

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

Red Hot Ice Cream LLC,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0201965

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

It is the decision of the USDA that the record indicates that Red Hot Ice Cream LLC, (hereinafter Appellant) committed violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). There is sufficient evidence to support a finding that the permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in the program, as initially imposed by the Retailer Operations Division was appropriate.

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with 7 CFR § 278.6(c) and (e)(1) in its administration of the SNAP, when it assessed a permanent disqualification against Appellant by letter dated September 28, 2017.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and the 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

In a letter dated September 7, 2017, Retailer Operations Division charged the Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations, based on a series of irregular SNAP transaction patterns that occurred during the months of April 2017 through June 2017. The letter noted that the penalty for trafficking is permanent disqualification as provided by 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). The letter also noted that the Appellant could request a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a permanent disqualification within 10 days of receipt under the conditions specified in 7 CFR § 278.6(i).

In a September 12, 2017, telephone conversation with Retailer Operations Division, Appellant stated that it extended credit accounts to SNAP customers. In a letter dated September 12, 2017 and received on September 13, 2017, Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant that the acceptance of SNAP benefits as payment for items sold to a household on credit is a violation of SNAP regulation 278.2(f). A firm that commits such violations shall be disqualified from participation for a period of one year. The letter stated, please provide documentation to support that food items were purchased on credit as stated in the telephone conversation on September 12, 2017. This documentation must identify specific accounts along with corresponding dates and amounts. Appellant was also informed that the requested documentation and any information, explanation, or evidence regarding the charges outlined in the September 7, 2017 letter, must be provided within 10 calendar days of its receipt of this letter.

In correspondence dated September 22, 2017, Appellant replied to the charge letter and generally stated that all neighborhood customers spend money to buy food and groceries in their store. I offer home delivery and sometimes customer go with me and sometimes I go alone. I purchase whatever they need and as soon as I deliver the food they come to the store to pay. I never hold or use their card. Customers can't go to SAM'S club because they don't have cars and are mostly elderly and Spanish people. I did not keep receipts.

Retailer Operations Division issued a Determination letter dated September 28, 2017. The letter informed Appellant that it was permanently disqualified from the SNAP in accordance with Sections 278.6(c) and 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations. The letter also stated that Retailer Operations Division considered Appellant's eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. However, Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because it failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that Appellant had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the SNAP.

In a letter postmarked October 3, 2017, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's assessment and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

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 an 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 & Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021 and 278 of Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Part 278.6(a) (c) and (e)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store in the event that personnel of the firm have engaged in trafficking SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, *inter alia*, that “FNS may disqualify any authorized retail food store...from further participation in the program 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(c) reads, in part, “*Review of Evidence.* 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)...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...”

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1) reads, in part, “FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.” Trafficking is defined, in part, in 7 CFR § 271.2, as “the buying or selling of SNAP benefits for cash or consideration other than eligible food.”

7 CFR § 271.2 states in part that, “Eligible foods mean: Any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption.”

SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES

The charges on review were based on an analysis of SNAP electronic benefit transfer (EBT) transactions dated during the three month period of April 2017 through June 2017. This involved two patterns of EBT transaction characteristics indicative of trafficking:

1. Multiple transactions were made from individual benefit accounts in usually short time frames.
2. Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, it is more likely true than not true that the questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

The Appellant made the following summarized contentions in its response to the permanent disqualification letter issued by Retailer Operations Division, and its request for administrative review, in relevant part:

- All of my neighborhood customers spend money to buy their groceries in my store.
- I offer home delivery services where sometimes they will go with me and sometimes I go by myself and buy whatever they need. I buy the food and they come to the store and pay me.
- I never knew if I bought something for my customers from other places that I should keep the receipt.
- If I lose SNAP the store’s sales will go down and it will be difficult for me to survive.

