

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

Stop N Shop LLC,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0224453

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 Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against Stop N Shop LLC (hereinafter Appellant) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), in its administration of the SNAP when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Appellant on April 20, 2020.

AUTHORITY

According to 7 U.S.C. § 2023 and the 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 the compliance of Appellant with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period February 24, 2020, through February 26, 2020. The investigation determined that personnel at the Appellant firm accepted 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) of SNAP benefits in exchange for 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in cash (trafficking) taken from the firm’s cash register on two occasions as noted in the letter of charges for Exhibits B and C, respectively. These transactions were deemed clearly violative and warrant a permanent disqualification. Additionally, the investigation determined that personnel at the firm accepted

SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on three occasions (Exhibits A, B, and C). The items sold are best described in regulatory terms as common nonfood items such as toilet paper, plastic utensils, and plastic cups. The investigative report indicates that all three transactions were handled by the same clerk.

As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance informed Appellant, in a letter dated April 2, 2020, that the firm and its ownership were charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). The letter of charges states, in relevant part, “As provided by Section 278.6(e)(1) of the SNAP regulations, the sanction for trafficking . . . is permanent disqualification.” The letter also states that “under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) . . . in lieu of permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

Appellant, through counsel, responded to the charges in a letter dated April 11, 2020, which did not request a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification or provide any evidence in support of a CMP. After giving consideration to the evidence, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated April 20, 2020, that the firm was permanently disqualified from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP in accordance with Section 278.6(c) and 278.6(e)(1) for trafficking violations. This determination letter also states that Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking CMP according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated “. . . you are not eligible for the CMP because you failed to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that your firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.”

By letter dated April 27, 2020, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance decision and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted. Subsequent correspondence was received.

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 Section 278. In particular, Sections 278.6(a) and Part 278.6(e)(1)(i) establish the authority upon which a permanent disqualification may be imposed against a retail food store or wholesale food concern in the event that personnel of the firm have engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

7 CFR § 271.2 states that: Eligible foods means any food or food product intended for human consumption except alcoholic beverages, tobacco, and hot food and hot food products prepared for immediate consumption.

7 CFR § 278.2(a) states that: Coupons [SNAP benefits] may be accepted by an authorized retail food store only from eligible households, and only in exchange for eligible food. Further, the citation specifies that coupons may not be accepted in exchange for cash, in payment of interest on loans, or for any other nonfood use.

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 on-site investigations.

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) reads, in part, “FNS shall . . . [d]isqualify 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, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits . . . for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone . . .” Trafficking is further defined, in 7 CFR § 271.2, to include “(5) Intentionally purchasing products originally purchased with SNAP benefits in exchange for cash or consideration other than eligible food.”

7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) states in relevant part, “FNS may impose a civil money penalty as a sanction in lieu of disqualification when the firm is selling a substantial variety of staple food items, and the firm’s disqualification would cause hardship to SNAP households. A civil money penalty for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification.”

7 CFR § 278.6(i) states, inter alia: “FNS may impose a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking . . . if the firm timely submits to FNS substantial evidence which demonstrates that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations of the Program.”

7 CFR §278.6(b)(2)(ii) states, inter alia: “Firms that request consideration of a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking shall have the opportunity to submit to FNS information and evidence . . . that establishes the firm’s eligibility for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification in accordance with the criteria included in §278.6(i). This information and evidence shall be submitted within 10 days, as specified in §278.6(b)(1).” Part 278.6(b)(2)(ii) further states that if a firm fails to request consideration for a civil money penalty in lieu of a permanent disqualification for trafficking and submit documentation and evidence of its eligibility within the 10 days specified in Part 278.6(b)(1), the firm shall not be eligible for such a penalty.

In addition, 7 CFR § 278.6(i)(2) states in relevant part, “As specified in Criterion 3 above, in determining whether a firm has established an effective policy to prevent violations, FNS shall consider written and dated statements of firm policy which reflect a commitment to ensure that the firm is operated in a manner consistent with this part 278 of current FNS regulations and

current FSP policy on the proper acceptance and handling of food coupons.” This section goes on to state, “As required by Criterion 2, such policy statements shall be considered only if documentation is supplied which establishes that the policy statements were provided to the violating employee(s) prior to the commission of the violation.” This section further states, “A firm which seeks a civil money penalty in lieu of permanent disqualification shall document its training activity by submitting to FNS its dated training curricula and records of dates training sessions were conducted . . .”

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

The following may represent a summary of Appellant’s contentions 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 herein:

- The firm employed two clerks at the time of the violations and was assured they knew the SNAP program and its regulations. The firm did not have a written training program at the time of the violations, but the owner had verbally instructed his clerks on how to administer SNAP including that SNAP benefits should never be exchanged for cash or for ineligible items. The firm now has a written program and the owner requires all clerks to sign an acknowledgement of SNAP Training for Employees form. An example of the form as well as copies signed by the two clerks were provided;
- The owner never received any benefit from these sales as the clerk pocketed 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) for the sales 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C);
- The firm serves 90-100 SNAP customers daily and is open 24/7 so it is able to serve them when no other location is available. Many customers rely on the store and it would be a great inconvenience to them if the store were unable to assist them.
- The owner operates another gas station convenience store that has been SNAP authorized since 2010 with no problems with USDA programs. Clerks at this store have been trained and copies of their training documents were also provided;
 - Both stores have experienced declining sales of as much as nine percent due to the pandemic and the owner has participated in government loan programs to assist the businesses. The suspension of SNAP has resulted in a decline in sales of about six percent monthly; and,
- The firm has had no prior violations and requests a CMP. As a result of the corrective actions, the firm now has established and implemented an effective compliance policy that includes the FNS Training Guide for Retailers so there will be no further violations. The firm deserves another chance. The owner requests the firm be reinstated because the penalty is too extreme and causes financial hardship in excess of the violations. A CMP is a reasonable alternative under the circumstances.

