



## 2018 Legislative and Case Law Update

December 5, Irvine | December 6, Los Angeles | December 6, San Francisco  
December 7, San Diego | December 8, Sacramento | December 13, Ontario

*An Employment Law Breakfast Briefing with*



**ON THE FRONT LINES  
OF WORKPLACE LAW™**

**Irvine**  
2050 Main Street  
Suite 1000  
Irvine, CA 92614  
(949) 851-2424

**Los Angeles**  
444 South Flower Street  
Suite 1590  
Los Angeles, CA 90071  
(213) 330-4500

**Sacramento**  
621 Capitol Mall  
Suite 1400  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 210-0400

**San Diego**  
4747 Executive Drive  
Suite 1000  
San Diego, CA 92121  
(858) 597-9600

**San Francisco**  
One Embarcadero Center  
Suite 2050  
San Francisco, CA 94111  
(415) 490-9000

[www.fisherphillips.com](http://www.fisherphillips.com)

Atlanta Baltimore Boston Charlotte Chicago Cleveland Columbia Columbus Dallas Denver Fort Lauderdale Gulfport Houston Irvine Kansas City Las Vegas Los Angeles  
Louisville Memphis New Jersey New Orleans New York Orlando Philadelphia Phoenix Portland Sacramento San Diego San Francisco Seattle Tampa Washington, DC



**San Diego  
2018 Legislative Update  
December 7, 2017**

**PROGRAM AGENDA**

<b>TIME</b>	<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>PRESENTER</b>
<b>8:30 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.</b>	Registration & Breakfast	
<b>9:00 a.m. – 10:15 a.m.</b>	Legislative Update	Chris Hoffman
<b>10:15 a.m. – 10:30 a.m.</b>	Break	
<b>10:30 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.</b>	Case Law Update	Megan Winter
<b>11:15 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.</b>	Benefits	Melissa Shimizu



## Update on New California Laws for 2018

December 5-13, 2017

Presented by:  
Chris Hoffman  
Phone: (858) 597-9610  
Email: [choffman@fisherphillips.com](mailto:choffman@fisherphillips.com)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### A Very Busy Legislative Year



• **2,495 bills were introduced in January!**

- Hundreds had to do with labor/employment issues.
- Legislative process dwindled these down.
- Governor Brown signed a number of bills aimed at countering President Trump's agenda.

[fisherphillips.com](http://fisherphillips.com)

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – “Ban the Box”



- Prior state law applied only to public employers (cannot inquire about criminal history until employer determines applicant meets minimum qualifications).
- This new law applies to public and **private** employers.
- Based on City of Los Angeles ordinance but requirements are different.

[fisherphillips.com](http://fisherphillips.com)

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – “Ban the Box”

- Applies to employers with **5 or more** employees.
- **GENERAL RULE - Cannot consider criminal history until a conditional offer of employment has been made.**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Job Applications

- Employers are prohibited from including on any application any question that seeks the disclosure of the applicant’s conviction history *before the employer makes a conditional offer of employment*.
- Review job applications now.
- Any questions or “boxes” that ask about criminal conviction history should be eliminated.
- You can still advise applicants that you may consider conviction history after a conditional offer is extended.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Criminal History Inquiry

- When conditional offer is made, require the applicant to disclose in writing any criminal convictions, and to certify that all information provided on the form is true and correct.
- The form should include a written warning that in the event of falsification or omission of material fact, the applicant will not be hired or, if hired, will be subject to immediate termination.
- Applicant should be advised that the offer is contingent upon the outcomes of the criminal history inquiry, a background check (if conducted) and pre-employment drug test (if administered).
- **This preserves the “honesty test” previously provided by the box on the application.**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Interview Process

- You may not inquire about criminal conviction history during interview process.
- Train any staff who are involved in the hiring process.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Individualized Assessment

- Before you can deny the applicant the position based on prior criminal convictions you must conduct an **individualized assessment**.
- This assessment must analyze whether the conviction has a direct and adverse relationship with the specific duties of the position.
- The **individualized assessment** must consider:
  - 1) Nature and gravity of offense.
  - 2) Time that has passed since offense.
  - 3) The nature of the job held or sought.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Notice Requirement # 1