The preceding may represent a brief summary of Appellant’s contentions in this matter however, in reaching a decision, full attention has been given to all contentions presented, including any not specifically recapitulated or referenced herein.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The FNS authorized the business as a convenience store on January 26, 2017. The file indicates that in reaching a disqualification determination, Retailer Operations Division considered information obtained during a January 6, 2017, store visit to the business conducted by a FNS contractor to observe the nature and scope of the firm's operation, stock and facilities. This information was then used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the EBT transactions at Appellant that formed patterns indicative of trafficking. The firm review summary documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- One cash register and One POS device with a small counter area partially obstructed by other smaller items available for sale.
- Estimated to be approximately 192 square feet.
- No shopping baskets or carts available for customers.
- No adding machines or optical scanners were available at checkout. No specialty registers present.
- Store does not operate through a night window or plastic barrier with food stock behind the barrier.
- No evidence of wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers.
- No food stored in an area outside of public view.
- Store is not primarily selling one food type such as meat, poultry, dairy, seafood, fruits, baked goods or vegetables.
- No expensive staple foods or accessory food items.
- Store stocks a significant amount of non-food items such as but not limited to paper products, housewares, tobacco products, and cleaning products.
- Store stocks minimal amounts of dairy products, bread and cereal products, fruit and vegetable products and meat, poultry and fish products. No fresh fruits or produce, no fresh meat or poultry. Most meats are canned, packaged or frozen.
- No kitchen/prepared food area with hot foods sold for onsite consumption.
- No hot food sold.
- No deli or prepared food section. Stock is not used in preparation of food.
- No meat or seafood specials or bundles or fruit/vegetable boxes sold.

The issue for consideration is whether Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. Each attachment furnished with the charge letter represents the questionable and unusual patterns of SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at the Appellant firm during the review period. As there is more than one pattern of irregular transactions, the case of trafficking becomes more convincing.

Attachment 1 of the Charge Letter - Multiple transactions were made from individual accounts in unusually short timeframes.

During the review period, this attachment lists 22 sets of 53 transactions totaling 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits. Multiple transactions conducted by the same household account within a 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) period is a method which violating stores use to avoid the detection of single high dollar transactions that cannot be supported by the retailer's inventory and structure. Appellant's explanation of credit or shopping at Sam's Club and delivering items to customers who visit the store to make payment does not adequately explain Appellant's SNAP transactions during the review period. As an example, it is not credible that:

- 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)
- 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Additionally, since attributing suspicious EBT transactions to credit may be an attempt to avoid a more serious sanction which is appropriate for a trafficking violation indicated by the available evidence, to refute charges of trafficking, as part of the retailer's reply to the charge letter, the retailer must provide adequate proof that credit accounts existed at the time the suspicious EBT transactions occurred. It is imperative that the retailer provide evidence to refute charges of trafficking so that the Retailer Operations Division can compare such proof with the transactions outlined in the Charge letter. If the retailer does not provide adequate proof, the determining office shall permanently disqualify the retailer for trafficking.

The determining office shall compare the credit information provided by the retailer against the transactions outlined in the letter of charges and the recipient personal identifying information available from the State EBT administrative terminals. The retailer shall be assessed a fiscal claim for each transaction determined to be a credit account violation. If the retailer is not able to account for all of the suspicious EBT transactions for which it has been charged, the determining office must evaluate the remaining transactions and determine whether trafficking has occurred. If the retailer does not provide adequate proof, the determining office shall permanently disqualify the retailer for trafficking.

The record reflects that Retailer Operations Division presented Appellant with an opportunity to provide documentation and any information, explanation or evidence in support of its claim that the Attachment 1 transactions were as a result of credit accounts. Appellant was notified that the documentation must identify specific accounts along with corresponding dates and amounts to qualify as adequate proof of credit accounts. Appellant failed to provide sufficient evidence that the transactions cited in the Charge letter are as a result of credit accounts. Therefore,

Appellant's contention it offered credit accounts does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges or for mitigating the impact of those charges.

While there are legitimate reasons why a SNAP recipient might return to a convenience store during a short period of time to make SNAP purchases, it is implausible that households that rely on SNAP benefits to make ends meet would make multiple large purchases at a minimally stocked convenience store with no fresh or frozen meat, no produce and where the stock consisted mainly of inexpensive snack and individually prepared items.

In conclusion, it is therefore more likely true than not true that the irregular transactions cited in the charge letter Attachment 2 are due to trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Attachment 2 of the Charge Letter - Excessively large purchase transactions were made from recipient accounts.

This attachment lists 200 SNAP transactions **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. The firm does not offer food in bulk or any ethnic or specialty foods that sell for a high price. Therefore, the substantial number of high dollar purchases calls into question the legitimacy of these transactions.

The average convenience store transaction in Atlantic County New Jersey, during the review period, was \$9.16. **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. It is also important to note that Appellant's total SNAP redemptions during the review period were higher than the average total SNAP redemption of convenience stores in Atlantic County. Appellant's layout and inventory do not support a high percentage of transactions markedly exceeding the average transaction amount or total SNAP redemption amounts for this store type.

