1	DAVID L. GURLEY, Bar No. 194298 STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT		
2			
3	300 Oceangate, Suite 850	ORCEWENT	
4	Long Beach, California 90802 Telephone: (562) 590-5461		
5	Facsimile: (562) 499-6438		
6	Attorney for the Labor Commissioner		
7			
8	BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER		
9	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	THE GERSH AGENCY, INC., a	CASE NO. TAC 47191	
12	California corporation,	DETERMINATION OF CONTROVERSY	
13	Petitioner,		
14	VS.		
15	DARRYL HUGHLEY, an individual (aka "DL HUGHLEY"); FIVE TIMZ		
16	PRODUCTIONS, INC., a California corporation,		
17	Respondents.		
18			
19	I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>		
20	The above-captioned matter, a Petition to Determine Controversy under Labor Code		
	section 1700.44, came on regularly for hearing in Los Angeles, California, on December 7, 2017		
21	before the undersigned attorney for the Labor Commissioner assigned to hear this case. Petitioner,		
22	THE GERSH AGENCY, INC., a California corporation (hereinafter, referred to as "TGA") was		
23	represented by Joseph P. Costa, Esq. of COSTA BESSER & CHILDRESS, LLP. Respondents,		
24	DARRYL HUGHLEY, an individual (aka "DL HUGHLEY"); FIVE TIMZ PRODUCTIONS,		
25	INC., a California corporation (hereinafter, collectively referred to as "Hughley") were		
26	represented by Joseph R. Taylor, Esq. and Tiffany R. Caterina, Esq. of FRANKFURT KURNIT		
27	KLEIN + SELZ, PC. The matter was taken under submission and post-trial briefs submitted.		

Based on the evidence presented at this hearing and on the other papers on file in this matter, the Labor Commissioner hereby adopts the following decision.

II. <u>FINDINGS OF FACT</u>

- 1. Petitioner TGA is a talent and literary agency. TGA operates six full-service departments, including a Comedy department.
- 2. Respondent Hughley is a well-known comedian. He has performed in the comedy industry for decades, including from 1998 to 2002 when he wrote, produced, and starred in his television series, *The Hughleys*.
- 3. Prior to joining TGA, Hughley was represented by ICM Partners (ICM), including talent agent, William Rodriguez (hereinafter, referred to as "Rodriguez"). According to Hughley, he was dissatisfied with ICM, in part, because ICM continued to engage Hughley at the same comedy clubs he had performed for years for which Hughley paid a 10% commission. Hughley testified he no longer wanted to pay 10% to an agency for comedy clubs ("comedy club dates") in which he had a "standing invitation".
- 4. In 2014, Rodriguez left ICM and became an agent at TGA. Hughley testified as an incentive to sign him, Rodriguez told Hughley that TGA would not commission the same comedy club dates Hughley had performed at for years and previously commissioned by ICM.
- 5. In or around September 2014, Hughley and TGA entered into an oral agreement whereby TGA would serve as Hughley's talent agency. What specific performances were commissionable is the basis of this dispute, as TGA asserts it is entitled to ten percent (10%) of all compensation earned by Hughley for his services as an entertainer, including comedy club dates.
- 6. Hughley continued to perform at the same comedy club dates he had been performing for years and Rodriguez continued to book those engagements on behalf of Hughley. When executives at TGA discovered that Hughley was not paying commissions on comedy club dates, they looked to Rodriguez for answers. Rodriguez denied promising Hughley he would not commission comedy club dates.

1 7. On March 16, 2015, a few months after Hughley joined TGA, Hughley's 2 representative, Sonya Vaughn, sent Rodriguez the following email: 3 Good morning William, 4 Per DL, Gersh is not to commission club dates? If that is the case, \$3200 was commissioned in Pleasanton, CA and \$2000 was 5 commissioned in Tacoma, WA. 6 Please advise 7 Thanks! Sonya 8 9 8. On the same day, Rodriguez responded by email: "Correct, b/c those are icm [sic] 10 dates." This email response along with the credible testimony of Hughley and evasive responses 11 by Rodriguez established Rodriguez promised Hughley that TGA would not commission comedy 12 club dates. 13 9. Around the time that Hughley joined TGA, Hughley performed at a charity 14 comedy event with Cedric "The Entertainer", Eddie Griffin, George Lopez and Charlie Murphy 15 to honor the late comic legend, Richard Pryor, and to raise funds for a memorial in his honor. 16 This assembly of popular comedians generated interest in a comedy tour featuring the five 17 comedians, which became known as "The Comedy Get Down" or the "Black and Brown Tour" 18 (hereinafter, referred to as, "Tour Dates"). 19 Hughley testified the five comedians wanted to negotiate and organize Tour Dates 10. 20 through the United Talent Agency ("UTA") and it was UTA that arranged Tour Dates. At first, 21 TGA sought 10% commission for Tour Dates but during pre-hearing discovery, it became 22 undisputed that Hughley agreed to pay a 5% commission on the guarantees for each Tour Date. 23 This agreement was confirmed in an April 6, 2015 email from Hughley's representative, Allen 24 Chanzis: 25 Hi William, 26 I just wanted to follow up on the conversation you just had with Mark Landesman about DL's commission to Gersh on the Black & 27 Brown shows. 28 You told Mark that Gersh is commissioning 5% of the guarantee

