

United States
Department of
Agriculture



Food and
Nutrition
Service

Supplemental
Nutrition
Assistance
Program

Retailer Policy
Division

Administrative
and Judicial
Review Branch

1320 Braddock
Place, 5th Floor,
Alexandria, VA
22314

Phone:
(312) 898-9782

Fax:
(855) 511-6555

amie.l.churchill
@usda.gov

May 15, 2023

Mansoor Ansari J.D., L.L.M.,
Ansari Law Firm
2650 Holcomb Bridge Road, Suite 110
Alpharetta, Georgia 30022

RE: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Dear Counselor:

Enclosed is the Final Agency Decision of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) in response to your May 3, 2022, request for administrative review.

It is the decision of the USDA that there is insufficient evidence to support the determination by FNS's Retailer Operations Division to permanently disqualify Big Bear from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). Therefore, the permanent disqualification decision is reversed. The SNAP authorization for [REDACTED] shall be immediately reinstated.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Amie Churchill".

AMIE CHURCHILL
Administrative Review Officer

Enclosure

cc: [REDACTED]

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

Big Bear,

Appellant,

v.

Retailer Operations Division,

Respondent.

Case Number: C0249226

FINAL AGENCY DECISION

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) finds that there is insufficient evidence to support the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification from participating as an authorized retailer in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) against Big Bear ("Appellant").

ISSUE

The issue accepted for review is whether the Retailer Operations Division, in its administration of SNAP, took appropriate action, consistent with Title 7 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 278, when it imposed a permanent disqualification against Big Bear.

AUTHORITY

7 U.S.C. § 2023 and its implementing regulations at 7 CFR § 279.1 provide that "[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 December 16, 2021, the Retailer Operations Division 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."

The record reflects that the Retailer Operations Division considered any information provided by Appellant prior to making a determination. The Retailer Operations Division determined that Appellant's contentions did not outweigh the evidence that the store was trafficking. Based on the preponderance of evidence, the Retailer Operations Division concluded that trafficking is the most probable explanation for the questionable transactions listed in the charge letter attachments.

The Retailer Operations Division issued a determination letter dated April 25, 2022. 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 Retailer Operations Division 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 Retailer Operations Division 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 May 3, 2022, Appellant appealed the Retailer Operations Division's determination and requested an administrative review of this action. The appeal was granted.

On April 25, 2023, the administrative review was reassigned to review officer Amie Churchill.

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 AND REGULATIONS

The controlling law in this matter is found in the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, as amended (7 U.S.C. § 2021), and promulgated 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.

7 U.S.C. § 2021(b)(3)(B) states, in part:

...[A] disqualification under subsection (a) shall be...permanent upon...the first occasion or any subsequent occasion of a disqualification based on the purchase of coupons or trafficking in coupons or authorization cards by a retail food store or wholesale food concern or a finding of the unauthorized redemption, use, transfer, acquisition, alteration, or possession of EBT cards...

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, [or] evidence obtained through a transaction report under an electronic benefit transfer system....

7 CFR § 278.6(e)(1)(i) states:

FNS shall disqualify a firm permanently if personnel of the firm have trafficked as defined in § 271.2.

7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part:

Trafficking means: 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...

7 CFR § 271.2 states, in part:

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 § 278.6(b)(1) 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) states, 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(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.

7 CFR § 278.6(i) states, in part:

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 § 279.4(a) states, in part:

Upon receipt of a request for review of administrative action, the administrative action shall be held in abeyance until the designated reviewer has made a determination. However, permanent disqualifications for trafficking shall not be held in abeyance and shall be effective immediately as specified in 278.6(b)(2) of this chapter. If the disqualification is reversed through administrative or judicial review, the Secretary shall not be held liable for the value of any sales lost during the disqualification period...

SUMMARY OF CHARGES

Appellant was charged with trafficking and subsequently permanently disqualified from SNAP based on an analysis of EBT transaction data from May 2021 through October 2021. This involved the following transaction patterns, which are common trafficking indicators:

- There were multiple transactions made from the accounts of individual SNAP households within a set time period.
- The store conducted EBT transactions that were large based on observed store characteristics and recorded food stock.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

A review of the evidence does not support the Retailer Operations Division's determination in this case. Accordingly, the permanent disqualification is dismissed, and it is unnecessary to address Appellant's contentions in this matter.

This administrative review decision is based on the specific circumstances of this case as documented by materials provided by Appellant and the Retailer Operations Division. In addition, this administrative review decision does not establish policy or supersede federal law or regulations.

CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion above, the determination by the Retailer Operations Division to impose a permanent disqualification against Big Bear from participating as an authorized retailer in SNAP is reversed.

RELEASE OF INFORMATION

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.

AMIE CHURCHILL
Administrative Review Officer

May 15, 2023