The record reflects that there are at least 40 SNAP authorized retailers within one mile of Appellant's store including small and medium grocery stores and supermarkets where household also shopped. Retailer Operations also conducted an analysis of the shopping habits of five of the households identified in the charge letter. This analysis concluded that these households also shopped at other area grocery stores including full-line supermarkets and superstores that offer a much larger quantity and variety of eligible food items for likely better prices either on the same day or within days of visiting Appellant's firm. This again indicates that lack of access to other stores is not at issue.

Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of sufficient evidence as to the legitimacy of such transactions, a conclusion can be drawn, through a preponderance of evidence that the "unusual, irregular, and inexplicable" transactions and patterns cited in the charge letter evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation. In this case, ownership did not provide sufficient evidence to legitimize Appellant's

transaction data as outlined in the Attachments. Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking and concluded, through a preponderance of evidence, that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

Appellant contends that it will be very hard for the store to survive without food stamps. With regards to this contention, it is recognized that some degree of economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is disqualified from participation in SNAP. 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 firm resulting from imposition of such penalty. To allow ownership to be excused from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship to the firm would render virtually meaningless the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and the enforcement efforts of the USDA. Furthermore, giving special consideration to economic hardship of the firm would forsake fairness and equity, not only to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, but also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, ownerships contention does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

The transaction data and overall firm record convincingly demonstrate repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this type of firm indicative of trafficking. Once Retailer Operations Division established the convincing case against Appellant, ownership 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 matter asserted is more likely to be true than not true. If this is not demonstrated, the case is to be sustained.

As noted, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) states that 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 inconsistent redemption data, and evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system.

Retailer Operations Division has presented a convincing case that Appellant has likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. This is evidenced by: the suspicious patterns in two attachments of EBT transaction data, the inadequacy of the firm's eligible food stock as observed and recorded during the onsite visit to support such large transactions, the lack of evidence of invoices of foods in inventory to cover SNAP redemption totals for the review months, the lack of explanation for customer

spending habits given that there are other SNAP authorized stores located within proximity to Appellant, and the irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to other convenience stores in the State.

Government analyses of stores caught in trafficking violations during on-site investigations have found that transactions involving trafficking consistently display particular characteristics or patterns. These patterns include, in part, those cited in the letter of charges. Therefore, based on this empirical data, and in the absence of evidence for the legitimacy for such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn through a preponderance of evidence that the unusual, irregular, and inexplicable transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges evidence trafficking as the most likely explanation. While ownership was afforded the opportunity to provide valid explanations and evidence that support that the questionable transactions were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items, Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence in the record.

The purpose of the administrative review process is to ensure that firms aggrieved by Retailer Operations Division's adverse actions have the opportunity to have their position fairly considered by an impartial review authority prior to that adverse action becoming final.

Appellant has been duly given, and has taken the opportunity to present to USDA through the administrative review process whatever evidence and information it deems pertinent in support of its position that Retailer Operations Division's adverse action should be reversed. Therefore, any evidence and information that Appellant presented to Retailer Operations Division, as well as any such information submitted subsequently, have now been considered in this administrative review in rendering the final agency administrative decision in this case. The record does not indicate any departure from established policy or procedures with regard to Appellant's right to a fair and thorough review.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

Appellant was notified in the charge letter dated September 7, 2017, that it had 10 calendar days upon receipt of the charge letter to provide required documentation in order to be considered for the trafficking CMP.

Appellant failed to provide Retailer Operations Division with the required documentation to be considered for a trafficking CMP in lieu of disqualification. Therefore, Retailer Operations Division correctly determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP as set forth in the SNAP regulations.

CONCLUSION

Ownership has not provided sufficient evidence to rebut the convincing case that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. As such, 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 shall disqualify the firm permanently.

Retailer Operations Division' analysis of Appellant's EBT transaction record was the primary basis for its determination to permanently disqualify Red Hot Ice Cream LLC from participation in the SNAP. This data provided substantial evidence that the questionable transactions during the review period had characteristics that are consistent with trafficking in SNAP benefits.

Therefore, based on a review of all the evidence in this case, it is more likely true than not true that program violations did, in fact, occur as charged by Retailer Operations Division. Based on the discussion herein, the determination to impose a permanent disqualification against Red Hot Ice Cream LLC is sustained.

RIGHTS AND REMEDIES

Your attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and to Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 279.7 (7 CFR § 279.7) with respect to your right to a judicial review of this determination. Please note that 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 you reside or are 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 (FOIA), 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.

Monique Brooks
Administrative Review Officer

December 13, 2017