PUBLIC RECORDS / WORKED EXAMPLE

Dollar General: shelf-price evidence

Case walkthrough

Prepared by Dossier Editorial | November 21, 2026

EVIDENCE SOURCES	EVIDENCE CHECKED	PUBLISHER INSTITUTIONS
7	2026-11-21	4

SECTIONS	READER QUESTIONS	REVIEW SCOPE
9	4	Public records

EVIDENCE CHECKED	2026-11-21
EDITION	1 | Public-source research
ARTICLE	dossierplus.ai/blog/dollar-general-shelf-price-overcharge-inspection-evidence

IMPORTANT USE NOTE

Prepared by Dossier Editorial with AI assistance from public filings, agency records and the company's statement. This educational document review does not claim a live Dossier investigation, human approval, legal review or access to private customer records. It does not determine anyone's entitlement to compensation.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

PART 01

The decision in brief

Match the exact product, advertised price, purchase conditions and final register charge, then keep inspection statistics separate from individual transactions. The FTC's November 20, 2026 amended Dollar General complaint supplies a worked example: 11 errors among 50 tested products, including eight overcharges. Those are pleaded inspection results, not a court finding, a national overcharge rate or proof that a particular shopper received a refund.

Publication date: November 21, 2026. Historical event dates are identified separately. This PDF and the article use the same structured source selection and findings.

PART 02

Executive summary

- The November 20 amendment added ten states, bringing the FTC's state partners to 30. The new document is a complaint seeking relief, not an entered judgment.
- For the Strong, Arkansas example, 11 ÷ 50 = 22% pricing errors; eight ÷ 50 = 16% overcharged items; eight ÷ 11 is about 72.7% of errors were overcharges. Each percentage answers a different question.
- The defensible output is a dated evidence table: what was alleged, what the original inspection supports, what a transaction proves, and what remains unresolved. [S1] [S2]

Current outcome: a broader pending enforcement case with contested allegations. The reviewed record does not establish a merits judgment, a case-wide refund program or a payment to an individual shopper. [S1] [S4] [S5]

PART 03

Identify the company and the exact proceeding

The defendant is Dollar General Corporation, also doing business as Dollar General. The action is Federal Trade Commission et al. v. Dollar General Corporation, U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Tennessee, No. 3:26-cv-01693. FTC identifiers 2623006 and X270004 are agency matter/file references; they are not additional court cases. [S1] [S5]

The original complaint is Document 1, filed October 26, 2026, 95 pages. The first amended complaint is Document 102, filed November 20, 119 pages. Its filing stamp and caption control the document identity. The FTC library retains an older long-form caption alongside its newer timeline, so a copied page heading alone can leave the state count out of date. [S1] [S3] [S5]

PART 04

Chronology: preserve the event, filing and check dates

The amendment is this article's new development. The inspection below occurred in 2025; publishing its analysis today does not turn it into a new inspection.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

DATE	PUBLIC RECORD	WHAT IT ESTABLISHES
October 25, 2025	Strong, Arkansas inspection described in amended paragraph 81	Historical inspection alleged by plaintiffs; underlying worksheet not obtained. [S1]
October 26, 2026	Document 1 and Dollar General's public response	Original lawsuit and the company's dated position, including its challenge to redress methodology. [S3] [S4]
November 20, 2026	Document 102 and FTC announcement	Ten additional states joined; the filed amendment remains a pleading. [S1] [S2]
November 21, 2026	FTC library and court public-feed check	FTC status: pending. The court feed includes a later entry labeled Seal, number 105; that label alone does not reveal its substance. [S5] [S7]

The added states are Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Minnesota, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina and South Dakota. Their participation does not establish that every store failed an inspection or that every purchase produced an overcharge. [S2]

PART 05

Calculate the right rate for the right question

Paragraph 81 alleges that a Strong store had 11 incorrectly priced products in a 50-product inspection, with eight of those errors producing overcharges totaling $4.85. The calculations below reproduce the pleaded counts. We did not independently obtain the inspection report, item list or register records. [S1]

QUESTION	CALCULATION	LIMITED INTERPRETATION
How many tested products had pricing errors?	11 / 50 = 22%	Share of the inspected products with an alleged error. [S1]
How many tested products produced overcharges?	8 / 50 = 16%	Share of tested products with alleged overcharges. [S1]
What share of the errors were overcharges?	8 / 11 is about 72.7%	Composition of the errors; not the share of all products. [S1]
How much did the example total?	$4.85, as pleaded	An inspection total; not a national loss estimate or verified consumer reimbursement. [S1]