on these shows. It is our understanding that the guarantees on these shows is \$30,000. Per the settlements that we received, there have been deposits of \$3,000 on each of the 5 shows that have already played.

Can you please send us a statement accounting for these deposits, and *clarify if we [sic] incorrect about the guarantees*. Based on these numbers, it looks like there is money due DL from Gersh on this.

Please advise.

Thanks Allen

Rodriguez confirmed the agreement and responded as follows:

Sure. We refunded the extra money a while back and we will with this past weekend[.]

- Hughley testified that after one of the Comedy Get Down Tour Dates, two writers approached Hughley and the other comedians about developing a scripted television show based upon the Tour (hereinafter, referred to as, "Series"). In March 2016, TGA was sent a draft of a proposed offer and agreement for a television series starring Hughley as a principal cast member. The offer came directly from Black Entertainment Television (BET) to Hughley's manager Michael Rotenberg. At the request of Hughley's manager, BET then sent the offer to Danielle Schoenberg of TGA. The email indicates "... it would be helpful if you would please coordinate the comments with all representatives of the principal cast so that we can expedite the documentation process." The testimony was conflicting as to TGA's level of involvement but the evidence suggests this was the extent of TGA's efforts for the Series. Hughley was paid \$562,000 for his participation in the Series and consequently TGA seeks 10% or \$56,200 in unpaid commissions. Hughley testified TGA was not involved in any aspect of procuring the Series, and as a result, TGA is not entitled to commission this project.
- 12. Hughley did not receive another commission statement from TGA until May 12, 2016. Like prior statements, the May 12, 2016 statement reflected that Hughley paid a \$1,500 commission for each of the "Tour Dates". However, unlike the prior statement, the May 12, 2016 statement included unpaid charges for commissions on comedy club dates.
 - 13. On May 17, 2016, Hughley's representative, Ms. Steingruber, replied (consistent

with Hughley's position in March 2016):

Hi Sarah,

I heard back from DL, he indicated he doesn't pay commission on club dates, just on concerts. Do you want to re-do your statement and send to me?

Thanks!

Suzie

- 14. This disagreement as to whether a promise was made to Hughley by Rodriguez that TGA would not commission comedy club dates became insurmountable. Hughley terminated TGA in or around October 2016. On October 7, 2016, Steven M. Kravit, Executive Vice President of TGA, sent Hughley a "protection letter" with a copy to Rodriguez. The letter states:
 -this will confirm that in addition to all other prior projects and deals, projects for which we shall remain entitled to our 10% agency commission on all guarantees as well as backend compensation [include deals listed on the attached exhibits to the letter].
- 15. The exhibits to the letter include comedy club dates and unpaid Tour Dates. As for the unpaid Tour Dates, TGA asserts Hughley stopped paying commissions for Tour Dates engaged in during the parties' relationship. In contrast, Hughley argues TGA is not entitled to commissions for Tour Dates performed after the termination. In support of this argument, Hughley described a complicated multi-step process for engaging Hughley for the Tour Dates. Specifically, Hughley argued the process for booking venues for Tour Dates required UTA to put together a performance offer sent many months prior to the actual performance date. UTA would send the "performance offer" to venues and wait for venues to either offer the date, provide another date or reject the date. Hughley argued the venues responded a few months before the actual event and therefore argued it was absurd for TGA to assert rights to commissions on Tour Dates played many months after Hughley terminated TGA.
- 16. This post-termination letter is the first time TGA asserted Hughley owed the agency a 10% commission on all projects and deals, including comedy club performances.

17. On April 3, 2017, TGA filed this Petition to Determine Controversy seeking the unpaid commissions for comedy club dates and unpaid Tour Dates in the amount of \$56,615.58. At some point after TGA filed the petition and documents exchanged, TGA increased their claim to \$118,115.58, which includes unpaid commissions for earnings from the BET television series.

