

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

**Vacca Drugs,**

**Appellant,**

**v.**

**Case Number: C0213654**

**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 (“ROD”) to impose a permanent disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) against Vacca Drugs (“Appellant”).

**ISSUE**

The purpose of this review is to determine whether the ROD took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(a), (c) and (e)(1)(i), when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on February 11, 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 November 30, 2019, the ROD charged Appellant with trafficking, as defined in Section 271.2 of the SNAP regulations. This charge was based on a series of SNAP transaction patterns that “establish clear and repetitive patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable activity for your type of firm.” This letter of charges states: “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 a permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

Appellant replied to the ROD’s charges in writing. The record reflects that the ROD received and considered the information provided prior to making a determination. The ROD determined that Appellant’s contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the ROD concluded that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The ROD issued a determination letter dated February 11, 2019. This letter informed Appellant that it 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. The letter also states the ROD considered Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations. The ROD determined that Appellant was not eligible for the CMP because Appellant had not submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

On February 15, 2019, Appellant, through counsel, appealed the ROD’s determination 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. § 2021), and implemented through regulation under Title 7 CFR Part 278. In particular, 7 CFR § 278.6(a) and (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 engaged in trafficking of SNAP benefits.

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** . . . .

(Emphasis added.)

7 CFR § 278.6(a) states, in part:

Any firm considered for disqualification ... under paragraph (a) of this section... shall have full opportunity to submit to FNS information, explanation, or evidence concerning any instances of noncompliance before FNS makes a final administrative determination. The FNS regional office shall send the firm a letter of charges before making such determination. The letter shall specify the violations or actions which FNS believes constitute a basis for disqualification. The letter shall inform the firm that it may respond either orally or in writing to the charges contained in the letter within 10 days of receiving the letter . . .

7 CFR § 278.6(c) reads, in part:

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) of this section, 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, regardless of whether a request for review is filed in accordance with part 279 of this chapter.

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 7 CFR § 271.2, in part, as:

The buying, selling, stealing, or otherwise effecting an exchange of SNAP benefits issued and accessed via Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) cards, card numbers and personal identification numbers (PINs), or by manual voucher and signature, for cash or consideration other than eligible food, either directly, indirectly, in complicity or collusion with others, or acting alone”

Also at 7 CFR § 271.2, eligible food is defined as:

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 § 278.6(b)(2)(ii) states, in part:

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).

7 CFR § 278.6(b)(2)(iii) states:

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 § 278.6(b)(1), the firm shall not be eligible for such a penalty.

### **SUMMARY OF CHARGES**

The charges under review were based on an analysis of SNAP Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) transaction data during the period from May 2018 through October 2018. This analysis identified the following patterns of SNAP transaction activity that indicate trafficking:

- Multiple transactions made from the same accounts in unusually short time frames; and,
- Excessively large transactions.

The attachments enclosed with the charge letter specify the questionable and unusual SNAP transactions indicative of trafficking which were conducted at Appellant during the review period.

### **APPELLANT'S CONTENTIONS**

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

- Appellant denies the allegations.
- The bulk of Appellant's business comes from conveniently-located government subsidized housing. All of the participants from these locations are SNAP participants.
- Appellant is a pharmacy and sells grocery items and fresh meat.
- The clerks have been trained in the proper handling of SNAP transactions.
- Appellant offers credit accounts.
- The data that shows trafficking is because the credit card machine takes any type of credit card, including the EBT card.
- Appellant has not been provided with specifics regarding the alleged trafficking.

In support of its contentions, Appellant provided the following documentation:

- ~500 page of invoices; and,
- ~30 store photos.

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

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. Based on this empirical data, and in the absence of any reasonable explanations for such transaction patterns, a conclusion can be drawn by a preponderance of evidence that trafficking is the most likely explanation for “unusual, irregular, and inexplicable” transactions and patterns cited in the letter of charges is trafficking. Transactions with these patterns sometimes have valid explanations that support the idea that they were the result of legitimate purchases of eligible food items. This is why opportunities are given to charged retailers to explain the questionable transactions cited. In this case, the ROD determined that Appellant's responses did not outweigh the evidence. Evidence relied upon by the ROD was considered in this administrative review, including SNAP transaction data, store visit observations, location and characteristics of competitor firms, and household shopping patterns. The issue in this review is whether, through a preponderance of evidence, is it more likely true than not true that questionable transactions were the result of trafficking.

