

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

Rabesa Mexican Products Corp,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0218686

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is insufficient evidence to support the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to withdraw the authorization of Rabesa Mexican Products Corp. (“Appellant”) to participate as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.1(l)(1)(iii), in its administration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) when it withdrew Appellant’s authorization to participate as a retailer in SNAP in a letter dated May 30, 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 May 30, 2019, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant that its authorization to participate as a retailer in SNAP would be withdrawn due to the firm’s failure to meet minimum SNAP eligibility requirements. This withdrawal decision was based on observations during a store visit on May 4, 2019 as well as information provided on the firm’s reauthorization application.

The Retailer Operations Division determined that the firm did not meet eligibility Criterion A or Criterion B under 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1) of the SNAP regulations. The withdrawal letter stated Appellant failed to meet the requirements of Criterion A because it did not offer for sale on a continuous basis a variety of foods in the dairy products category and the meats, poultry or fish category. Also, Appellant failed to meet the requirements of Criterion B because staple food sales did not comprise more than 50 percent of its gross retail sales.

As the firm failed to meet either eligibility criterion for approval, Appellant was informed that the firm could not submit a new application to participate in SNAP for a period of six months as provided in 7 CFR § 278.1(k)(2). This determination letter also stated that the Retailer Operations Division considered Appellant's eligibility under the need for access provision at Section 278.1(b)(6) of the SNAP regulations. However, the letter stated Appellant did not qualify for SNAP authorization under this provision.

On May 31, 2019, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division determination and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal request was granted and implementation of the withdrawal has been held in abeyance 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 insufficient 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. § 2018), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.1(l)(1) establishes the authority upon which the authorization of any firm to participate in SNAP may be withdrawn if it fails to meet established eligibility requirements.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(i) relays specific program requirements for retail food store participation, which reads, in part:

An establishment . . . shall . . . effectuate the purposes of the program if it . . . meets one of the following criteria: Offer for sale, on a continuous basis, a variety of qualifying foods in each of the four categories of staple foods . . . including perishable foods in at least three of the categories (Criterion A); or have more than 50 percent of the total gross retail sales of the establishment . . . in staple foods (Criterion B).

7 CFR § 271.2 defines staple food, in part, as:

Those food items intended for home preparation and consumption in each of the following food categories: meat, poultry, or fish; bread or cereals; vegetables or fruits; and dairy products.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(A) of the SNAP regulations as currently implemented define continuous basis as offering for sale no fewer than three different varieties of food items in each of the four staple food categories with a minimum depth of stock of three stocking units for each qualifying staple variety on any given day of operation.

7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(ii)(C) of the SNAP regulations define “variety”, in part, as:

Different types of foods within each staple food category. For example: Apples, cabbage, tomatoes, bananas, pumpkins, broccoli, and grapes in the vegetables or fruits category; or cow milk, almond milk, soy yogurt, soft cheese, butter, sour cream, and cow milk yogurt in the dairy products category; or rice, bagels, pitas, bread, pasta, oatmeal, and whole wheat flour in the bread or cereals category; or chicken, beans, nuts, beef, pork, eggs, and tuna in the meat, poultry, or fish category. Variety of foods is not to be interpreted as different brands, nutrient values (e.g., low sodium and lite), flavorings (e.g., vanilla and chocolate), packaging types or styles (e.g., canned and frozen) or package sizes of the same or similar foods. Similar food items such as, but not limited to, tomatoes and tomato juice, different types of rice, whole milk and skim milk, ground beef and beefsteak, or different types of apples (e.g., Empire, Jonagold, and McIntosh), shall count as depth of stock but shall not each be counted as more than one staple food variety for the purpose of determining the number of varieties in any staple food category. Accessory foods shall not be counted as staple foods for purposes of determining eligibility to participate in SNAP as a retail food store.

7 CFR § 278.1(l)(1) reads, in part:

FNS shall withdraw the authorization of any firm authorized to participate in the program for any of the following reasons [t]he firm fails to meet the requirements for eligibility under Criterion A or B, as specified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section . . . for the time period specified in paragraph (k)(2) of this section.

7 CFR § 278.1(k) reads, in part:

FNS shall deny the application of any firm if it determines that [t]he firm has failed to meet the eligibility requirements for authorization under Criterion A or Criterion B, as specified in paragraph (b)(1)(i) of this section . . . for a minimum period of six months from the effective date of the denial.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

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

- Appellant has a variety of food in sufficient quantities for SNAP authorization on a continuous basis. Appellant provided three invoices.
- Appellant provided a list of the items it carries in each of the staple food categories and 18 store pictures.

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

An evaluation of the percentages of staple food sales reported on Appellant's retailer application, as well as the photographs and store inventory provided from the store visit, indicate that Appellant did not receive more than 50 percent of its projected annual sales from the sale of staple foods. Accordingly, the Retailer Operations Division correctly determined Appellant was not eligible for authorization under Criterion B.

There is insufficient evidence in the Retailer Operations Division case file to determine whether Appellant failed to meet Criterion A. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence to support the determination of the Retailer Operations Division to withdraw the authorization of Appellant. Accordingly, it is unnecessary to address Appellant's remaining contentions in this matter. However, in reaching a decision, full attention and consideration have been given to all contentions presented.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to withdraw the authorization of Rabesa Mexican Products Corp. to participate as a retailer in SNAP is reversed. Nothing in this decision restricts the Retailer Operations Division from withdrawing the authorization of Appellant in the future if Appellant fails to meet the requirements for authorization.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

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

July 22, 2019