

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

**San Miguel Market,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Case Number: C0202387**

**Retailer Operations Division,**

**Respondent.**

**FINAL AGENCY DECISION**

It is the decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) that the record supports that San Miguel Market (Appellant) committed violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) regulations. There is sufficient evidence to sustain a six month disqualification of Appellant from the SNAP as imposed by the Retailer Operations Division (Retailer Operations).

**ISSUE**

The issue accepted for review is whether Retailer Operations took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 278.6(f)(1), 7 CFR § 278.6(a), and 7 CFR § 278.6(e) in its administration of the SNAP, when it imposed a six month period of disqualification against Appellant.

**AUTHORITY**

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and the implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1 provide that a food retailer aggrieved by administrative action under § 278.1, § 278.6 or § 278.7 may file a written request for review of the administrative action with the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS).

**CASE CHRONOLOGY**

The USDA conducted an investigation of the compliance of Appellant with Federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of October 4, 2017 through December 27, 2017. In a letter dated July 26, 2018, Retailer Operations charged Appellant with accepting SNAP benefits in exchange for merchandise which included ineligible nonfood items in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a). These SNAP violations occurred on five out of five compliance visits. The letter further informed Appellant that the violations warranted a disqualification period of six months as provided in 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5).

Appellant did not reply to the charges outlined in the July 26, 2018, Charge Letter. After considering the evidence of this case, Retailer Operations issued a Determination Letter dated August 9, 2018. The Determination Letter informed Appellant that it was disqualified from the SNAP for a period of six months in accordance with 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e). The Determination Letter also stated that Retailer Operations considered Appellant's eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) under 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1). Retailer Operations determined that Appellant was not eligible for the hardship CMP in lieu of the six month disqualification because there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.

In a letter dated August 20, 2018, Appellant requested an administrative review of this action. FNS granted Appellant's request for administrative review by letter dated September 5, 2018. Upon acceptance of the administrative review request, implementation of the six month disqualification was 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 the evidence, that the administrative action should be reversed. That means 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 argument asserted is more likely to be true than not true.

### **CONTROLLING LAW AND REGULATIONS**

The controlling statute in this matter is contained in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, 7 U.S.C. § 2021 and § 278 of 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (e)(5) establish the authority upon which a six month disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store.

7 CFR § 278.2(a) states: "Coupons may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households or the households' authorized representative, and only in exchange for eligible food."

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states that a firm is to be disqualified for six months "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."

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states: "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..."

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) provides for CMP assessments in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause hardship to SNAP benefit households because of the unavailability of a comparable participating food store in the area to meet their shopping needs. It states: “FNS may impose a CMP as a sanction in lieu of disqualification when the firm’s disqualification would cause hardship to SNAP benefit households because there is no other authorized retail food store in the area selling as large a variety of staple food items at comparable prices.”

### **SUMMARY OF THE CHARGES**

A report of the investigation was provided to Appellant as Exhibits with the Charge letter. The investigative report provides details on the results of each compliance visit. The investigation report documents that SNAP violations were recorded during five store visits that warrant a six month disqualification. The violations involved the sale of nonfood items for SNAP benefits in violation of 7 CFR § 278.2(a).

### **APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS**

Consideration of all contentions, as stated by responding owner, are provided below:

- I give my sincere apology for not attending to this matter timely; I was on a two week vacation. San Miguel Market Seafood Grill is a small business with one store location in the city of Greensboro, we have been in business for eight years, and this is the first sanction against our store.
- The cashier mentioned in the investigative report is no longer with us. We realized she was not competent for the job and she was let go immediately after discovering her continuous mistakes and after providing her training and coaching.
- Our business income is small and a six-month sanction will be a financial hardship on us.

### **ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS**

This review is to either validate or to invalidate the determination made by Retailer Operations; it is limited to the facts at the basis of Retailer Operations’ determination at the time it was made. Upon review, the evidence supports that Appellant established a record of selling nonfood items as defined by § 271.2 of the regulations on multiple occasions. Exhibits A, B, C, D, and E furnished with the Charge letter warrant a disqualification period of six months.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) specifies that FNS shall “disqualify the firm for six months 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 nonfood items due to carelessness or poor supervision by the firm’s ownership or management.” Three violations are considered evidence of carelessness. Therefore, the violations in this case are not too limited to warrant a disqualification.

The responding owner contends that the current charges are the first allegations of any violations of the SNAP rules made against Appellant. However, a record of participation in the SNAP with

no previously documented instance of violations does not constitute valid grounds for dismissal of the current charges of violations or for mitigating the impact of those charges. The owner is liable for all violative transactions that occur at Appellant. Regardless of who the Appellant owner utilize to handle store business, the owner is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

Two different clerks sold a variety of nonfood items at Appellant. The responding owner does not dispute that the violations did occur. The regulations stipulate FNS shall disqualify the firm for six months 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 the sale of common nonfood items due to carelessness and poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

Retailer Operations rendered a finding that it was not appropriate to impose a CMP in lieu of a six month period of disqualification. Based on the evidence, the disqualification of Appellant would not cause a hardship to SNAP recipients in the area. There are at least three authorized stores located within a nearby radius of Appellant that stock a variety of comparable staple foods at comparable prices, including a medium grocery and two super markets.

The preponderance of the evidence does not support that it will cause hardship for SNAP recipients if Appellant is disqualified. Therefore, Appellant is not eligible for a hardship CMP.

### **CONCLUSION**

The preponderance of the evidence in the record supports that the program violations charged did occur at Appellant. The USDA investigative record is specific, thorough, and fully documented 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. The owner acknowledged that Appellant committed violations of the SNAP regulations.

The record documents that Retailer Operations considered Appellant's eligibility for a hardship CMP according to the terms of § 278.6(f)(1) and properly denied it. Therefore, the six month disqualification of Appellant from participation as an authorized retail food store in the SNAP is sustained.

### **RIGHTS AND REMEDIES**

This penalty shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this Decision. A new application for participation in the SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six month period of disqualification. Please contact the Retailer Center at 877-823-4369 with any questions regarding the SNAP application process.

Attention is called to Section 14 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. § 2023) and to the regulations at 7 CFR § 279.7 with respect to your right to a judicial review of this decision. If 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 owners reside or are all 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.

Kim Dameron  
Administrative Review Officer

April 11, 2019