- If you tentatively decide to disqualify an applicant, must you notify them in writing.
- The notice may (but is not required to) explain your reasoning, but it must identify the conviction(s) considered.
- Notice must contain:
  - 1) Notice of the disqualifying conviction or convictions that are the basis for the tentative decision to rescind the offer.
  - 2) Copy of the conviction history report, if any.
  - 3) An explanation of the applicant's right to respond and the deadline to respond. You must inform the applicant they can submit evidence challenging the accuracy of the information, evidence of rehabilitation or mitigating circumstances, or both.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Applicant’s Response

- Applicant then has **five business days** to respond to challenge accuracy of the criminal history information or submit evidence of mitigation or rehabilitation **before the employer can make a final decision.**
- If the applicant challenges accuracy of information, he/she must be given an **additional five business days.**
- You must consider the applicant’s response.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 – Notice Requirement # 2

- If you make a final decision to deny employment, **you must notify the applicant in writing.**
- Notice must contain:
  - 1) The final denial or disqualification. You may, but you are not required to, justify or explain your reasoning.
  - 2) You must disclose any existing procedure for appealing the decision.
  - 3) You must state that the applicant may file a complaint with the **Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH).**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 1008 - Exceptions

**The new law does not apply to the following:**

- A position with a state or local agency required by law to conduct a conviction history background check.
- A position with a criminal history agency (Penal Code 13101).
- A position as a Farm Labor Contractor.
- A position where the employer is required by state, federal or local law to conduct criminal background checks or restrict employment based on criminal history (includes the Securities and Exchange Act).

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## AB 1008 – Local Ordinances

### Does AB 1008 supersede local ordinances (LA, SF)?

- Unfortunately no.
- The new law specifically provides that it does not affect other rights and remedies that an applicant may have under any other law, “including any local ordinance.”
- Employers in local jurisdictions with ordinances will have to comply with both AB 1008 and the local ordinance.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## AB 1008 – Ban the Box

### Employer Dilemma

- Do I deny employment based on criminal history and risk FEHA lawsuit?
- Or
- Do I hire applicant and risk liability for negligent hiring and retention?



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Relation Between AB 1008 and New FEHC Criminal History Regulations



- Some overlap.
- Similar terms and procedural requirements.
- But some contradictions as well.
- AB 1008 imposes a **process**.
- FEHC says may have to “revisit” the regulations in light of passage of AB 1008, but no timeline.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 168 – No Salary History Inquiries

- Part of growing nationwide trend (Delaware, Oregon, Massachusetts, SF, NYC, Philadelphia).
- Proponents argue that salary history inquiries perpetuate wage inequality when employers base a new hire's compensation on prior rate of pay.



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 168 – What *Can't* Employers Do?

- You may not seek salary history information, orally or in writing, personally or through an agent, about an applicant for employment (this includes inquiring through recruiter or during reference checks).
- "Salary history information" includes compensation and benefits.
- You cannot rely on salary history as a factor in determining whether to offer job or what salary to offer.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 168 – What *Must* Employers Do?

- Upon reasonable request, you must provide the pay scale information to an applicant applying for employment.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### AB 168 – Does Not Prohibit Voluntary Disclosure

- Does not prohibit an applicant from “**voluntarily and without prompting**” disclosing salary history information to a prospective employer.
- If the applicant does so, you may consider or rely on that information in determining the salary for that applicant.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 450 - Immigration

- Largely a response to actions of Trump Administration.
- Puts employers right in the middle of the immigration debate.



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 450 – No More “Voluntary Consent”

- Employer must demand a **judicial warrant** before granting ICE access to any non-public area of the worksite.
- Employer must demand a **subpoena or judicial warrant** before granting ICE access to review or obtain employee records.
- Does not apply to “Notice of Inspection” for I-9 and other forms.
- Bottom line – you no longer may “**voluntarily consent**” to ICE access.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 450 – Notice of Worksite Inspection

- Employer shall post a **notice** at the worksite within 72 hours of receiving a Notice of Inspection (NOI) with the following info:
  - 1) The name of the agency conducting the inspection.
  - 2) The date the employer received the notice.
  - 3) The “nature of the inspection” to the extent known.
- Written notice must also be provided to the employees’ union (if any) within 72 hours.
- Labor Commissioner will develop a template by July 1, 2018.
- Must provide an employee with a **copy** of the NOI “upon reasonable request.”