These are different measures, even though they come from the same paragraph. None tells us the percentage of all Dollar General shoppers overcharged. The complaint also describes 99 inspections of 54 North Carolina stores and at least 1,168 pricing inaccuracies. Inspections, stores and inaccurate items are different units; without the tested-item denominator, those counts do not yield an item-level error percentage. [S1]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

PART 06

Read the inspection method before using a percentage

NIST Handbook 130's 2026 price-verification procedure distinguishes sampling plans, records errors and preserves supporting receipts. Its Table 1 varies the sample and pass/fail rules by store type and stage. Note 2 on printed page 239 cautions against using routine inspection sample sizes to estimate overall store price accuracy. [S6]

The procedure also preserves state and local requirements. A sample acceptance threshold is not permission to overcharge customers. Before applying a rule to this case, obtain the jurisdiction's operative procedure for the inspection date, the sampling plan and any documented exclusions. We use NIST here to frame the review; we have not independently verified which protocol governed the Strong inspection. [S6]

PART 07

Include the company's response and the missing records

Dollar General's October 26 statement says it aims for complete shelf/register accuracy, acknowledges occasional discrepancies and says staff are expected to correct them. It describes process improvements and disputes both the FTC's consumer-redress calculation and its legal theory under the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. This is the company's position on the original lawsuit, not a newly obtained response to the November 20 amendment. [S4]

A stated goal does not demonstrate achieved accuracy; a policy does not prove that a specific correction occurred. Likewise, disagreement over methodology is not a court ruling rejecting it. Keep both sides' positions in the evidence record while seeking the documents that could resolve the disagreement.

- Original inspection worksheets, product identifiers and receipts for the examples were not independently obtained.
- The amended complaint's internal-audit discussion includes redactions. Missing numbers cannot be reconstructed from the surrounding allegations.
- The request for injunctive and monetary relief on pages 98–99 is a request to the court. It is not an order awarding those remedies.
- The FTC library and current court feed are bounded status checks, not a complete docket review. The underlying document for feed entry 105 was not obtained; no inference about liability is drawn from its label. [S1] [S5] [S7]

PART 08

Decision tree: what can the evidence support?

Use each question to determine the next defensible statement. A missing record narrows the conclusion and supplies a concrete follow-up task.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

1. IS THE EXACT PRODUCT AND APPLICABLE ADVERTISED PRICE ESTABLISHED?

- If established: Record the UPC/SKU, pack size, quantity, shelf or promotion date and applicable conditions. Compare like with like.
- If unresolved: Keep the price mismatch unresolved; a nearby shelf label or different pack size is insufficient.

2. IS THE FINAL CHARGED PRICE DOCUMENTED FOR THAT TRANSACTION?

- If established: Compare the receipt line after applicable discounts with the established price; record taxes and other adjustments separately.
- If unresolved: Describe a displayed or scanned discrepancy only. Do not assert completed customer loss.

3. ARE THE INSPECTION INPUTS AND GOVERNING PROCEDURE AVAILABLE?

- If established: Reconcile tested items, errors, overcharges, exclusions and repeat visits; label each numerator and denominator.
- If unresolved: Report the pleading's figures as allegations. Do not extrapolate to every store or shopper.

4. IS A CORRECTION, REFUND OR COURT OUTCOME SUPPORTED BY ITS OWN RECORD?

- If established: Record the dated correction or payment evidence, or the actual entered order and its scope. Preserve earlier status.
- If unresolved: Retain requested, promised, disputed or pending status. Do not convert any of those into received or adjudicated.

PART 09

Reproduce the review in a Dossier workspace

- Start a public-source review titled Dollar General shelf pricing, with case number 3:26-cv-01693, evidence cutoff November 21, 2026 and the concrete question about price verification.
- Add the original and amended complaints as separate versions. Preserve download URLs, capture times, hashes, page numbers and filing stamps; link the amendment to the earlier pleading.
- Create one source-linked claim per proposition. Mark paragraph 81 as plaintiffs' allegation, the three percentages as calculations from its counts, and the company's response as an attributed position.
- Use a transaction worksheet with product identifier, pack size, quantity, advertised price, promotion terms, final receipt charge, adjustment, refund evidence and unresolved mismatch. Leave absent fields blank rather than estimating.
- Build dated timeline entries for the inspection, original filing, company statement, amendment and evidence check. Record the current outcome separately from historical allegations.
- Export a reader-facing report with the decision tree and source register. Keep raw captures and QA receipts separate; exclude customer identities and payment details from public examples.

This is a reproducible authoring workflow, not a claim that a customer matter was created or that Dossier ran a paid provider investigation. The accompanying PDF uses the same article content and source references.

