coupons, if applicable;
- 6) Bagging the items for carry out;
- 7) Handing the customer bagged items to make room for more food items on the counter;
- 8) Informing the customer of the totals (one for eligible foods and one for non-eligible items, if applicable);
- 9) Pressing the "SNAP transaction key" on the point-of-sale device;
- 10) Swiping the card;
- 11) Entering of the required PIN by the customer;
- 12) Entering the purchase amount by the cashier;
- 13) Confirming that the customer has a sufficient benefit balance;
- 14) Processing and approval of the transaction by the system;
- 15) Printing out cash register and EBT receipts;
- 16) Accepting an alternate form of payment for nonfood items and possibly handling cash and change; and,
- 17) Removing products from the checkout area so the next customer in line can begin another transaction.

While such transactions may well be conducted in succession, performing these actions on large transactions cannot be done rapidly. The amount of time required is generally proportional to the dollar amount of the transaction; typically, the larger the dollar amount transacted the longer the time period between transactions. Limited counter space and a lack of shopping carts add additional time to transactions. Appellant processed very large orders considerably faster than supermarkets typically process them, yet it has only one small checkout counter, no optical

scanner, and none of the logistical tools (such as conveyor belts, rotating bagging platforms or order separators) routinely used in rapid throughput operations.

As described above, the rapid processing of large transactions of eligible food items at Appellant is improbable. Yet, the questionable transaction data cited in Attachment 2 reveals consecutive transactions involving large-dollar amounts 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). It is highly unlikely that the rapid, multiple, large transactions described above involve solely the sale of eligible foods.

Repeat Transactions by the Same Household

Attachment 3 to the charge letter documents the same household conducting back-to-back transactions in unusually short time frames. Violating stores may conduct multiple transactions from the same household account 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) to avoid the detection of single, high-dollar trafficking transactions. There are 2397 repeat transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) included in this document.

Appellant contends Appellant is located in an area with many SNAP participants who do not have access to transportation. The record reflects that customers conducting rapid, repetitive, and large transactions at Appellant frequently spent SNAP benefits at better-stocked and more competitively-priced grocery stores, sometimes on or about the same day they shopped at Appellant.

Appellant argues there are no large grocery stores located near Appellant. The Case Analysis Document identifies much larger stores with more reasonable prices located within one mile of Appellant. There is no basis for unusually high customer attraction to Appellant, there being no great price advantage, profusion of ethnic goods, or special or custom services rendered. Oddly, some SNAP households spent considerably less at the larger stores than at Appellant.

The following examples from the ROC's Case Analysis Document show households shopped at better stocked firms on or about the same day as conducting large transactions at Appellant:

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)

While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a convenience store in a short period of time, the examples in Attachment 3 indicate a series of purchases that total to large amounts. SNAP benefits are intended to supplement the food budget for households whose net income is near or below the Federal Poverty Level. It is difficult to believe customers who must rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet prefer to pay higher prices and spend considerable amounts of their benefits at a convenience store. Spending sizable portions of one's SNAP benefit allotment in a convenience store - when there are larger stores at which one also shops that carry more variety of foods at a lower cost - is unreasonable customer behavior. Moreover, households listed in this attachment conducted this strange shopping pattern of making substantial purchases at Appellant multiple times during the review period. Given the

common practice of violating retailers breaking up large, suspicious transactions into multiple, smaller transactions to avoid detection, a firm's explanation and evidence for why these transactions are occurring 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in a convenience store should be both rational and compelling. Appellant's explanation is neither.

SNAP Benefit Depletions

Attachment 4 to the charge letter documents the same household exhausting all or nearly all its benefits in rapid order. There are 103 transactions 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) included in this document.

In some cases, SNAP customers depleted SNAP account balances to within pennies of a zero balance and/or depleted balances during the first week of the month. It is highly implausible that customers would desire, or be able, to regularly conduct large transactions that deplete balances to within pennies of a zero balance. The likelihood that these transactions were the result of the legitimate sale of only eligible foods only is extremely small.

A government report on SNAP shopping patterns¹ indicates that after the first day of benefit issuance, on average, 80 percent of a household's allotment remains unspent. Even after seven days, 40 percent of benefits still remain unspent. It typically takes 14 days to deplete 80 percent of one's benefits, and 21 days to deplete 90 percent. This report also revealed that households most often redeemed their benefits at supermarkets and supercenters, with only four percent of all households never shopping in a supermarket.