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 450 – Notice of Results

- Employer must provide each affected employee (and union, if any) with a **copy** of the notice that provides the results of inspection (typically a “Notice of Suspect Documents”) within 72 hours of receipt.
- Must also provide written notice (within 72 hours) to affected employees (and union, if any) of the obligations of the employer and the employee with respect to the following:
  - 1) Description of any deficiencies or other items identified.
  - 2) The time period for correcting any deficiencies.
  - 3) The time and date of any meeting with employer to correct deficiencies.
  - 4) Notice that the employee has the right to representation during any meetings with the employer.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### AB 450 – No Re-Verification of Current Employees

- You may not **re-verify** the employment eligibility of a **current** employee at a time or in a manner not required by federal law, or that would violate any E-Verify MOU the employer has with the Department of Homeland Security.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## AB 450 - Immigration

- Any violation of any of the above is punishable by civil penalty of between **\$2,000 and \$10,000**.
- Law was amended to provide for exclusive enforcement by Labor Commissioner or Attorney General by civil action...
- No PAGA!

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Related Issue – SB 54 “Sanctuary State” Law

### Trump Administration Response:

- *“ICE will have no choice but to conduct at-large arrests in local neighborhoods and at **worksites**.”* (ICE Director Tom Homan 10/6/2017).
- *“We’re taking worksite enforcement very hard this year. We’ve already increased the number of inspections and worksite operations, you’re going to see that **significantly increase** this next fiscal year.”* (ICE Director Tom Homan 10/18/2017).
- ICE Director has given instruction for workplace enforcement to increase **“four or five times.”** (ICE Director Tom Homan 10/18/2017).

**What will all of this mean for California employers?**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SB 63 – Parental Leave

### Honey I Shrunk The CFRA!

*Parental Leave for Employers of  
20-49 Employees*



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### SB 63 – Parental Leave - Overview

- Applies to employers with **20 or more** employees (does not apply if CFRA/FMLA applies (50 or more)).
- Provides for **12 weeks** of job-protected parental leave (including birth, adoption, foster care placement).
- Must maintain group health insurance coverage (similar to FMLA/CFRA).
- Contains other provisions similar to CFRA (retaliation, etc.)

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### SB 63 – Who’s Covered?

#### Employees:

- Works at a worksite where there are 20 or more employees within 75 miles (may include multiple worksites).
- Has at least 12 months of service with the employer (need not be consecutive).
- Has worked at least 1,250 hours within the previous 12-month period.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### SB 63 – What’s Covered?

- **12 weeks** of leave to bond with a new child within one year of the child’s birth, adoption or foster care placement.
- Parental leave **only**. Not all of the other CFRA/FMLA types of leave.
- Unpaid leave. But employee may use accrued vacation, paid sick time, other accrued time off.
- Where both parents work for same company, employer is not required to grant more than 12 weeks of leave total. Employer may, but is not required to, grant leave to both parents simultaneously.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SB 306 - Retaliation



- Authorizes “**injunctive relief**” in retaliation cases.
- This is a court order forcing the employer to **reinstate** the employee while the case is pending.
- You **can** discipline employee for conduct unrelated to the retaliation claim.
- Allows the Labor Commissioner to cite for retaliation claims without an employee complaint.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SB 306 - Retaliation

- The employee can seek injunction on his or her own.
- Employee can petition for reinstatement in pending lawsuits that include a Labor Code section 1102.5 claim.
  - Whistleblower claims – internal and external.
  - Retaliation for refusing to participate in illegal activity.
- **Burden** – “reasonable cause” to believe unlawful retaliation has occurred (much lower standard than normally required for injunctions).

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SB 306 - Retaliation

### The Next Big Bargaining Chip:

Pay up, or look at this face every day when you come to work!



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## SB 396 – Sexual Harassment Training (AB 1825)

### The “Transgender Work Opportunity Act”



- Requires sexual harassment training to include harassment based on *gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation*.
- Does not increase overall “two hours” requirement.
- Also requires posting of a poster on “transgender rights.”

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## AB 1701 – General Contractor Joint Liability

- Applies to **private** construction projects.
- General contractor is liable for any wage or fringe benefit debt owed by a subcontractor at any tier.
- Suit may be brought by Labor Commissioner, trust fund or joint labor-management committee.
- Applies to contracts entered on or after January 1, 2018.



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Increase in State Minimum Wage

- For employers of **26 or more** employees minimum wage will increase to **\$11.00** per hour effective January 1, 2018.
- For employers of **25 or fewer** employees minimum wage will increase to **\$10.50** per hour effective January 1, 2018.