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

PART 10

Evidence that would justify the next installment

A useful follow-up would add original inspection records, an available answer or substantive motion, an entered order, a documented settlement, or a verifiable correction and payment record. Compare new evidence with the specific open question it resolves; a new procedural entry alone does not establish the merits.

- For the Strong example: obtain the worksheet and receipt evidence, match the 50 tested products and reconcile the 11 errors, eight overcharges and $4.85 total.
- For a broader rate: obtain the sampling design, full tested-item denominator, selection criteria and repeat-inspection handling before making a population claim.
- For a refund outcome: identify the operative terms, eligible transaction and dated disbursement or receipt evidence; a requested remedy or company service policy is insufficient.

Related Dossier walkthroughs on Cleo's entered settlement order and Hims & Hers' legal accrual apply the same discipline to remedies and accounting estimates. Related-case links on the blog let readers compare those evidence thresholds.

PART 11

Questions readers ask

DID DOLLAR GENERAL LOSE THE FTC CASE WHEN TEN MORE STATES JOINED?

The November 20 record is an amended complaint. The FTC library still lists the matter as pending. Added plaintiffs do not establish a merits judgment, and this review did not obtain a complete court docket. [S1] [S2] [S5]

DOES A 22% ERROR RATE MEAN 22% OF SHOPPERS WERE OVERCHARGED?

No. In the pleaded Strong example, 22% describes 11 pricing errors among 50 tested products. Eight tested products allegedly produced overcharges, or 16%. Neither measure is a shopper-level or national rate. [S1]

WHAT EVIDENCE HELPS VERIFY AN INDIVIDUAL PRICE MISMATCH?

A product identifier and pack size, contemporaneous advertised price and applicable promotion terms, plus the final receipt charge. Corrections and refunds need separate dated evidence. Do not infer a completed charge from a display alone.

CAN THIS ARTICLE TELL ME WHETHER I AM OWED A REFUND?

No. It does not verify an individual purchase, determine eligibility or establish a refund program. The complaint requests relief; a payment outcome requires its own supporting record. [S1]

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC

PART 12

Linked source register

Titles with a recorded URL link to that source. Entries without a URL identify retained material but do not open an original file. For any court or business record being used in litigation, obtain a certified copy directly from the clerk or filing authority and preserve the retrieval date.

S1 **First amended complaint against Dollar General**
Filed complaint. Anchor: Document 102, filed November 20, 2026; pp. 1–2, 39–40 (paragraphs 81 and 89–91), 98–99. Original court-stamped pleading. Allegations and requested relief, not judicial findings. Underlying inspection records not independently obtained. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S2 **Ten additional states join the Dollar General lawsuit**
Agency announcement. Anchor: November 20, 2026; added-state list and amended-complaint link. Agency account of the amendment; not an independent publisher from the FTC-hosted pleadings. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S3 **Original Dollar General complaint**
Filed complaint. Anchor: Document 1, filed October 26, 2026; pp. 1–2, caption and filing stamp. Original 95-page pleading retained for version and party comparison; superseded by the first amendment for this walkthrough. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S4 **Dollar General statement regarding the FTC lawsuit**
Company statement. Anchor: October 26, 2026; accuracy goal, corrective policy, redress methodology and GLB Act discussion. Company position on the original complaint. Substantive rendered text captured; no November 20 response or independently verified remediation is claimed. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S5 **FTC Dollar General case library**
Case-status index. Anchor: Matter 2623006 / X270004; 3:26-cv-01693; pending status and November 20 timeline. Checked November 21. Agency index, not a complete court docket; older long-form caption persists beside newer timeline. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S6 **NIST Handbook 130: price verification procedure**
Government measurement guidance. Anchor: 2026 edition, Section V; printed pp. 233, 237–239 and 247–249; Table 1, note 2, Sections 8–10. General method and scope limitations. Jurisdiction-specific adoption and the historical Strong inspection protocol were not independently verified. · retrieved 2026-11-21

S7 **Middle District of Tennessee public case feed**
Public docket-event feed. Anchor: Captured November 21, 2026; 3:26-cv-01693, entry 105, feed timestamp 01:18:09 UTC. Mutable feed lists Seal and entry 103 Appear Pro Hac Vice. Underlying entry 105 and complete docket not obtained; labels do not establish merits. · retrieved 2026-11-21

Generated by Dossier · Doc ID DSR-4DST-GEYZ-ZNBT · Seal 0DD2C2D4FC9F · SHA-256 DBBA8B69AD4D5759 · Issued 2026-11-21 17:14 UTC