C. ROBERT SIMPSON, State Labor Commissioner DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT Carl G. Joseph 107 South Broadway, Room 5015 Los Angeles, CA 90012 213/620-2500

# BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CLOUTMAN-MILLER AGENCY, INC. dba MILLER AGENCY, TALENT AGENCY,

Case No. TAC 3-83

Petitioner.

DETERMINATION

vs.

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

201

21!

23

24

ARTHUR BOTHAM,

Respondent.

The above-entitled controversy came on regularly for hearing before the Labor Commissioner, Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, Department of Industrial Relations, State of California, by Carl G. Joseph, attorney for the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, serving as Special Hearing Officer under the provisions of Section 1700.44 of the Labor Code of the State of California. Petitioner CLOUTMAN-MILLER AGENCY, INC. appeared by the law firm of William H. Simon, Jr., Inc. by William H. Simon, Jr. Respondent ARTHUR BOTHAM appeared by the law firm of Bilford and Bilford by David R. Bilford. Oral and documentary 27 evidence having been introduced, and the matter having been

1. Respondent, as a Director of Photography, was an artist, as defined in Labor Code Section 1700.4.

**\_ 25**!

2. Petitioner violated the 72 hour notice requirements of Administrative Code, Title 8, Section 12002 and is therefore not entitled to recover a fee or commission from Respondent with respect to his employment as director of photography on Dukes of Hazard for the 1982 season.

I

#### INTRODUCTION

On March 21, 1983, Petitioner, CLOUTMAN-MILLER AGENCY, INC. dba MILLER AGENCY, TALENT AGENCY (hereinafter referred to as "MILLER") filed a petition to determine controversy pursuant to Labor Code Section 1700.44 with the Labor Commissioner of the State of California, against ARTHUR BOTHAM (hereinafter referred to as "BOTHAM"). The petition alleged that MILLER was ertitled to commissions in an amount equal to 10% of BOTHAM's compensation as director of photography on the television series "Dukes of Hazard", for the 1982 season.

Petitioner prayed for the following relief:

- 1. That the Labor Commissioner determine that MILLER procured and negotiated BOTHAM's employment as director of photography on "Dukes of Hazard" for the 1982 season.
- 2. That MILLER was entitled to commission of 10% of all compensation received by Respondent pursuant to said employment, plus interest and costs.

On May 2, 1983, Respondent filed an answer to the petition denying the essential allegations and raising various affirmative defenses.

A hearing took place on July 14, 1983. Petitioner's opening brief was filed July 29, 1983. Respondent's reply brief was filed August 24, 1983. Petitioner's reply brief was filed September 1, 1983.

II

## <u>ISSUES</u>

- 1. Was Respondent, BOTHAM, an "artist" as defined by Labor Code Section 1700.4?
- 2. Did Petitioner comply with the 72 hour notification requirements of Administrative Code Section 12002?

III

### APPLICABLE LAW

The Labor Code, Section 1700.4 defines "artist" as "artists and other persons rendering professional services in motion pictures, theatrical, radio, television and other entertainment enterprises."

Administrative Code, Title 8, Section 12002 provides as follows:

"No artist's manager shall be entitled to recover a fee or commission under an oral contract unless the particular employment for which the fee or commission is sought shall have been procured directly through the efforts or services of the manager and shall have been confirmed in writing within 72 hours thereafter."



- 25

# DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

Re: RESPONDENT'S STATUS AS AN ARTIST:

В

In the instant case, the Labor Commissioner finds that Respondent, BOTHAM, as director of photography on the television series "Dukes of Hazard," was employed as a person rendering professional services in a television enterprise, and therefore was an artist, as defined by Labor Code Section 1700.4.

Re: PETITIONER'S COMPLIANCE WITH ADMINISTRATIVE CODE SECTION 12002:

The evidence at the hearing in this matter established that the alleged contract between Petitioner and Respondent was oral and that Petitioner acted as Respondent's artist manager, and therefore Petitioner was required to comply with the provisions of 12002 of the Administrative Code. As previously cited, said code section provides that the manager must provide written confirmation of employment within 72 hours after procurement.

The evidence further established that Petitioner never advised Respondent that an essential term of the subject contract which had been confirmed by a written "deal confirmation memo," with respect to Respondent's wages, had been deleted. The Labor Commissioner finds that the Administrative Code requires Petitioner to provide Respondents with written notice of such facts within 72 hours and that Petitioner failed to comply with said provision. The Labor Commissioner further finds that Petitioner is therefore not entitled to recover any fee or commission under the subject contract.

Petitioner chose not to advise Respondent of the change in an essential term of the agreement and to allow Respondent to work under the agreement under the impression that the deal confirmation memo was accurate as submitted. Therefore, Petitioner violated his statutory obligations and the agreement between Petitioner and Respondent was void and unenforceable.

#### CONCLUSION

The evidence in this case establishes that Petitioner violated the Administrative Code Provisions of Section 12002 and is therefore not entitled to any fee or commission pursuant to the oral agreement with Respondent.

DATED:_		
---------	--	--

CARL G. JOSEPH Special Hearing Officer

ADOPTED

-25

DATED:

C. ROBERT SIMPSON California Labor Commissioner

-5-