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Increase in Minimum Wage Increases Other Minimums Too...**

- For employers of **26 or more** employees, minimum salary for “white collar” overtime exemption will increase to **\$45,760** per year effective January 1, 2018.
- For employers of **25 or fewer** employees minimum salary for “white collar” overtime exemption will increase to **\$43,680** per year effective January 1, 2018.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Increase in Minimum Wage Increases Other Minimums Too...**

- For employers of **26 or more** employees, the minimum wage for employees who are required to provide their own hand tools will increase to **\$22.00** per hour effective January 1, 2018.
- For employers of **25 or fewer** employees minimum wage for employees who are required to provide their own hand tools will increase to **\$21.00** per hour effective January 1, 2018.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Increase in Minimum Wage Increases Other Minimums Too...**

- For employers of **26 or more** employees the minimum earnings per hour to qualify for the inside salesperson exemption from overtime in a given workweek will increase to **\$16.51** per effective January 1, 2018.
- For employers of **25 or fewer** employees the minimum earnings per hour to qualify for the inside salesperson exemption from overtime in a given workweek will increase to **\$15.76** per effective January 1, 2018.

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Final Questions**

Presented by:  
**Chris Hoffman**  
Phone: (858) 597-9610  
Email: [choffman@fisherphillips.com](mailto:choffman@fisherphillips.com)



fisherphillips.com December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Fisher Phillips**  
ON THE FRONT LINES OF WORKPLACE LAW

**December 2017  
Case Law Update**

December 5-13, 2017

Presented by:  
**Megan Winter**  
Phone: (858) 597-9622  
Email: [mwinter@fisherphillips.com](mailto:mwinter@fisherphillips.com)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.**

- Facts:
  - Security guards
  - Employer required them to keep pagers and radios on during rest breaks
  - They were seldom, if ever, actually paged



fisherphillips.com December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



### Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.

• Issue:

- Can employers require their employees to remain “on call” during rest periods?



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.

• Result:

- Plaintiffs were awarded **\$90 million** in damages, interest, and penalties (employees are entitled to one hour of pay for every day in which a 10 minute rest period is missed)
- California Supreme Court upheld the award



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.

• Rationale:

- State law requires employers to provide *off-duty* rest periods for employees
- Requiring guards to remain on call during rest periods meant they were not *off-duty* as they remained under the employer’s control



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Augustus v. ABM Security Services, Inc.**

- Takeaways:
  - You must relieve employees of all duties during rest breaks; they cannot be required to answer calls or assist customers
  - Consider requiring employees to leave their work areas during breaks
  - Because they are still “on the clock,” they are still subject to company policies while on break

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Bareno v. San Diego Community College District**

- Facts
  - Leticia Bareno was an administrative assistant at a community college
  - Bareno had a disciplinary history regarding absences
  - She requested CFRA leave and did not return when leave was up
  - Employer took the position that she “voluntarily resigned” and refused to reconsider despite receipt of certification of her need for additional leave



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Bareno v. San Diego Community College District**

- Result:
  - Trial court granted summary judgment for employer
  - Court of appeal reversed
  - Under CFRA, employee has up to 15 days to provide certification of need for additional leave



---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Bareno v. San Diego Community College District**

- Takeaways:
  - Do not fire for “job abandonment” employees who fail to return from an FMLA/CFRA leave when due
  - Instead, contact the employee and tell them they must either return to work or submit medical certification of their need for additional leave within 15 days
  - If they fail to do either, they can be terminated



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **McLean v. State**

- Facts:
  - Janis McLean, a former deputy attorney general working for the Department of Justice, retired
  - She did not receive her final pay on her last day so she filed a class action for “waiting time penalties” under the Labor Code



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **McLean v. State**

- Issue:
  - Do Labor Code sections 202 and 203 (regarding waiting time penalties) apply when employees retire?



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **McLean v. State**

- Result:
  - Prompt wage payment requirements applying to employees who “quit” also apply to employees who retire
- Waiting Time Penalties Refresher:
  - Wages due 72 hours after employee “quits”
  - Wages due immediately if employee gave 72 hours notice
  - Wages due immediately if employee is discharged
  - Penalty = up to 30 days’ pay



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Featherstone v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group**

- Facts:
  - Ruth Featherstone resigned. She told her supervisor that she resigned because “God had told her to do something else”
  - She confirmed resignation in writing
  - A few days later, she requested to rescind her resignation
  - Employer refused
  - Featherstone sued, alleging that her employer discriminated against her while she had a temporary disability



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Featherstone v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group**

- Issues:
  - Was the employer’s refusal to allow Featherstone to rescind her resignation an adverse employment action?
  - Was the employer on notice of any temporary mental disability triggering a duty to accommodate?
  - Did the employer have a duty under FEHA to engage in the interactive process?