It is extremely doubtful that a SNAP household making a legitimate purchase would choose to spend a large portion of its monthly allotment at a convenience store with likely higher prices and substantially less inventory than what would be found at a supermarket or superstore. Although many SNAP households do shop early in the month as opposed to later in the month, most households do not spend all or a majority of their monthly benefits in only a few transactions or a single day. Depleting a large portion of one's SNAP balance early in the benefit month, leaving little to purchase food for the remainder of the month, is inconsistent with the normal shopping behavior of SNAP households.

Large Transactions

The food stock and facilities of Appellant as reported in the store visit documentation do not appear sufficient to provide for all of one's food needs. People generally do not spend large sums at such stores. They usually stop at convenience stores to pick up a few staple food items, such as bread, milk, or a can or two of food that they may consider are not worth a trip to the supermarket to purchase. It is rare for a convenience store such as Appellant's to have purchases like those included in Attachment 5 to the charge letter. This attachment cites 2256 EBT transactions during the six-month period of investigation 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

¹U.S. Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service, Office of Research and Analysis, *Benefit Redemption Patterns in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program*, by Laura Castner and Juliette Henke. Project officer: Anita Singh, Alexandria, VA: February 2011.

These transactions significantly exceed the county's average SNAP transaction, which was \$6.21 for this type of store during the six months of the review period.

5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). Appellant's average transaction is significantly higher than the county's average transaction. As previously stated, Appellant has a limited food stock typical of a convenience store and does not have any features that would induce people to spend substantially more than the typical convenience store purchase amount.

Additionally, the Case Analysis Document contains a comparison of Appellant's redemption activity during the analysis period to seven SNAP-authorized convenience stores located nearby. Appellant's SNAP redemptions during the analysis period ranged from 5 to 19 times that of the nearby comparable firms.

Based on the store layout, infrastructure, and available inventory, it is not credible that the Appellant would so frequently conduct large transactions closely resembling those typically found at a supermarket or superstore. It is not plausible that the firm's customers would regularly carry very large amounts of merchandise around the store without the benefit of shopping carts, especially since larger, better-stocked stores are readily available and in the vicinity of the Appellant firm. Appellant is not set up to process high-dollar transactions, as indicated by its lack of equipment to facilitate large transactions and limited counter space. There are no legitimate bases for SNAP customers' unusual attraction to the firm such as a superior selection of staple foods, price advantages, package specials, bulk or promotional items, an extensive variety of otherwise unavailable ethnic food items, or special services rendered. Appellant failed to provide convincing evidence to establish the legitimacy of these excessively large transactions, such as itemized cash register receipts. Based on all of these factors discussed in this section, the large volume of transactions for high-dollar amounts is unlikely to indicate a pattern of legitimate food purchases.

Evidence of Trafficking

Appellant argues there is no evidence or proof of trafficking, and that unusual transaction patterns cannot establish a violation of the SNAP regulations that prohibit trafficking. As previously stated, 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, inconsistent redemption data, **evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system** . . . (Emphasis added.)

FNS employs a computerized fraud detection tool to identify EBT transactions that form patterns having characteristics indicative of trafficking. This tool does not determine that trafficking has occurred. The ROC must still analyze the transaction patterns, along with other information such as store visit observations, customer shopping patterns, and comparative data from nearby stores. Only then does the ROC conclude whether questionable transactions were, more likely than not, the result of trafficking. Transactions with these patterns sometimes have valid explanations that

support the idea they were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items, which is why opportunities are given to charged retailers to explain the questionable transactions cited. In this case, based on the suspicious patterns displayed and the other supporting evidence in the file - and in the absence of any reasonable explanations for such transaction patterns - the preponderance of the evidence supports that the “unusual, irregular, and inexplicable” transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges are the result of trafficking.

Constitutionality

Appellant contends that both the charge letter does not meet the requirements of the United States Constitution. In reference to these contentions, no findings or conclusions are rendered. The administrative review process does not include an assessment of the constitutionality of the laws, regulations and policies under which the agency imposed adverse actions, but rather whether the agency actions undertaken were proper pursuant to those laws, regulations and policies and sustainable by a preponderance of evidence. As such, this office does not have the authority to assess whether the United States Congress, in its enactment of legislation, has conformed to Constitutional mandates.

