Department of Health and Human Services

DEPARTMENTAL APPEALS BOARD

Civil Remedies Division

Center for Tobacco Products,

Complainant,

v.

7-Eleven, Inc. d/b/a 7-Eleven 20996,

Respondent.

Docket No. C-15-315 FDA Docket No. FDA-2014-H-1845

Decision No. CR3562

Date: January 8, 2015

INITIAL DECISION AND DEFAULT JUDGMENT

The Center for Tobacco Products (CTP) filed an Administrative Complaint (Complaint) against Respondent, 7-Eleven, Inc., d/b/a 7-Eleven 20996 that alleges facts and legal authority sufficient to justify the imposition of a civil money penalty of \$500. Respondent did not answer the Complaint, nor did Respondent request an extension of time within which to file an answer. Therefore, I enter a default judgment against Respondent and assess a civil money penalty of \$500.

CTP began this case by serving the Complaint on Respondent and filing a copy of the Complaint with the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA) Division of Dockets Management. The Complaint alleges that Respondent impermissibly sold cigarettes to minors and failed to verify that a cigarette purchaser was 18 years of age or older, thereby violating the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (Act), 21 U.S.C. § 301 *et seq.*, and its implementing regulations, Cigarettes and Smokeless Tobacco, 21 C.F.R. pt. 1140 (2013). CTP seeks a civil money penalty of \$500.

On November 13, 2014, CTP served the Complaint on Respondent by United Parcel Service, pursuant to 21 C.F.R. §§ 17.5 and 17.7. In the Complaint and accompanying cover letter, CTP explained that within 30 days, Respondent should pay the proposed penalty, file an answer, or request an extension of time within which to file an answer. CTP warned Respondent that if it failed to take one of these actions within 30 days, an Administrative Law Judge could, pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 17.11, issue an initial decision ordering Respondent to pay the full amount of the proposed penalty.

Respondent has not filed an answer within the time provided by regulation, nor has it requested an extension. Pursuant to 21 C.F.R. § 17.11(a), I am required to "assume the facts alleged in the [C]omplaint to be true" and, if those facts establish liability under the Act, issue a default judgment and impose a civil money penalty. Accordingly, I must determine whether the allegations in the Complaint establish violations of the Act.

Specifically, CTP alleges the following facts in its Complaint:

- Respondent owns 7-Eleven 20996, an establishment that sells tobacco products and is located at 3948 Caratoke Highway, Barco, North Carolina 27917. Complaint ¶ 3.
- During an inspection of Respondent's establishment on June 4, 2013, at approximately 12:49 PM, an FDA-commissioned inspector observed that "a person younger than 18 years of age was able to purchase a package of Marlboro cigarettes . . . [.]" Complaint ¶ 10.
- On June 20, 2013, CTP issued a Warning Letter to Respondent regarding the inspector's observation from June 4, 2013. The letter explained that the observation constituted a violation of regulations found at 21 C.F.R. § 1140.14(a) and that the named violation was not necessarily intended to be an exhaustive list of all violations at the establishment. The Warning Letter went on to state that if Respondent failed to correct the violation, regulatory action by the FDA or a civil money penalty action could occur and that Respondent is responsible for complying with the law. Complaint ¶ 10.
- On July 12, 2013 CTP received a letter from Beverly Lenhart, who identified herself as a Field Consultant for 7-Eleven 20996. Ms. Lenhart stated "that the employee who sold the tobacco product to the minor no longer works at the establishment. Ms. Lenhar also stated that Respondent's employees would retake the 'Come of Age training module on age restricted sales' and that Respondent would discipline any employee who 'fails to properly complete an age restricted sale." Further, Ms. Lenhart stated that "Respondent requires employees to use an identification scanner for tobacco purchases and, if the identification will not scan,

Respondent requires employees to manually enter the purchaser's birth date as it appears on the identification." Complaint ¶ 11.

• During a subsequent inspection of Respondent's establishment on May 17, 2014, at approximately 9:13 PM, FDA-commissioned inspectors documented that "a person younger than 18 years of age was able to purchase a package of Marlboro cigarettes ... [.]" The inspector also observed that "the minor's identification was not verified before the sale" Complaint ¶ 1.

These facts establish that Respondent is liable under the Act. The Act prohibits misbranding of a tobacco product. 21 U.S.C. § 331(k). A tobacco product is misbranded if distributed or offered for sale in any state in violation of regulations issued under section 906(d) of the Act. 21 U.S.C. § 387c(a)(7)(B); 21 C.F.R. § 1140.1(b). The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services issued the regulations at 21 C.F.R. pt. 1140 under section 906(d) of the Act. 21 U.S.C. § 387a-1; *see* 21 U.S.C. § 387f(d)(1); 75 Fed. Reg. 13,225, 13,229 (Mar. 19, 2010). The regulations prohibit the sale of cigarettes to any person younger than 18 years of age. 21 C.F.R. § 1140.14(a). The regulations also require retailers to verify, by means of photo identification containing a purchaser's date of birth, that no cigarette purchasers are younger than 18 years of age. 21 C.F.R. § 1140.14(b)(1).

Taking the above alleged facts as true, on June 4, 2013 and May 17, 2014, the Respondent violated the prohibition against selling tobacco products to persons younger than 18 years of age, 21 C.F.R. § 1140.14(a). On May 17, 2014, the Respondent also violated the requirement that retailers verify, by means of photo identification containing a purchaser's date of birth, that no cigarette purchasers are younger than 18 years of age. 21 C.F.R. § 1140.14(b)(1). Therefore, Respondent's actions constitute violations of law that merit a civil money penalty.

CTP has requested a fine of \$500, which is a permissible fine under the regulations. 21 C.F.R. § 17.2. Therefore, I find that a civil money penalty of \$500 is warranted and so order one imposed.

/s/ Steven T. Kessel Administrative Law Judge