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Featherstone v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group**

- Result:
  - Trial court awarded summary judgment for employer; appellate court affirmed
  - Employer was not required to allow employee to rescind her resignation as a “reasonable accommodation” as the employment relationship had ended
  - Employer was not on notice of any mental disability



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Featherstone v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group**

- Takeaways:
  - You need not allow an employee to rescind a resignation
  - If employee orally resigns, get it in writing (e-mail is OK)



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### **Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

- Facts:
  - Hourly, non-exempt employees brought class action lawsuit alleging that employer violated the Labor Code by not providing them with one day of rest in seven days
  - Both employees worked more than six consecutive days, on multiple occasions, with some but not all shifts being six or less hours in duration



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**Relevant Law – California Labor Code**

- Section 551 – Every person in any occupation of labor is entitled to one day’s rest in seven
- Section 552 – No employer of labor shall *cause* his employees to work more than six days in seven
- Section 556 – Sections 551 and 552 shall not apply to any employer or employee when the total hours of employment do not exceed 30 hours in any week or six hours in any one day

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**When is a day of rest required?**

- Plaintiffs’ Interpretation – On a Rolling Basis
  - One day of rest in any period of seven consecutive days
  - If you work six consecutive days, then you must have the next day off
- Employer’s Interpretation – On a Weekly Basis
  - One day of rest in a given workweek
  - Would allow employer to schedule an employee to work up to **twelve** consecutive days by starting the work week with an off day and ending the next workweek with an off day
  - **Court agreed with employer’s interpretation**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**How is the exception applied?**

- Recall that section 556 provides:
  - Sections 551 and 552 **do not apply** to any employer or employee when the total hours of employment do not exceed 30 hours in any week or six hours in any one day thereof
- Plaintiffs’ Interpretation – Each and every day of work must be six hours or less
- Employer’s Interpretation – At least one day of work must be six hours or less
- **Court agreed with plaintiffs’ interpretation**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**The rule is not absolute**

- Court recognized that Labor Code section 554 allows for an accumulation of days of rest when the nature of the work reasonably requires that the employee work 7 or more consecutive days, so long as in each calendar month the employee receives the equivalent of one day's rest in seven.
- Overtime laws contemplate work on the 7th day at 1-1/2 times regular rate for first 8 hours and 2 times regular rate for more than 8 hours
- **If the number of days of rest in a month equal or exceed the number of calendar days divided by 7, the statute will be satisfied**

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**What does it mean for an employer to *cause* its employees to work more than six days in seven?**

- Plaintiffs' Interpretation – "cause" means allow, suffer, or permit to work
- Employer's Interpretation – "cause" means requires, forces, or coerces work
- **Court arrived at a middle ground:** "An employer causes its employees to go without a day of rest when it induces the employee to forgo rest to which he or she is entitled. An employer is not . . . forbidden from permitting or allowing an employee, fully apprised of the entitlement to rest, independently to choose not to take a day of rest."

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Mendoza v. Nordstrom, Inc.**

**Takeaways:**

- You can comply by giving employees one day off per workweek
- You can also comply by giving employees the equivalent of one day's rest in seven every calendar month if the nature of the work requires it
- You may not induce or encourage employees from waiving their minimum days of rest but they may voluntarily agree to do so

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---


---

---

### ***Williams v. Superior Court***

• Facts:

- Plaintiff brought PAGA action against defendant retail store chain for various Labor Code violations
- Plaintiff served employer with interrogatories seeking contact information of each nonexempt California employee in the relevant time period
- Employer refused to provide information



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### ***Williams v. Superior Court***

• Result:

- Court ordered employer to produce the contact information
- Mere contact information for employees is not subject to the same right to privacy as health or financial information
- It is not unduly burdensome for employer to produce such information



fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

### ***Williams v. Superior Court***

• Takeaways:

- Employer may be subject to burdensome discovery early in most PAGA cases
- Employer's exposure will be increased in most cases as plaintiff's lawyer will have access to many potentially aggrieved employees
- More pressure on employers to settle PAGA cases early

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC

• Facts:

- Employer failed to include the last four digits of employees' social security numbers on wage statements
- Employee sued under PAGA
- Employer claimed no violation because it was not "knowing and intentional" and did not cause injury

