

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

**Former Store Owner,  
Manhab LLC,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Retailer Operations Division,**

**Respondent.**

**Case Number: C0226150**

**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 Transfer of Ownership Civil Money Penalty (TOCMP) of \$11,095.00 was properly levied by the Retailer Operations Division against the former owner of Manhab Corp. (Manhab or Appellant) for selling and/or transferring a store that was disqualified from participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

**ISSUE**

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2), (3), and (4) and 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2) and (g), in its administration of the SNAP when it assessed a TOCMP in the amount of \$11,095.00 against Appellant by letter dated January 9, 2020.

**CASE CHRONOLOGY**

The Retailer Operations Division disqualified Manhab from participation as a SNAP retailer on December 23, 2019, for a period of three years due to its disqualification from the Wisconsin WIC program. Both the November 25, 2019, charge letter and the disqualification letter dated December 10, 2019, stated that if the owner(s) sold or transferred the store after its disqualification, it would be subject to and liable for a TOCMP as provided by SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2)(3) and (4). The letters also noted that the amount of the TOCMP would be calculated based on regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(g).

The case record documents the former store owner of Manhab sold the firm to a new owner on or about December 25, 2019. These documents were provided to FNS when the new store owner applied for SNAP retailer re-authorization at this location. As a result, the Retailer Operations

Division, in a letter dated February 11, 2020, notified the former owner of Manhab that it had assessed a TOCMP in the amount of \$11,095.00 in accordance with the SNAP regulations.

By letter dated February 17, 2020, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment of the TOCMP and requested administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted and implementation of the sanction has been 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, 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 and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 USC § 2021 and § 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). In particular, 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2) and (g) establish the authority upon which a TOCMP may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

7 USC § 2021(e)(1) states:

In the event any retail food store or wholesale food concern that has been disqualified under subsection (a) of this section is sold or the ownership thereof is otherwise transferred to a purchaser or transferee, the person or persons who sell or otherwise transfer ownership of the retail food store or wholesale food concern shall be subjected to a civil penalty in an amount established by the Secretary through regulations to reflect that portion of the disqualification period that has not yet expired. If the retail food store or wholesale food concern has been disqualified permanently, the civil penalty shall be double the penalty for a ten-year disqualification period, as calculated under regulations issued by the Secretary. The disqualification period imposed under subsection (b) shall continue in effect as to the person or persons who sell or otherwise transfer ownership of the retail food store or wholesale food concern notwithstanding the imposition of a civil penalty under this subsection.

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2) reads, in part:

In the event any retail food store . . . which has been disqualified is sold or the ownership thereof is otherwise transferred . . . , the person or other legal entity who sells or otherwise transfers ownership . . . shall be subjected to and liable for a civil money penalty . . .

The following steps, based on the regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(g), are used to calculate the amount of a TOCMP:

Step 1: Determine the cumulative redemptions for the 12 month period immediately preceding the issuance of the Retailer Operations Division's Charge letter;  
Step 2: Determine the firm's average monthly redemptions (AMR) by dividing the amount derived in Step 1 by 12. (Round this amount to the nearest dollar);  
Step 3: Multiply the AMR (as determined in Step 2) by .10. (Round this amount to the nearest dollar);  
Step 4: Multiply the amount derived in Step 3 by 240. (The number 240 is used for permanent disqualifications in accordance with the Act and the regulations.) The result is the amount of the TOCMP.

### **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

In Appellant's February 17, 2020, administrative review request, and subsequent information postmarked February 19, 2020, Appellant stated the following summarized contentions, in relevant part:

- Appellant is experiencing a financial hardship.
- Appellant is unemployed.
- The business had to be sold.
- The former owner is unable to work due to the suspension of his driver's license for nonpayment of child support.

In support of its contentions, Appellant provided bank statements, child support statements, outstanding student loan documentation, and mortgage documentation.

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

### **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

The purpose of this review is limited to determining whether the Retailer Operations Division's decision to assess a TOCMP against Appellant was appropriate. The disqualification itself is not under review. Thus, any contentions pertaining to the original disqualification action by the Retailer Operations Division are not subject to review.

Documents in the case file show that Appellant sold and/or transferred the disqualified store to a new owner on or about December 25, 2019, and that this was the basis of the Retailer Operations Division's assessment of an \$11,095.00 TOCMP. The disqualification letter dated December 10, 2019, informed Appellant that "in the event that you sell or transfer ownership of your store subsequent to your disqualification, you will be subject to and liable for a CMP as provided by SNAP regulations Sections 278.6(f)(2), (3), and (4). The amount of this sale or transfer CMP will be calculated based on SNAP regulations at 278.6(g)." Manhab was disqualified for three year period from the SNAP effective July 22, 2019.

## **TOCMP Calculation**

A review of the case record documents that the Retailer Operations Division correctly calculated the amount of the TOCMP under 7 CFR § 278.6(g). That regulation states that the TOCMP is to be calculated on a formula which includes the SNAP redemption volume of the store during the 12 months prior to the firm being notified of the violations that led to the store's disqualification. Modifications to the TOCMP may occur only when there is an error in calculation or the amount exceeds the agency limit.

## **Summary**

In summary, the SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(2) authorize FNS to assess a TOCMP against the owner of a disqualified retail food store that has been sold or in which the ownership is otherwise transferred. The Retailer Operations Division determined that a legal sale of Manhab did occur on December 25, 2019, and this is supported by documents in the case record. Appellant's contentions do not give any legal grounds for vacating or reducing the TOCMP. Moreover, the regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(g) outline how to calculate the amount of the TOCMP, as described above, and do not provide any authority to waive or reduce the assessed TOCMP. As such, there is no discretion in the calculation of the TOCMP amount.

## **Appellant Hardship**

Appellant explains that it does not have the funds to pay the penalty in full and is experiencing a hardship. It is recognized that some degree of economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a transfer of ownership CMP is assessed. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for waiver or reduction of an administrative penalty assessment on the basis of possible economic hardship to the former store owner resulting from imposition of such penalty based on the sale or transfer of a permanently disqualified store.

To allow the former store owner to be excused from an assessed administrative penalty based on 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. Furthermore, giving special consideration to economic hardship to the former store owner would forsake fairness and equity, to those retailers who have been assessed transfer of ownership civil money penalties in the past. Therefore, the contention does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the CMP for \$11,095.00.

## **CONCLUSION**

This review finds that the evidence provided by the Retailer Operations Division as to a bona fide sale of a disqualified retail food store is sufficient to support its determination to assess a transfer of ownership CMP against Appellant in the amount of \$11,095.00.

## **RIGHTS AND REMEDIES**

Applicable rights to a judicial review of this decision are set forth in 7 USC § 2023 and 7 CFR § 279.7. 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 Appellant's owner resides or is 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.

Mary Kate Karagiorgos  
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

April 6, 2020