1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
2	Division of Labor Standards Enforcement Department of Industrial Relations	
3	MICHAEL N. JACKMAN, SBN 149138 7575 Metropolitan Drive, Suite 210	
4	San Diego, CA 92108 Tel. (619) 767-2023	
5	Fax. (619) 767-2026	
6	Attorney for the State Labor Commissioner	
7		
8	BEFORE THE	LABOR COMISSIONER
9		OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	AYLYA MARZOLF,	NO. TAC- 29364
12	Petitioner,	DETERMINATION
13	v.	OF CONTROVERSY
14	LYNN VENTURELLA, an individual, THE PINKERTON MODEL & TALENT	
15	COMPANY, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company,	
16	Respondent.	3
17		
18	This matter, a Petition to Determine (Controversy under Labor Code §1700.44, came on
19	regularly for hearing in Los Angeles, Califor	nia, before the undersigned attorney for the Labor
20	Commissioner assigned to hear the case. Pet	titioner AYALA MARZOLF (hereinafter referred to as
21	"Ms. Marzolf") appeared by her attorney Ste	ven B. Sitglitz. Respondents LYNN VENTURELLA
22	(hereinafter referred to as Ms. Venturella) an	d THE PINKERTON MODEL & TALENT
23		"Pinkerton") appeared at the commencement of the
24	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
25	hearing by Ms. Venturella, representing both	herself and Pinkerton. In further proceedings at the
26	continued hearing, both respondents appeared	d by their attorney Drew Sherman.
27		
28	2	
		1
	a	

DETERMINATON OF CONTROVERSY

1	FINDINGS OF FACT
2	1. AYALA MARZOLF is an artist, as that term is defined in Labor Code Section 1700.4,
3	and rendered services as an actor in advertisements for Dentyne, Taco Bell, Apple, Speedo,
4	Volkswagen and Adidas.
5	2. LYNN VENTURELLA was a licensed talent agency within the definition set forth in
6	Labor Code Section 1700.4 during the time relevant to this action.
7 8	3. Ms. Marzolf was managed by Total Talent Management, a business jointly owned by
9	Nick Roses and Ms. Venturella's husband, Richard Venturella. Ms. Marzolf was properly paid for
10	the work she performed on the Dentyne and Taco Bell advertisements. The wages due from those
11	two jobs were tendered to Total Talent Management (TTM) and that company properly distributed
12	the commissions due to the respondents, with the remainder of the wages going to petitioner, . At
13	
14	some point, TTM ceased doing business, after which time Ms. Marzolf contracted with former TTM
15	partner Nick Roses, who thereafter represented Ms. Marzolf as her manager.
16	4. By agreement among Ms. Marzolf, Total Talent Management, Nick Roses and the
17	respondents, wages Ms. Marzolf earned for union jobs was to be paid to TTM, with wages for non-
18	union jobs to be paid to the respondents. Those non-union jobs included the work performed on the
19	Apple, Speedo, Volkswagen and Adidas advertisements. The wages for those jobs (a total of six
20 21	separate jobs) were tendered to the respondents, and are at issue in this proceeding.
22	5. Ms. Venturella conceded that the respondents owe Ms. Marzolf \$1,480.36 in wages, but
23	asserts that amount was calculated taking into account amounts she deducted from Ms. Marzolf's
24	wages which she paid to TTM for amounts she believed to be due to that company for management
25	services TTM provided for the petitioner. The respondents did not provide either their client Ms.
26	Marzolf, or the hearing officer in this matter, any accounting for the withholdings or basis for those
27 28	amounts to be paid to a third party on Ms. Marzolf's behalf.

1	6. No enforceable agreement existed between the petitioner and the respondent which	
2	would allow Ms. Venturella or Pinkerton to lawfully withhold any portion of Ms. Marzolf's wages	
3	to be paid to TTM or any other entity, without a proper accounting of those amounts.	
4	7. The documentary evidence and testimony provided at the hearing show that for the six	
5	jobs at issue in this proceeding, Ms. Marzolf earned \$6,607.45 in wages, after proper deductions for	
7	commissions due to the respondent and her management.	
8	8. The respondents tendered a total of \$2,580.00 to the petitioner as amounts conceded due	
9	for the petitioner's wages retained in their client trust account, and interest on those wages.	
10	LEGAL ANALYSIS	
11	The prime issue in this case is regarding wages withheld by the respondents for payments the	
12	respondents allegedly paid to Total Talent Management. Those withheld wages were never	
13 14	substantiated by any accounting to the client, as is required by law.	
15	The Talent Agency Act, codified at California Labor Code Section 1700, et seq. impose strict	
16	requirements on talent agents who receive wages on behalf of their clients, to properly retain, to	
17	timely pay and to adequately account for an artist's wages. Labor Code Section 1700.25 states, in	
18	part:	
19	A licensee who receives any payment of funds on behalf of an artist shall immediately	
20	deposit that amount in a trust account maintained by him or her in a bank or other recogn depository. The funds, less the licensee's commission, shall be disbursed to the artist wit	
21	30 days after the receipt.	
22 23	In this case, the petitioner, through her attorneys, repeatedly requested an accounting for the	
24	wages received, amounts retained, and amounts paid to third parties for the six jobs at issue. The	
25	respondents failed to provide a proper accounting for the wages and their disbursement.	
26	The petitioner requested, and was issued by this hearing officer, a subpoena which required	
27	the respondents to appear at the hearing and produce the records necessary to substantiate and	
28	properly account for the amounts in controversy. Talent agents are required by Labor Code Sections	
	3	

.

