

**U.S. Department of Agriculture
Food and Nutrition Service
Administrative Review Branch
Alexandria, VA 22302**

R & Yaar Food Mart,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0195333

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 Retailer Operations Division to impose a one-year disqualification against R & Yaar Food Mart (“Appellant”) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(5) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a one-year period of disqualification against Appellant on October 2, 2017.

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

USDA conducted an investigation of Appellant's compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of December 26, 2016 through July 20, 2017. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on six separate occasions. These items sold during the impermissible transactions are best described in regulatory terms as "common ineligible nonfood items" and a major ineligible item. The investigation revealed that one unidentified male clerk and five unidentified female clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions. As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated September 26, 2017, that the firm was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.2(a). The letter states, in part, that the violations ". . . warrant a disqualification period of six months (Section 278.6(e)(5)). Under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification (Section 278.6(f)(1))."

Appellant replied to the Retailer Operations Division's charges orally. The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

The Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated October 2, 2017 that the firm was being disqualified for one year from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This determination letter also stated that Appellant's eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that ". . . you are not eligible for the CMP because there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices."

On October 5, 2017, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's decision to impose a one-year disqualification, and requested an administrative review of the action. The appeal was granted and implementation of the sanction has been on hold pending completion of this review.

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)(5 and 6) establish the authority upon which a one-year disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern.

Section 278.6(e)(5 and 6) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, when a firm is to be disqualified for one year:

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.(6) Double the appropriate period of disqualification prescribed in paragraphs (e)(2) through (5) of this section as warranted by the evidence of violations if the same firm has once before been assigned a sanction.

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

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

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

- The mistake was made by a new employee;
- Appellant started an employee training program;
- Appellant posted a notice about SNAP-eligible items;
- Appellant assured the problems would not reoccur; and,
- Appellant may close if disqualified. Appellant provided six pages of financial statements.

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 contends it posted a notice about SNAP-eligible items and that the mistake was made by a new employee. When ownership signed the FNS application to become a SNAP authorized retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that Appellant 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 document include selling ineligible non-food items. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may use to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

This review is limited to considering the circumstances at the time the Retailer Operations Division’s decision was made. It is not within this review’s scope to consider actions that Appellant may have taken subsequent to this decision to begin to comply with program requirements. There is no provision in SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of corrective actions implemented subsequent to investigative findings of program violations. Therefore, Appellant’s staff training and assurance the problem would not reoccur, while positive steps, do not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

The investigation report shows that of the seven times that nonfood violations were attempted, store personnel permitted them six times. The Retailer Operations Division attributed violations to “carelessness, or poor supervision by the firm’s ownership or management,” pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations which provides for a disqualification of six months. This is consistent with Appellant’s contention that violations were committed in error. As the firm had been previously subjected to a six- month disqualification, pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(6) of the SNAP regulations this time period is doubled. Therefore, a one-year disqualification for the violations committed, the minimum, is the appropriate sanction in this case.

No Undue Hardship to Appellant

Appellant maintains that disqualification would pose an extreme hardship to the firm. Economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is disqualified from SNAP participation. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from such a penalty. To excuse Appellant from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship

would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Moreover, giving special consideration to the firm for economic hardship would forsake fairness and equity to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, and also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it will incur economic hardship due to an administrative penalty does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the imposed penalty.

Investigative Record

Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue did, in fact, occur as charged. As noted previously, the charges of violations are based on the findings of a formal USDA investigation. All transactions cited in the letter of charges were conducted under the supervision of a USDA investigator and all are fully documented. The investigative record is specific and accurate with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific ineligible merchandise sold in exchange for SNAP benefits, and in all other critically pertinent detail.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

A CMP as an optional penalty in lieu of a one-year disqualification was considered in this case. As Appellant has been previously been sanctioned, the Retailer Operations Division denied CMP in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(f). Therefore, a CMP in lieu of disqualification is not appropriate in this case.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a disqualification of one year against R & Yaar Food Mart from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

In accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act, and the regulations thereunder, this penalty shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. A new application for participation in SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the one-year disqualification period.

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 (FOIA), it may be necessary to release this document and related correspondence and records upon request. If such a request is received, FNS will seek to protect, to the extent provided by law, personal information that if released could constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

RICH PROULX
Administrative Review Officer

November 20, 2017