18. Further complicating matters was Hughley's discovery that after the October 2016 termination, during the months of May through December 2016, TGA diverted \$26,698.86 from Hughley's earning in connections with the comedy club dates. TGA argues these monies were authorized deductions for unpaid commissions on comedy club dates due TGA. According to Hughley, he did not notice the amounts withheld by TGA from Hughley's earnings until well after this litigation was commenced. As a result, Hughley seeks disgorgement for these amounts received by TGA. Notably, TGA provided credible authorization from Hughley enabling TGA to receive, accept, deliver, endorse and deposit or negotiate and deduct its commissions from Hughley's earnings.

III. ARGUMENT

Labor Code section 1700.4(b) includes "artists rendering professional services in television ... and other entertainment enterprises" in the definition of "artist" and petitioner is therefore an "artist" within the meaning of Labor Code section 1700.4(b). It was stipulated that TGA is a California licensed talent agency.

Labor Code section 1700.23 provides that the Labor Commissioner is vested with jurisdiction over "any controversy between the artist and the talent agency relating to the terms of the contract," and the Labor Commissioner's jurisdiction has been held to include the resolution of contract claims brought by artists or agents seeking damages for breach of a talent agency contract. *Robinson v. Superior Court* (1950) 35 Cal.2d 379, *Garson v. Div. Of Labor Law Enforcement* (1949) 33 Cal.2d 861. Therefore, the Labor Commissioner has jurisdiction to determine this matter.

In sum, TGA has not met their burden of proof on this issue. The proper burden of proof is found at Evidence Code §115 which states, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by law, the burden of proof requires proof by preponderance of the evidence." Further, *McCoy v. Board of Retirement of the County of Los Angeles Employees Retirement Association* (1986) 183

Cal.App.3d 1044 at 1051 states, "the party asserting the affirmative at an administrative hearing has the burden of proof, including both the initial burden of going forward and the burden of persuasion by preponderance of the evidence (cite omitted)." "The 'preponderance of the evidence' standard of proof requires the trier of fact to believe that the existence of a fact is more probable than its nonexistence." *In re Michael G.* 74 Cal.Rptr.2d 642, 63 Cal.App.4th 700. The evidence suggests it is more likely than not that Rodriguez promised Hughley TGA would not commission comedy club dates. Consequently, TGA is not entitled to commission comedy club dates. Moreover, it is undisputed that TGA diverted \$26,698.86 from Hughley's earning in connection with the comedy club dates. Although, TGA was authorized to make these deductions as Hughley's agent, Hughley is entitled to disgorgement for these amounts received by TGA.

B. Are Post-Termination "Tour Dates" Commissions Owed?

The second issue is whether TGA is entitled to the payment of commissions for Tour Dates discussed during the relationship but performed after termination.

In short, Hughley reaped the financial benefits for work he agreed was commissionable and then unilaterally determined he did not want to pay anymore once he terminated TGA. Courts have long held, "he who shakes the tree is the one to gather the fruit." *Willison v. Turner* 89 Cal.App.2d 589 (1949). Certainly, Hughley may terminate a personal services agreement if he feels his agent is not providing for the services contracted. However, he may not unilaterally determine he has no further obligation to pay for work already performed. TGA, at minimum, had a hand in the Tour Dates and is therefore entitled to commission those dates set in motion during the parties' relationship.

Further, California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 12001(b) states, "[t]o be entitled to the payment of compensation after termination of the contract between the artist and the talent agency, the talent agency shall be obligated to serve the artist and perform obligations with

1 respect to any employment contract or to extensions or renewals of said employment contract or 2 to any employment requiring the services of the artist on which such compensation is based." It 3 was clear through testimony and documentary evidence TGA was willing and able to conduct 4 services on behalf of Hughley. As such, TGA is entitled to commissions for Tour Dates. 5 Does a Violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 12002 Forfeit the Petitioner's Right to Commission the "Series"? 6 7 Finally, in defense of TGA's claim for commissions owed on the "Series", Hughley 8 alleges TGA violated Title 8, California Code of Regulation, section 12002, thereby foregoing 9 their right to commission the "Series." Section 12002 states: 10 A talent agency shall be entitled to recover a fee, commission or compensation under an oral contract between a talent agency and an 11 artist as long as the particular employment for which such fee, commission or compensation is sought to be charged shall have 12 been procured directly through the efforts or services of such talent agency and shall have been confirmed in writing within 72 hours 13 thereafter. Said confirmation may be denied within a reasonable time by the other party. However, the fact that no written 14 confirmation was ever sent shall not be, in and of itself, be sufficient to invalidate the oral contract. 15 16 TGA did not comply with this regulation. It was determined the "Series" was not 17 procured directly through the efforts of TGA within the meaning of section 12002. TGA was not 18 the procuring force behind the "Series", and was not directly involved in the negotiation of the 19 financial terms. Here, Hughley did not benefit from TGA's efforts. As a result, noncompliance 20 with this regulation under these circumstances is sufficient to invalidate TGA's right to 21 commission this engagement. 22 111 23 111 24 111 25 111 26 111 27 111

