

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

Utica’s Best Market Inc,

Appellant,

v.

**Office of Retailer Operations and
Compliance,**

Respondent.

Case Number: C0231060

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 six-month disqualification against Utica’s Best Market Inc. (“Appellant”) from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP).

ISSUE

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(5) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a six-month period of disqualification against Appellant on February 25, 2021.

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

USDA conducted an investigation of Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of September 24, 2020 through January 1, 2021. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for ineligible merchandise on three separate occasions. These items sold during these impermissible transactions are best described in regulatory terms as “common ineligible nonfood items.” The investigation revealed that two unidentified clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions. As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Office of Retailer

Operations and Compliance informed Appellant, in a letter dated January 27, 2021, that the firm was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.2(a). The letter states, in part, that the violations “. . . warrant a disqualification period of six months (Section 278.6(e)(5)). Under certain conditions, FNS may impose a civil money penalty (CMP) in lieu of a disqualification (Section 278.6(f)(1)).”

Appellant replied to the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination.

The Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance notified Appellant in a letter dated February 25, 2021 that the firm was being disqualified for six months from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. This determination letter also stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a hardship civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(f)(1) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . you are not eligible for the CMP because there are other authorized retail stores in the area selling as large a variety of staple foods at comparable prices.”

On March 2, 2021, Appellant appealed the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance’s decision to impose a six-month disqualification, and requested an administrative review of the action. The appeal was granted and implementation of the sanction has been on hold 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 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 Part 278. In particular, 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 or wholesale food concern.

Section 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations states, in part, when 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, in part:

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

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

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

- The penalty is too harsh.
- There is no evidence to support the determination.
- The owners rejected attempts to purchase nonfood items with SNAP benefits.
- The nonfood items were all cleaning supplies that are more necessary due to COVID-19.
- The value of the nonfood items **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**.
- The clerk refused trafficking on one occasion.
- Appellant requests a brief suspension or warning.
- This is the first time the firm has had a problem with SNAP compliance.

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 owners rejected attempts to purchase nonfood items with SNAP benefits. When ownership signed the FNS application to become a SNAP authorized retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that Appellant would “accept responsibility on behalf of the firm for violations of the SNAP regulations, including those committed by any of the firm’s employees, paid or unpaid, new, full-time or part-time.” The violations listed on this certification document include selling ineligible non-food items. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may use to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

First SNAP Violation

Appellant is correct that a clerk refused trafficking on one occasion. Trafficking is a more serious violation that carries a more severe penalty. Appellant stated that the value of the nonfood items **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)**. Appellant is correct that the nonfood items were of low-dollar value; permitting the sale of more expensive items with SNAP benefits carries a more severe penalty.

Appellant contends that the nonfood items were all cleaning supplies made more necessary due to COVID-19. While this may be true, purchase of cleaning supplies are not permitted with SNAP benefits.

Appellant's maintains that this is the first time there has been an issue related to SNAP, states the penalty is too harsh, and requests a brief suspension or warning. A record of program participation with no documented previous violations, however, does not constitute valid grounds for mitigating the impact of the present charges of sale of nonfood items. In addition, the investigation report shows that of the five times that nonfood violations were attempted, store personnel permitted them three times. Repeatedly entrusting an unsupervised, inexperienced and/or untrained clerk(s) to handle SNAP benefits is reasonably viewed as careless or the exercise of poor supervision. Accordingly, the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance attributed violations to "carelessness, or poor supervision by the firm's ownership or management," pursuant to 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(5) of the SNAP regulations, which results in a disqualification of six months. This penalty is only permitted if the firm has not been previously sanctioned. Therefore, a six-month disqualification for the violations committed, the minimum, is the appropriate sanction in this case.

Investigative Record

Appellant insists there is no evidence to support the determination. Based on a review of the evidence, it appears that the program violations at issue did, in fact, 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 under the supervision of a USDA investigator and all are fully documented. The investigative record is specific and accurate 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.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Office of Retailer Operations and Compliance to impose a disqualification of six months against Utica's Best Market Inc. from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is sustained.

In accordance with the Food and Nutrition Act, and the regulations thereunder, this penalty shall become effective thirty (30) days after receipt of this letter. A new application for participation in SNAP may be submitted ten (10) days prior to the expiration of the six-month disqualification period.

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

May 25, 2021