DETERMINATON OF CONTROVERSY

1700.26 and 1700.27 to maintain such records, to make them available to the Labor Commissioner during reasonable hours, and to furnish them upon the Labor Commissioner's request. The subpoena was properly and timely served upon the respondents, but the respondent failed to provide the records requested.

In response to the hearing officer's inquiry regarding production of the subpoenaed documents, Ms. Venturella initially responded that she was not she did not understand the subpoena and was not aware that the subpoena required the respondents to produce documents at the hearing. Later on in her testimony, Ms. Venturella stated that she decided not to bring the documents because she was concerned that to do so would violate a confidentiality agreement between her husband Richard Venturella on behalf of TTM and Nick Roses, Mr. Venturella's former partner in that business. This contradictory testimony leads this hearing officer to doubt Ms. Venturella's credibility and to give little weight to her statements in every other aspect of the case.

The documentary evidence and testimony in this case show that Ms. Marzolf earned \$6,670.45 for the six jobs at issue, that those amounts were received by the respondents and retained by the respondents beyond the time allowed by statute. The most recent of the earned wages due should have been paid by November 2, 2012, but were retained. The evidence also shows that the respondents have paid Ms. Marzolf a total of \$2,580.00 toward those wages earned, leaving a balance due of \$4,090.45. Interest on that amount to August 1, 2014 is \$715.20.

The evidence also shows that the respondents' failure to disburse the artist's funds within the time required by Labor Code Section 1700.25(a) is a willful violation of that statute. The factor of willfulness is found as a result of evidence offered by both parties in the proceeding showing that the respondents were utterly lacking not only in their failure to keep proper records and account to the petitioner under the Talent Agency Act, but even apart from that statutory requirement, to maintain the kind of financial records accepted in common business practice. The respondents were

contemptible stewards of their client's money, and were utterly unresponsive not only to her counsel's proper demands for an accounting, but also failed to produce the records subpoenaed by the Labor Commissioner.

As a consequence of the willful violation of the requirement to timely disburse amounts held in trust for the petitioner, the Labor Commissioner awards Ms. Marzolf, as the prevailing artist, her reasonable attorney fees, pursuant to Labor Code Section 1700.25(e)(1). Following a statement of decision, the parties were directed to submit evidence and argument regarding the award of attorney fees. In response to that direction, counsel for the petitioner submitted a declaration setting forth a basis for petitioner's request for 35 hours of attorney fees at the rate of \$375.00 per hour. The respondent did not submit a response to that request. Accordingly, petitioner is awarded \$13,125.00 in attorney fees. The petitioner also requested an award of her costs in this proceeding; however, such an award is not supported by the provisions of the Talent Agency Act, and is therefore denied.

CONCLUSION

The Labor Commissioner finds that Respondents Lynn Venturella and The Pinkerton Model & Talent Company, LLC unlawfully withheld wages due to Petitioner Ayla Marzolf, and that the failure to pay those wages is a willful violation of the Labor Code Section 1700.44(a).

Accordingly, Petitioner is awarded \$4,090.45 in wages. Interest is awarded on the wages at the legal rate from November 2, 20012 in the amount of \$715.20. In addition, as a result of a finding of willfulness under Labor Code Section 1700.25(e), Petitioner is awarded reasonable attorney fees in the amount of \$13,125.00.

The total amount of the award is \$17,930.65.

Dated: 8/7/20/4 Respectfully submitted By: MICHAEL N. ACKMAN Attorney for the State Labor Commissioner ADOPTED AS THE DETERMINATION OF THE LABOR COMMISSONER Dated: 8.6.14 By: IE A. SU Labor Commissioner, State of California DETEDMINIATION OF CONTROLVING OV

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE BY MAIL (C.C.P. 1013A) OR CERTIFIED MAIL

I, JUDITH A. ROJAS, do hereby certify that I am a resident of or employed in the County of San Diego, over 18 years of age, not a party to the within action, and that I am employed at and my business address is: 7575 Metropolitan Drive, Suite 210, San Diego, CA 92108-4421

On August 7, 2014, I served the within **DETERMINATION OF CONTROVERSY** by placing a true copy thereof in an envelope addressed as follows:

Bryan J. Freedman, Esq. Steven B. Stiglitz, Esq. Freedman & Taitelman LLP 1901 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 500 Los Angeles, CA 90067

Drew Harris Sherman, Esq. Sherman Law Corp. 5023 N. Parkway Calabasas Calabasas, CA 91302

and then sealing the envelope and with postage and certified mail fees (if applicable) thereon fully prepaid, depositing it for pickup in this city by:

Federal Express Overnight Mail

X Ordinary First Class Mail

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 7, 2014, at San Diego, California.

letta Kr

Case No. TAC-29364