No Denial of Due Process

Appellant contends that it has been denied due process. In this regard, the permanent disqualification of Appellant by the ROC is neither a criminal nor a civil action, but rather an administrative action imposed against the firm as a result of trafficking violations. Section 278.6(b)(1) of the SNAP regulations states that upon charging a firm with SNAP violations, the letter informing the firm of the charges “shall inform the firm that it may respond either orally or in writing to the charges contained in the letter within 10 days of receiving the letter.”

FNS’s due process procedures include two levels of review. First, the retailer is afforded an opportunity to reply to the charges leveled by the ROC. The regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(c) state:

in the case of a firm subject to permanent disqualification under paragraph (e)(1) of this section . . . 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, regardless of whether a request for review is filed in accordance with part 279 of this chapter.

After the determination letter is issued, the second level of due process involves an administrative review. Appellant availed itself of this option and in the process of which Appellant was granted 21 days to provide additional information in support of the request for review. Appellant took advantage of this opportunity and provided additional information.

The purpose of the administrative review process is to ensure that a firm aggrieved by FNS’s adverse actions has the opportunity for their position to be fairly considered by an impartial reviewing authority prior to that adverse action becoming final. Through the administrative review process, Appellant has been duly given, and has taken, the opportunity to present any

evidence and information it deemed as pertinent in support of its position that the ROC's adverse action should be reversed. All evidence and information that Appellant presented to the ROC, as well as any such information submitted subsequently, have now been considered in this administrative review prior to rendering the final agency decision. The firm provided no additional records during the administrative review that would establish that the suspicious transactions were legitimate purchases. The record does not indicate any departure from established procedures with regard to Appellant's right to a fair and thorough review. Appellant has exercised its opportunity to reply to the charge letter and its administrative review rights. By doing so, it has availed itself of the full complement of the agency's statutory obligations with regard to due process.

Summary

The ROC determined that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The charges of violations were based on the ROC's assessment that substantial evidence exists that the questionable transactions occurring during the review period displayed patterns inconsistent with legitimate sales of eligible food to SNAP participants. The evidence the ROC considered in support of its determination included:

- The irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to similar stores;
- Observations made during an store visit by a USDA contractor, including the inadequacy of the firm's staple food stock to support such large transactions;
- The availability and characteristics of other SNAP-authorized stores located close to Appellant; and,
- Shopping behaviors of Appellant's customers.

The transaction data and overall firm record demonstrate the patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this firm is likely the result of trafficking.

Appellant argues that the penalty is arbitrary and capricious, but Appellant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. Appellant provided inadequate explanations for the suspicious transactions and insufficient evidence to legitimize its transaction data. It has not convincingly rebutted the ROC's determination that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. 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 must disqualify the firm permanently.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

For a firm to have the opportunity to be considered for a civil money penalty (CMP), it must request that FNS consider a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification and submit supporting documentation within ten days of receipt of the charge letter. Appellant was advised of these provisions in the charge letter of September 10, 2019. The regulations specify that such supporting documentation must demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective SNAP compliance policy and training program prior to the occurrence of violations. A review of the administrative record indicates Appellant did not, at any time, request a CMP.

Appellant also did not submit any documentation to support its eligibility for this alternative sanction, before or after the deadline.

In the absence of a request for a CMP and any supporting documentation, a CMP was not assessed by the ROC. According to the requirements stated in 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1), § 278.6(b)(2)(ii and iii), and § 278.6(i), Appellant is not eligible for a CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. The determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to deny Appellant a civil money penalty is sustained.

CONCLUSION

The record has yielded no indication of error in the finding by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance that Appellant trafficked in SNAP benefits. A review of the evidence supports that it is more likely true than not true that program violations occurred as charged. Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against Magic Korner from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. If Appellant desires a judicial review, the complaint must be filed in the U.S. District Court for the district in which Appellant's owner resides, is engaged in business, or in any court of record of the State having competent jurisdiction. This complaint, naming the United States as the defendant, 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.

RICH PROULX
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

March 9, 2020