

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

V & V Deli Corp,

Appellant,

v.

Case Number: C0208377

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 impose a permanent disqualification against V & V Deli Corp. (“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 Retailer Operations Division took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 of Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 278.6(e)(1)(i) in its administration of SNAP when it imposed a Permanent Disqualification against Appellant on September 19, 2018.

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

The USDA conducted an investigation Appellant’s compliance with federal SNAP law and regulations during the period of July 16, 2018 through August 15, 2018. The investigation reported that personnel at Appellant accepted SNAP benefits in exchange for cash (trafficking) in the amount **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** on one occasion and **5 U.S.C. § 552 (b)(6) & (b)(7)(C)** on another occasion, as well as permitting the purchase of other

non-food items with SNAP benefits. The investigation revealed that three unidentified clerks were involved in the impermissible transactions.

As a result of evidence compiled from this investigation, the Retailer Operations Division informed Appellant, in a letter dated September 4, 2018, that its firm was charged with violating the terms and conditions of the SNAP regulations, 7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1). This letter stated, in 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 a permanent disqualification of a firm for trafficking.”

Appellant replied to the charges in a subsequent letter to the Retailer Operations Division. The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division received and considered this information prior to making a determination.

The Retailer Operations Division notified Appellant in a letter dated September 19, 2018 that the firm was being 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 stated that Appellant’s eligibility for a trafficking civil money penalty (CMP) according to the terms of Section 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations was considered. However, the letter stated to Appellant that “. . . 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.”

On September 24, 2018, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division’s assessment 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(e)(1)(i) establishes 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 § 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 or selling of [SNAP benefits] or other benefit instruments for cash or consideration other than eligible food.

APPELLANT’S CONTENTIONS

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

- Appellant does not have clerks who meet the descriptions as stated in the investigative report.
- Appellant has a SNAP compliance and training program. Appellant provided two pages of training documents.
- A permanent disqualification would put the store in a very difficult financial situation.
- Appellant requests a CMP.
- Appellant apologizes for the alleged violations and states the owner did not participate in or give permission for the violations.
- Appellant’s employees deny committing the alleged violations.

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

As to Appellant’s denial of violations, this review examines the relevant information regarding the determination. Once the Retailer Operations Division establishes a violation occurred, Appellant bears the burden of providing relevant evidence to support a conclusion, considering the record as a whole, that that the permanent disqualification should be reversed. 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.

Appellant's contends that the description of two of the clerks in the investigative report do not accurately describe firm employees. Appellant did not provide any evidence in support of this contention. In this regard, the matter of descriptions is often subjective in nature and may involve descriptive features that are relative with respect to the point of view of the observer.

Appellant asserts it apologizes for the alleged violations and states the owner did not participate in or give permission for the violations. 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 trafficking. Regardless of whom the ownership of a store may utilize to operate the cash register and handle store business, ownership is accountable for the proper handling of SNAP benefit transactions. To allow store ownership to disclaim accountability for the acts of persons chosen to handle store business, would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

While a clerk did refuse to sell a non-food item on one occasion, clerks permitted the sale of non-food items or the exchange of SNAP benefits for cash on seven other occasions. In any case, neither the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended, nor the accompanying regulations 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 extremely serious, 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 must 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.

No Undue Hardship to Appellant

Appellant maintains that disqualification would pose an extreme hardship to the firm. Economic hardship is a likely consequence whenever a store is permanently disqualified from SNAP participation. However, there is no provision in the SNAP regulations for reducing an administrative penalty on the basis of possible economic hardship to the firm resulting from such a penalty. To excuse Appellant from an assessed administrative penalty based on purported economic hardship would render the enforcement provisions of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the enforcement efforts of the USDA virtually meaningless.

Moreover, giving special consideration to the firm for economic hardship would forsake fairness and equity to competing stores and other participating retailers who are complying fully with program regulations, and also to those retailers who have been disqualified from the program in the past for similar violations. Therefore, Appellant's contention that it will incur economic hardship due to an administrative penalty does not provide any valid basis for dismissing the charges or for mitigating the imposed penalty.

CIVIL MONEY PENALTY

Appellant requested a civil money penalty (CMP) contending that it had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent SNAP violations.

According to 7 CFR § 278.6(i) of the SNAP regulations, FNS may impose a CMP in lieu of permanent disqualification for trafficking.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) sets forth the eligibility requirements for a CMP:

The firm shall, at a minimum, establish by substantial evidence its fulfillment of each of the following criteria:

Criterion 1: The firm shall have developed an effective compliance policy as specified in Section 278.6(i)(1); and,

Criterion 2: The firm shall establish that both its compliance policy and program were in operation at the location where the violation(s) occurred prior to the occurrence of violations cited in the charge letter sent to the firm; and,

Criterion 3: The firm had developed and instituted an effective personnel training program as specified in Section 278.6(i)(2); and,

Criterion 4: Firm ownership was not aware of, did not approve, did not benefit from, or was not in any way involved in the conduct or approval of trafficking violations; or it is the first occasion in which a member of firm management was aware of, approved, benefited from, or was involved in the conduct of any trafficking violations by the firm . .

..

In support of Appellant's contention that it is eligible for a CMP, it provided two pages of training documents signed by employees. In this regard, the documentation provided by Appellant is not "substantial evidence" that fulfills each of the four criteria of 7 CFR § 278.6(i), demonstrating "that the firm had established and implemented an effective compliance policy and program to prevent violations." There is no documentary evidence that all employees participated in these trainings or documentation of the development of a policy to terminate violating employees.

The standards of eligibility for a trafficking CMP are high. They require substantial proof that a compliance policy and program was established and implemented prior to the occurrence of violations. These standards exist to thwart attempts to falsely present compliance policies and programs that were not actually implemented prior to violations. As Appellant did not provide the required supporting documentation, the Retailer Operations Division did not assess a CMP. 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

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. 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 exchanges of SNAP benefits for cash, and in all other critically pertinent detail.

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against V & V Deli Corp. 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

November 26, 2018