

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

Ta New Orleans Seafood, LLC,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0218338

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

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 deny the application of Ta New Orleans Seafood, LLC (“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(b)(1), in its administration of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) when it denied the application of Appellant to participate in SNAP in a letter dated May 13, 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 13, 2019, the Retailer Operations Division denied the application of Appellant to participate as an authorized retailer in SNAP because the firm is not a retail food store as defined by the SNAP regulations. Specifically, the denial letter states that firms that have more than 50 percent of their total gross sales in heated foods and/or prepared foods not intended for home preparation and/or consumption are not eligible to participate as retail food stores. The letter states the firm is primarily a restaurant based on information provided in Appellant’s application and the contractor’s store visit report dated May 8, 2019. As the firm failed to meet

the eligibility criteria 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 Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended.

In a letter dated May 28, 2019, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's decision and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

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. § 2018), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.1(k)(1) establishes the authority upon which the application of any firm to participate in SNAP may be denied if it meets the definition of an ineligible firm.

7 CFR § 278.1(k)(1) references 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1)(iv) which reads, in part:

Firms that are considered to be restaurants, that is, firms that have more than 50 percent of their total gross retail sales in hot and/or cold prepared foods not intended for home preparation and consumption, shall not qualify for participation as retail food stores. . . . This includes firms that primarily sell prepared foods that are consumed on the premises or sold for carryout.

The definition of retail food store at 7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part:

Entities that have more than 50 percent of their total gross retail sales in hot and/or cold prepared, ready-to-eat foods that are intended for immediate consumption either for carry-out or on-premises consumption, and require no additional preparation, are not eligible for SNAP participation as retail food stores.

Section 9 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, states in part:

A retail food store or wholesale food concern that is denied approval to accept and redeem benefits because the store or concern does not meet criteria for approval . . . may not, for at least 6 months, submit a new application to participate in the program.

APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS

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

- Appellant incorrectly completed its SNAP application. Appellant is a seafood specialty store and its staple foods sales are much higher than its hot food sales. Appellant submitted a revised application and a monthly sales report.
- Appellant is located in area with many SNAP recipients who rely on Appellant for their staple foods. Appellant provided a map of the local area.
- Food can be prepared for an additional fee.
- Appellant has operated since August 2013 with the same business model.

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 that the firm is a not a restaurant, but a retail store. For the purpose of determining whether a firm is a restaurant, the issue is not whether the firm has available for sale SNAP-eligible food. The central issue is whether actual sales of prepared foods comprise more than 50 percent of the store's total gross retail sales. There is no doubt that staple food items may be delivered to the store fresh, raw and unprepared, and are available to customers that way. However, the evidence provided supports the firm is set up primarily as a restaurant; thus, it is reasonable to expect that fresh food products do not outsell prepared and cooked food products at this establishment.

In regards to Appellant's contention that the store sells a great deal of fresh and unprepared food, the documentation presented does not support that the majority of the firm's business is in the sale of fresh foods for home preparation and consumption. The evidence in the inspection report and photographs of the May 8, 2019 store visit, and in the information provided by Appellant, indicates that Appellant operates as a combination seafood retail store/seafood takeout restaurant. The information provided on Appellant's application stated that Appellant sold primarily hot food. Appellant contends it incorrectly completed its SNAP application. However, the one-page sales report submitted by Appellant is insufficient to support its contention. Appellant did not provide register receipts or other documentation that could be used to analyze what percentage of sales at Appellant are from prepared foods.

Appellant contends that because it charges a separate fee for cooking, it avoids designation as a restaurant. Whether food is cooked as part of the initial purchase or through an additional charge is irrelevant to the determination of whether Appellant's establishment is a restaurant. Foods cooked on the premises before or after purchase are considered prepared foods.

Appellant contends it has operated since August 2013 with the same business model and was SNAP authorized. This administrative review is limited solely to those circumstances concerning Appellant's eligibility. Therefore, the firm's contention regarding the previous firm with different ownership cannot be used to reverse the decision of the Retailer Operations Division. However, the records indicate the reason for the withdrawal of the previous firm was because the

firm failed to provide documentation specifically requested to determine whether the firm was a restaurant.

Appellant stated that the firm is located in area with many SNAP recipients who rely on Appellant for their staple foods. SNAP regulation 7 CFR § 278.6(f)(1) provides for civil money penalties in lieu of disqualification in cases where disqualification would cause hardship to SNAP households because of the unavailability of a comparable participating retail food store in the area to meet their needs. However, firms that are considered restaurants are not eligible for participation or a civil money penalty.

Summary

The authorization of a store to participate in SNAP must be in accord with the Food and Nutrition Act and regulations, as amended. Those requirements of law cannot be waived. This review is limited to consideration of the circumstances at the time of the denial action by the Retailer Operations Division. On the day of the store visit, the evidence supported that the store is primarily a restaurant, and firms that are primarily restaurants are not eligible to participate in SNAP.

The store is set up primarily to sell hot and/or cold prepared, ready-to-eat foods that are intended for immediate consumption or for carry-out, and require no additional preparation. Although food items in Appellant's store may be available for sale fresh, it is more likely true than not true that the majority of foods in the store are actually sold prepared and/or hot and ready-to-eat. According to 7 CFR § 278.1(b)(1) of the SNAP regulations, such a store is considered a restaurant and is not eligible for SNAP participation as a retail food store. Therefore, Appellant's store does not qualify as a retail food store for purposes of SNAP participation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to deny the application of Ta New Orleans Seafood, LLC to participate as an authorized SNAP retailer 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 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, 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