Appellant argues it has not been provided with specifics regarding the alleged trafficking. Appellant received a detailed charge letter with the times, dates and amounts of all transactions considered by the ROD in reaching its assessment that patterns of suspicious activity were occurring at Appellant. Appellant has received substantial information regarding the bases for the trafficking charges.

Appellant stated that the single basis for the trafficking allegation is based on a misunderstanding as the credit card machine takes any type of credit card, including the EBT card. It is unclear what Appellant is attempting to convey with this argument. While the trafficking charges are based on patterns unusual transaction activity, as described below, the ROD gathered other evidence in support of these charges.

Regarding Appellant’s denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the ROD establishes trafficking occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that that it did not engage in trafficking. If this is not demonstrated, the case will be sustained. Without supporting evidence and rationale, assertions that the firm has not violated program rules do not constitute valid grounds for overturning the determination.

### **Store Characteristics**

In reaching a disqualification determination, the ROD considered information obtained during an August 6, 2019 store visit conducted by a USDA contractor to observe Appellant’s operation, stock, and facilities. This store visit information was used to ascertain if there were justifiable explanations for the firm’s irregular SNAP transaction patterns. The store visit report documented the following store size, description, and characteristics:

- Store size is approximately 1,951 square feet with 250 square feet of food storage outside of public view;
- Available inventory of SNAP-eligible food items showed stock composed predominantly of inexpensive items, which is typical of a convenience store;
- Two cash registers and one electronic SNAP terminal device;
- Shopping carts or hand baskets;
- No scanners or conveyor belts;
- No evidence of a wholesale business such as posted prices or separate entrances for wholesale customers; and,
- Ribs specials and “Pick 5” bundles for \$19.99.

In addition, the store's checkout counter space areas were moderately sized allowing a limited surface area to place large purchases and making it impractical to process more than one customer at a time. Appellant stated it is a pharmacy and sells grocery items and fresh meat. This is true, however given the available inventory, there was no sign that Appellant would be likely to have the SNAP redemption patterns reflected in the charge letter.

### **Availability of Alternative Stores**

Appellant contends the bulk of Appellant’s business comes from SNAP participants who live in conveniently located government subsidized housing. The record reflects that customers conducting rapid, repetitive, and large transactions at Appellant frequently spent SNAP benefits at better-stocked and more competitively-priced grocery stores, sometimes on or about the same day they shopped at Appellant.

The Case Analysis Document identifies a supermarket with more reasonable prices located within one mile of Appellant. There is no basis for unusually high customer attraction to Appellant, there being no great price advantage, profusion of ethnic goods, or special or custom services rendered.

The following examples from the ROD’s Case Analysis Document show households shopped at better stocked firms on or about the same day as conducting large transactions at Appellant:

#### **SNAP Household #1**

This SNAP household made two transactions at Appellant, 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

#### **SNAP Household #2**

This SNAP household made a transaction at Appellant 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

## Large Transactions

Appellant sold ribs and meat bundles for \$19.99, which would explain some larger transactions at Appellant. However, these offerings do not explain purchases like those included in Attachment 2 to the charge letter. This attachment cites 107 EBT transactions during the six-month period of investigation 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C).

Additionally, many of the charge letter transactions arrive at, or cluster around, certain dollar amounts in \$5 increments (5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)). Households typically shop to obtain a certain mix of food items, irrespective of the total cost (other than to remain within allotment balances), and do not strive to achieve a particular total. The purchase amount of eligible food items typically approximates a random total. In contrast, firms facilitating trafficking tend to concentrate transactions at particular dollar amounts. In the absence of any compelling rationale to the contrary, the pattern of clustering transactions around certain dollar levels is implausible and indicative of transaction structuring and SNAP-benefit trafficking.

These transactions significantly exceed the county's average SNAP transaction, which was \$5.96 for this type of store during the six months of the review period. 5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C). Appellant's average transaction is significantly higher than the county's average transaction. As previously stated, Appellant has a limited food stock typical of a convenience store and does not have any features that would induce people to spend substantially more than the typical convenience store purchase amount.

Based on the store layout, infrastructure, and available inventory, it is not credible that the Appellant would so frequently conduct large transactions closely resembling those typically found at a supermarket or superstore. It is not plausible that the firm's customers would purchase very large amounts of merchandise at the store, especially since larger, better-stocked stores are readily available and in the vicinity of the Appellant firm. Appellant is not set up to process high-dollar transactions, as indicated by its lack of equipment to facilitate large transactions and limited counter space. There are no legitimate bases for SNAP customers' unusual attraction to the firm such as a superior selection of staple foods, price advantages, an extensive variety of otherwise unavailable ethnic food items, or special services rendered. Appellant failed to provide convincing evidence to establish the legitimacy of these excessively large transactions, such as itemized cash register receipts. Based on all of these factors discussed in this section, the large volume of transactions for high-dollar amounts is unlikely to indicate a pattern of legitimate food purchases.

