

California Wage/Hour Update



FISHER & PHILLIPS LLP

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Solutions at Work®

www.laborlawyers.com

2009, No.2

Federal Court Withdraws Decision Awarding Overtime To Non-Residents Who Work In California

By Ron S. Brand (Irvine)

As we reported in our last issue (*California Wage/Hour Update, No. 1, January 2009*), the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit recently ruled that the overtime provisions of California's Labor Code apply to work performed in California by non-resident employees. *Sullivan v. Oracle Corporation*.

In a surprising move, the Ninth Circuit recently withdrew its decision and requested the California Supreme Court to address the issue.

Background

Oracle, the large software company, employs hundreds of workers to train its customers in the use of its software. Oracle calls these employees "Instructors," and requires work-related travel to destinations away from their city of domicile. For a number of years, Oracle classified these Instructors as "teachers" who are exempt from the overtime provisions of California's Labor Code (Labor Code) and the federal Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA).

In 2003, Oracle reclassified its California-based Instructors and began paying them overtime under the Labor Code. Oracle's reclassification of its Instructors appears to have been prompted by a 2003 class action in federal district court in California brought by Instructors claiming that Oracle misclassified them under the Labor Code and the FLSA. The class action was settled, but current and former Instructors who may have worked in California when they were not a resident of California were excepted from the settlement.

In the *Sullivan* case, three non-residents of California who performed some of their work as Instructors in California, brought a would-be class action in California state court against Oracle. The lawsuit alleged that Oracle failed to pay overtime to Instructors domiciled in other states, but who worked in California, and sought damages under the Labor Code. Oracle removed the case to federal district court on jurisdictional grounds.

The federal district court dismissed all of the Instructors' claims, holding that the Labor Code does not apply to non-residents who work primarily in other states. The employees then appealed the ruling to the

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. That Court held that the overtime provisions of the Labor Code do apply to work performed in California by non-residents, and that applying them does not violate the United States Constitution.

Passing The Overtime Buck

In withdrawing its decision, the Ninth Circuit certified the following question to the California Supreme Court: Does the Labor Code apply to overtime work performed in California for a California-based employer by non-resident employees, such that overtime pay is required for work in excess of eight hours per day or in excess of forty hours per week?

The Court found that there was no directly controlling precedent on this question, and recognized that the answer to this question will have considerable impact on California employers and non-resident employees. Furthermore, the Court believed that the answer to this question may have an appreciable economic impact on the overall labor market in California, given the competitive advantage non-resident employees may have over resident employees if overtime pay under the Labor Code is not required for work they perform in California.

Impact Of Withdrawing The Opinion

As a result of the Court of Appeals' action, California state courts are not permitted to adopt or cite to the decision until the California Supreme Court addresses the question posed. In the meantime, we advise caution. California employers that hire non-residents to perform work in California should abide by the overtime provisions of the Labor Code and pay those individuals for all overtime hours worked (unless an overtime exemption applies under California's more stringent requirements).

To talk about how the opinion affects your particular operation, give us a call.

For more information, email the author at rbrand@laborlawyers.com or call 949.851.2424.

Some Key Points For Wage/Hour Compliance

By John K. Skousen (Irvine)

Whether the economy is still declining or on the rebound, one thing is clear: the storm of wage & hour litigation continues to buffet employers, an increasing trend that began long before the current recession and plague of unemployment in California. Two key historical facts have contributed significantly to the rise of such litigation in California beginning this decade.

First, the restoration of daily overtime in January, 2000, and subsequent legislation adding numerous penalties and providing further incentives for attorneys to bring wage claims. Second, the current recession which has resulted in increased claims filed by unemployed individuals seeking money.

The Main Trouble Spots

Your best bet is to identify potential problem areas and take proactive measures to achieve and maintain compliance on wage & hour matters. The principal areas of concern should be the following:

Training. With turnover and hiring in flux, new employees assigned to duties requiring expertise in payroll and wage & hour compliance expertise must be provided with adequate training. Do not assume that managers or administrators, even those with some background in wage & hour matters, are up to speed.

Continued on next page

Some Key Points For Wage/Hour Compliance

Continued from previous page

Meal Period Compliance. A significant number of claims involve meal period compliance. Employees in California are entitled to one uninterrupted 30-minute off-duty meal period if they are working more than 5 hours, and a second meal period if they work more than 10 hours on any work day. The starting and stopping times of these meal periods must be recorded.

Employers must also pay an additional premium of one hour of pay if the meals are not provided as required by law. The issue of whether an employer has to assure that meal periods are taken, or merely make them available, is on review by the California Supreme Court. But at the very least you cannot interfere with an employee's right to enjoy a meal period.

Strict conditions also apply to implementing valid waivers in specific situations. Employers should schedule specific times for meal periods and require all employees to take and record their meal periods or face discipline for non-compliance. Set out meal-period policies in the employee handbook, with procedures for obtaining an employee's acknowledgment that the policy was received and understood. Merely posting the applicable Wage Order in areas frequented by employees will *not* suffice to show that meal periods were actually provided.