Appellant submitted two handwritten Beginning/Ending Shift Cigarette Count one page forms, a sample unsigned one page SNAP Training for Employees form, completed SNAP training documents for the two clerks at the Appellant firm, and completed SNAP training documents for the clerks at the other business in support of these contentions.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

It is important to clarify for the record that the purpose of this review is to either validate or to invalidate the earlier decision of the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance and is limited to what circumstances were at the basis of the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance action at the time such action was made. In this case, store ownership has not denied that store employees conducted violative transactions that included the trafficking of SNAP benefits. The Report of Investigation clearly shows the exchange 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in SNAP benefits for 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C) in cash taken from the firm's cash register in Exhibit B and Exhibit C as well as the exchange of SNAP benefits for ineligible items in Exhibits A, B, and C.

While store ownership may not have personally conducted the violative transactions, SNAP rules and regulations state that regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to handle store business or their degree of involvement in store operations, that ownership is accountable for the proper training of staff and the monitoring and handling of all SNAP benefit transactions. Both the SNAP retailer application and retailer reauthorization application contain a certification page whereby applicants must confirm their understanding of and agreement with SNAP retailer requirements in order to complete the application/reauthorization process. Store ownership did certify its understanding and agreement to abide by program rules and regulatory provisions when it initially applied to become a SNAP retailer and again when it applied for reauthorization. The ownership remains liable for all violative transactions handled by store personnel, whether paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time regardless of the amount of time the owner(s) is present at the subject firm.

The FNS investigative report shows that an employee of the Appellant firm transacted SNAP benefits for ineligible items on three occasions and for cash on two of these occasions indicating an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations. The transactions from the investigative report have been matched to SNAP transactions posted by the firm on the dates in question with no disagreements and a review of the investigative report shows no errors or discrepancies. There is no evidence of involvement by the firm's ownership or management. The acceptance of SNAP benefits for ineligible items or for cash are both violations of SNAP rules and regulations with the penalty for trafficking being permanent disqualification. There is no regulatory threshold for the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash or for the dollar value of the ineligible items purchased and store ownership does not dispute that violations occurred or that SNAP benefits were exchanged for cash and ineligible merchandise. Additionally, it is highly improbable, based on the willingness of the firm's employee to exchange SNAP benefits for ineligible nonfood items and for cash, that the only instances of SNAP violations were those identified as part of the FNS undercover investigation. Common sense dictates that these actions more likely than not represented an ongoing pattern of SNAP violations at the Appellant firm.

The Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, and the regulations issued pursuant thereto do not cite any minimum dollar amount of cash or SNAP benefits, or number of occurrences, for such exchanges to be defined as trafficking. Nor do they cite any degrees of seriousness pertaining to trafficking of SNAP benefits. Trafficking is always considered to be the most serious violation, even when the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash is dollar-for-dollar or is

conducted by a non-managerial store clerk. This is reflected in the Food and Nutrition Act, which reads, in part, that disqualification “shall be permanent upon . . . the first occasion of a disqualification based on . . . trafficking . . . by a retail food store.” In keeping with this legislative mandate, Section 278.6(e)(1)(i) of the SNAP regulations states that FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked. There is no agency discretion in the matter of what sanction is to be imposed when trafficking is involved and second chances are not an authorized option.

Based on the discussion above, there is not any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the penalty imposed.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

A CMP for hardship to SNAP households may not be imposed in lieu of a permanent disqualification as specified in SNAP regulations at 7 CFR § 278.6(f). Trafficking is a permanent disqualification so Appellant is not eligible for a hardship CMP.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance determined that the Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of a disqualification under 7 CFR 278.6(i) because Appellant failed to request a trafficking CMP or to submit sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations within the specified timeframe. As such, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance determined that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification.

Based on the above discussion and the evidence under review, Appellant failed to meet the regulatory standard for a trafficking CMP as it did not request or provide substantial evidence that it met all four criteria required by 7 CFR §278.6(i). Based on the above, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s decision not to impose a CMP in lieu of disqualification is sustained as appropriate pursuant to 7 CFR §278.6(i).

CONCLUSION

A review of the evidence in this case supports that the program violations at issue did 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 by a USDA investigator, signed under penalty of perjury, and all are thoroughly documented. A review of this documentation has yielded no indication of error or discrepancy in any of the reported findings. Rather, the investigative record is specific and accurate with regard to the dates of the violations, the specific exchange of items purchased with SNAP benefits for cash, and in all other critically pertinent detail. Additionally, the decision by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance that Appellant was not eligible for a trafficking CMP is also found to be correct.

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a permanent disqualification against the Appellant business from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

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 a judicial review is desired, 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, 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.

ROBERT T. DEEGAN
ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW OFFICER

June 22, 2020