## Credit Accounts

Appellant maintains that one of the reasons for the large transactions is that credit is extended to loyal customers, and their tabs are paid in full when they receive their SNAP benefits. In support

of this assertion, Appellant stated it only happened on a few occasions. Appellant did not provide evidence in support of its contention.

When a retailer attempts to refute charges of trafficking by claiming it maintains credit accounts, the retailer must provide adequate proof that credit accounts existed at the time the suspicious transactions occurred so that the ROD can compare such proof with transactions outlined in the letter of charges. This is because it is not uncommon for retailers to make false admissions of credit in an attempt to obtain a lesser penalty after committing the more egregious violation of trafficking. Without substantial documentation that credit was extended to SNAP customers, it is impossible to compare against any specific transactions outlined in the letter of charges dated November 30, 2019, or substantiate that such transactions were indeed the result of credit account repayments.

### **Appellant's Responsibilities**

Appellant contends clerks have been trained in the proper handling of SNAP transactions. When ownership signed the FNS application to become an authorized SNAP retailer, this included a certification and confirmation that the owner(s) 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 maintaining credit accounts and trafficking. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may choose to handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions.

### **Invoices**

Appellant submitted approximately 500 pages of invoices to establish that the store purchased enough inventory to support the total of its SNAP sales. The invoices are sufficient to demonstrate that Appellant purchased enough inventory to support the amounts of its SNAP transactions. Still, there is not enough information to determine whether they account for the sum of Appellant’s SNAP and non-SNAP transaction activity. While the overall dollar amount of SNAP activity is relevant, the charge letter did not cite as evidence Appellant’s SNAP sales total. Rather, the ROD identified a series of different suspicious transaction patterns. While Appellant claimed that 95% of its sales were from SNAP transactions, many of the offerings at Appellant are not eligible for purchase with SNAP. Further, the amount of SNAP transaction activity at Appellant represents only a small fraction of the total sales reported by Appellant.

### **Summary**

The ROD determined that Appellant likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. The charges of violations were based on the ROD’s assessment that substantial evidence exists that the questionable transactions occurring during the review period displayed patterns inconsistent with

legitimate sales of eligible food to SNAP participants. The evidence the ROD considered in support of its determination included:

- The irregular SNAP transaction data of Appellant as compared to similar stores;
- Observations made during an store visit by a USDA contractor, including the inadequacy of the firm's staple food stock to support such large transactions;
- The availability of other SNAP-authorized stores located close to Appellant; and,
- Shopping behaviors of Appellant's customers.

The transaction data and overall firm record demonstrate the patterns of unusual, irregular, and inexplicable SNAP activity for this firm is likely the result of trafficking.

Upon review, Appellant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the administrative action should be reversed. Appellant provided inadequate explanations for the suspicious transactions and insufficient evidence to legitimize its transaction data. It has not convincingly rebutted the ROD's determination that Appellant most likely trafficked in SNAP benefits. 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 must disqualify the firm permanently.

### **CIVIL MONEY PENALTY**

For a firm to have the opportunity to be considered for a civil money penalty (CMP), it must request that FNS consider a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification and submit supporting documentation within ten days of receipt of the charge letter. Appellant was advised of these provisions in the charge letter of November 30, 2019. The regulations specify that such supporting documentation must demonstrate that the firm had established and implemented an effective SNAP compliance policy and training program prior to the occurrence of violations. A review of the administrative record indicates Appellant did not, at any time, request a CMP. Appellant also did not submit any documentation to support its eligibility for this alternative sanction, before or after the deadline.

In the absence of a request for a CMP and any supporting documentation, a CMP was not assessed by the ROD. According to the requirements stated in 7 CFR § 278.6(b)(1), § 278.6(b)(2)(ii and iii), and § 278.6(i), Appellant is not eligible for a CMP in lieu of a permanent disqualification from participation as an authorized retailer in SNAP. The determination by the Retailer Operations Division to deny Appellant a civil money penalty is sustained.

### **CONCLUSION**

The record has yielded no indication of error in the finding by the Retailer Operations Division that Appellant trafficked in SNAP benefits. A review of the evidence supports that it is more likely true than not true that program violations occurred as charged. Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent

disqualification against Vacca Drugs 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 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

April 8, 2019