EMPLOYER COMPANY NAME: Lopez Company Address: 00000		EMPLOYEE SSN: [REDACTED]		EARNING STATEMENT	
EMPLOYEE NAME	EMPLOYEE ID	DATE	PERIOD	AMOUNT	TYPE
XXXXXXXX	12345678	12/31/2016	12/01/2016 - 12/31/2016	1500.00	REGULAR PAY
				200.00	OVERTIME PAY
				50.00	PAGA RE PAY
				10.00	PAGA TAX
				10.00	GR 31 TAX
				10.00	TOTAL

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC

Relevant Law:

- Section 226(a) – Sets forth nine components that must be included on a wage statement, namely the last four digits of an employee's social security number or employee identification number
- Section 226(e)(1) – Permits recovery of damages or a "penalty" by an individual employee for a violation of section 226(a) that is "knowing and intentional" and resulting in "injury"

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC

Issue:

- Does section 226(e)(1) apply to PAGA actions?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## ***Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC***

- Result:
  - No, the Court held that section 226(e)(1) is limited to claims for **damages** or **statutory penalties** for violations of section 226(a)
  - A PAGA action seeks only “**civil penalties**” so it is not subject to the requirements of section 226(e)(1)
    - Plaintiff does not have to show he suffered an “injury”
    - Plaintiff does not have to show employer’s alleged violation was “knowing and intentional”

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## ***Lopez v. Friant & Associates, LLC***

- Takeaway:
  - Be sure that your wage statements contain all of the required information!

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## **Final Questions**

**Presented by:**  
**Megan Winter**  
Phone: (858) 597-9622  
Email: [mwinter@fisherphillips.com](mailto:mwinter@fisherphillips.com)

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Benefits Update

December 5-13, 2017

*Presented by:*  
Melissa Shimizu  
Phone: (949) 798-2162  
Email: mshimizu@fisherphillips.com

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### Affordable Care Act (ACA)

- Repeal / Replace...
- Promoting Healthcare Choice and Competition Across the United States Executive Order (Otherwise known as the "AHP Executive Order")
  - Instructs agencies to expand the availability of AHPs
  - Expansion of Short-Term, Limited Duration Insurance
  - Expansion of HRAs

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### Affordable Care Act (ACA) (a blast from the past...)

Today's agenda:

1. Repeal / Replace
2. Repeal / Replace
3. Repeal / Replace
4. Repeal / Replace
5. Repeal / Replace

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### Affordable Care Act (ACA) (continued)

- In the meantime, IRS continues to plug forward...
- Individual returns must address healthcare coverage
- Early stages of enforce of the Employer Mandate
  - Penalty notices for 2015
  - 30-day deadline for responses
  - Importance of documentation
- Predictions...?

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### Healthy California Act (SB 562)

- Possible state law replacement if ACA is repealed
- Passed by Senate on June 1, 2017, but did not proceed from there
- "This bill . . . would create the Healthy California program to provide comprehensive universal single-payer health care coverage and a health care cost control system for the benefit of all residents of the state."
- Early stages and very high level right now
- Contingent on financing
- Funding sources still TBD

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### California Secure Choice Program

- Background
- Initially Contingent on DOL Guidance
- New Administration...
- Lawyers to the Rescue
- Legislative Amendment
- Current Estimated Effective Date for Employers: "Late 2019 is likely..."

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### California Secure Choice Program (continued)

Once Program is Operational:

- Employers with 100 or more employees will need to comply within 12 months
- Employers with 50-99 employees will need to comply within 24 months
- Employers with 5-49 employees will need to comply within 36 months

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### California FUTA Credit Reduction

- California's UI Trust Fund deficit was approximately \$3.9 billion at the end of 2016
- 2017 FUTA credit reduction was 2.1%
- Likely an additional 0.3% FUTA credit reduction for 2018 (total of 2.4%)
- Projections released by EDD in May of 2017 estimate that:
  - Trust Fund deficit will drop to \$1.4 billion by the end of 2017
  - In 2018, Trust Fund will end the year with a positive balance of \$1.6 billion—first positive balance since 2008

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Benefits Update

### Increased DOL and IRS Audit Activity

- General increase, particularly out of Pasadena and San Francisco DOL offices
- Increased focus on health and welfare plans
- Increased focus on Form 5500 compliance
- Increased enforcement of deadlines

fisherphillips.com

December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



**Final Questions**

*Presented by:*  
**Melissa Shimizu**  
Phone: (949) 798-2162  
Email: mshimizu@fisherphilips.com

fisherphilips.com      December 2017 Legislative and Case Law Update

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---