28

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

IV. ORDER

Tour Dates: The parties agreed Hughley would pay a commission of 5% of the guarantee (or \$1,500) for each Tour Date initiated during the agency relationship. Hughley did not pay commissions for all Tour Dates initiated during the agency relationship. The remaining unpaid commissions for Tour Dates initiated during the relationship but performed after termination remain unpaid. Therefore, Hughley owes TGA additional commissions for all Tour Dates initiated prior to October 2016. These Tour Dates and unpaid commissions include the following:

LA Forum initiated in March 2016, \$625.00 owed;

Memphis initiated March 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Oklahoma initiated in March 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Cincinnati, OH initiated in April 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Charlotte, initiated in May 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Jacksonville, initiated in March 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

August GA, initiated in March 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Baltimore initiated in May 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Tampa, initiated in April 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Sunrise, FL, initiated in July 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Raleigh, NC, initiated in March 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Dallas, TX, initiated in July 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Orlando, FL, initiated in July 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Detroit, initiated in July 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Chicago, IL initiated in July 2016, \$1,500.00 owed;

Total Commissions due TGA for Tour Dates: \$21,625.00 plus \$4,363.04 in interest calculated at 10% per annum for a total award of \$25,988.04 owed to TGA for Tour Dates.

The Series: TGA was not involved in Hughley's employment on the Series. The Series was not procured directly through the efforts or services of TGA within the meaning of California Code of Regulations, Title 8, section 12002. Therefore, Hughley does not owe TGA commission on the Series.

l	Comedy Club Dates: The parties' agreement was that Hughley would not pay	
2	commissions on comedy club dates. Therefore, Hughley does not owe TGA commissions on	
3	comedy club Dates. TGA received \$26,698.86 of Hughley's earnings and applied it to disputed	
4	commissions for comedy club dates. Therefore, TGA must disgorge \$26,698.86 back to	
5	Hughley.	
6	(\$25,988.04 owed to TGA for Tour Dates)	
7	Final Accounting: TGA owes Hughley \$710.82	
8		
9	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
10		
11	DATED: October 17, 2018 Respectfully submitted,	
12	$\sim ni\Omega ni$	
13	By: Anus a Turkey -	
14	DAVID L. GURLEY	
15	Attorney for the Labor Commissioner	
16		
17	ADOPTED AS THE DETERMINATION OF THE LABOR COMMISSIONER	
18		
19		
20	huli la	
21	Dated: October 17, 2018 By: Julie A. Su	
22	State Labor Commissioner	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 PROOF OF SERVICE 2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA) S.S. 3 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES 4 I, Lindsey Lara, declare and state as follows: 5 I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of eighteen years old and not a party to the within action; my business address is: 300 Oceangate, 6 Suite 850, Long Beach, CA 90802. 7 On October 17, 2018, I served the foregoing document described **DETERMINATION OF CONTROVERSY**, on all interested parties in this action by placing a 8 true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows: 9 Joseph P. Costa, Esq. Joseph R. Taylor, Esq. COSTA BESSER & CHILDRESS Tiffany R. Caterina, Esq. 10 17383 Sunset Blvd., Ste. A350 FRANKFURT KURNIT KLEIN + SELZ PC Pacific Palisades, CA 90272 2029 Century Park East, Ste. 1060 11 jcosta@cbc-llp.com Los Angeles, CA 90067 itaylor@fkks.com 12 tcaterina@fkks.com Attorney for Petitioner 13 Attorneys for Respondents 14 X (BY CERTIFIED MAIL) I am readily familiar with the business practice for collection 15 and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. This correspondence shall be deposited with fully prepaid postage thereon for certified mail 16 with the United States Postal Service this same day in the ordinary course of business at our office address in Long Beach, California. Service made pursuant to this paragraph, 17 upon motion of a party served, shall be presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date of postage meter date on the envelope is more than one day after the date of deposit for 18 mailing contained in this affidavit. 19 X (BY E-MAIL SERVICE) I caused such document(s) to be delivered electronically via email to the e-mail address of the addressee(s) set forth above. 20 X 21 I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California (STATE) that the above is true and correct. 22 Executed this 17th day of October 2018, at Long Beach, California. 23 24 25 Lindsey Lara 26 Declarant 27 28