Rest Period Compliance. An employee is entitled to a rest period of at least 10 minutes "net rest" for every 4 hours of work ("or major fraction thereof"), which should be permitted to be taken, if "practicable," in the middle of this work period. These rest periods need not be recorded and are paid working time. The no-documentation requirement may seem to lighten the burden on employers, but disputes as to whether a rest period was permitted on specific occasions often arise.

Thus, periodic signed acknowledgments should be obtained from employees confirming that breaks have been provided. The facts of each case become critical. For example, employees working with tight

schedules or in remote locations without relief may bring a rest-period claim.

Overtime Compensation. Many wage & hour lawsuits involve alleged unpaid overtime. Improper documentation of hours worked (including unpaid on-duty meal periods that are recorded as "off duty") often becomes the basis for claims for unpaid overtime. Independent contractors and salaried exempt employees who claim they were misclassified generally have not kept time records, making it more difficult to defend overtime claims. Some claims involve bad arithmetic or oversights. Key areas of concern include the following:

- **Bonus compensation:** most non-discretionary production bonuses should be included in the employee's regular rate for overtime compensation purposes.
- **Work performed by an employee for "joint employers":** work for different corporate entities or affiliated enterprises with different owners, must be amalgamated for overtime purposes. Whether two entities are "joint employers" is a mixed issue of fact and law which is determined on a case-by-case basis.
- **Exemptions:** effective January 1, 2009, the minimum compensation for highly skilled computer employees exempt from overtime requirements increased from \$36.00 to \$37.94 per hour, with the minimum annual of salary of \$79,050. If employees otherwise qualifying for this exemption are earning less than this threshold, their compensation must be increased to preserve the exemption.

Other overtime claims have resulted from improper deductions from an exempt employee's salary, or the alleged failure of employees to principally perform duties that qualify for an exemption. Periodic performance reviews and self-audits with support from legal counsel are recommended for exempt positions.

Hours Worked. You should carefully monitor how employees' time is being recorded for on-duty standby, travel, training events, and employer gatherings including employer-furnished meals. In California, "hours worked" is defined as time when employees are "suffered or permitted to work" or under the control of the employer. Strict policies should be implemented prohibiting "off the clock" work, and work performed outside the employer's premises should be authorized by the employer and timely recorded as with all other hours worked for the week. And of course documentation should be closely monitored and authenticated by employees each pay period.

Other Pay Practices. We see many claims involving technical compliance issues. For example, employers who fail to pay wages in a timely manner may be subject to penalties. Different standards and types of penalties apply depending on whether the payment was late for a regular pay period or upon termination of employment. In addition to making timely payment, if employees are not provided an itemized statement required by law, additional penalties could result. Deductions from earned wages are permitted only in special circumstances and generally require a written authorization signed by the employee. All accrued but unused vacation must be paid with final wages upon termination.

Informal Resolution. A number of claims arise as a direct result of an employer's improper or incomplete resolution of incorrect payroll practices. As evident from case law and recent legislation, a release of liability signed by an employee may not be proper or enforceable in all situations.

The best way to catch and correct these mistakes is through a thorough internal audit, not a lawsuit. We can help with such an audit, as well as in resolving any claims and achieving full compliance going forward.

For more information, email the author at jskousen@laborlawyers.com or call 949.851.2424.

The *California Wage/Hour Update* is a quarterly publication of Fisher & Phillips LLP and should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information purposes only, and you are urged to consult counsel concerning your own situation and any specific legal questions you may have. Fisher & Phillips LLP lawyers are available for presentations on a wide variety of labor and employment topics.

Office Locations

Atlanta phone (404) 231-1400	Houston phone (713) 292-0150	Orlando phone (407) 541-0888
Charlotte phone (704) 334-4565	Irvine phone (949) 851-2424	Philadelphia phone (610) 230-2150
Chicago phone (312) 346-8061	Kansas City phone (816) 842-8770	Portland ME phone (207) 774-6001
Columbia phone (803) 255-0000	Las Vegas phone (702) 252-3131	Portland OR phone (503) 242-4262
Dallas phone (214) 220-9100	Louisville phone (502) 561-3990	San Diego phone (858) 597-9600
Denver phone (303) 218-3650	New Jersey phone (908) 516-1050	San Francisco phone (415) 490-9000
Fort Lauderdale phone (954) 525-4800	New Orleans phone (504) 522-3303	Tampa phone (813) 769-7500

Fisher & Phillips LLP represents employers nationally in labor, employment, civil rights, employee benefits, and immigration matters

We're interested in your opinion. If you have any suggestions about how we can improve the *California Wage/Hour Update*, let us know by contacting your Fisher & Phillips attorney or email the editor at mmitchell@laborlawyers.com.

How to ensure continued receipt of this newsletter

If you would like to continue to receive our newsletters and other important information such as Legal Alerts and seminar information via email, then please take a moment right now to make sure your spam filters are set to allow transmissions from the following addresses: communications@laborlawyers.com or seminars@laborlawyers.com. If you currently receive communications from us by regular mail, and would like to begin receiving them by email, please send a request to communications@laborlawyers.com.