		· · · ·
1	DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT Department of Industrial Relations	
2	Il State of California	
3	By: James G. Pattillo, State Bar # 041764 107 South Broadway, Suite 5015 Los Angeles, CA 90012	
4	(213) 897-8105	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
5	fax (213)897-6020 Attorney for the Labor Commissioner	
6		
7		
8	BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER	
9	FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11		Case No. 26-96,
12	MARY KOHLER,	DETERMINATION OF
13	Petitioner,	CONTROVERSY
14		
15	AMERICAN TALENT NETWORK,	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	Introduction	
19	The above-captioned matter was initiated by a petition filed on July 29, 1996, by	
	MARY KOHLER (hereinafter "petitioner") against AMERICAN TALENT NETWORK	
21	(hereinafter "respondent," or "AMERICAN"), charging that respondent violated the Talent	
22	Agencies Act, Labor Code §§1700 et seq., by charging a registration fee. By the petition,	
23	petitioner seeks reimbursement of the amount paid.	
24	Respondent, although having been served with the petition, failed to file an answer. A	
25	notice setting the hearing of this matter for June 17, 1997, at 9:00 a.m., was sent on May 16,	
26	1997, but this notice gave an incorrect address for the location of the hearing. A corrected	
27	hearing notice, which set forth the correct address, was mailed on May 19, 1997. The copies	
28	of both notices which were sent to respondent (which were mailed to American Talent	
		•

¢

छ. 2

4a

6 6 5 6

9₀. 2

:{

1.44.4

е. Ч. На На

Network, 7095 Hollywood Blvd., Hollywood, CA 90028, were returned by the Post Office as undeliverable at that address.

Petitioner appeared by telephone from Brooklyn, New York. No appearance was made by respondent.

Based on the testimony and evidence presented at the hearing, the labor commissioner adopts the following Determination of Controversy.

Findings of Fact

1. In late 1995, petitioner saw a newspaper advertisement seeking children to appear in a television commercial. Petitioner mailed photographs of her son to the address given in the ad.

2. Petitioner then received a telephone call from an individual who identified herself as Keri Fisher. Ms. Fisher stated that she worked for respondent, that respondent had interested two ad agencies in using petitioner's son in television commercials, and that respondent required that petitioner pay the sum of \$375 for preparation of a "portfolio."

3. Petitioner inquired how this portfolio could be prepared. Ms. Fisher told petitioner
that copies would be made from the photographs which petitioner had sent. On one occasion,
Ms. Fisher stated that 190 copies had been (or would be) made. On another occasion, Ms.
Fisher stated that 210 copies had been (or would be) made. Ms. Fisher told petitioner that she
would be contacted by the ad agencies which intended to use her son in the commercials in
about 90 days.

4. On December 12, 1995, petitioner obtained a money order, and sent \$375 to 21 respondent. When nothing happened after 90 days, petitioner telephoned respondent's office, 22 and spoke with Ms. Fisher. A series of telephone calls ensued, with Ms. Fisher promising each 23 time to take some action to spur the advertising agencies to contact petitioner directly. Six 24 months went by in this manner. In her final telephone conversation with Ms. Fisher, petitioner 25 was assured that she would hear something within two days. When the two days had elapsed, 26 petitioner called back, and found that respondent's telephone had been disconnected. 27 Petitioner's son was never used in any commercial as a result of respondent's efforts. 28

13

14

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

Petitioner subsequently filed this proceeding.

Conclusions of Law

Petitioner's minor child is an "artist" within the meaning of Labor Code §1700.4(b).
 Labor Code §1700.4(a), defines "talent agency" as a person who "engages in the occupation of procuring, offering, promising, or attempting to procure employment or engagements for an artist." Respondent is a "talent agency" within the meaning of this section. The Labor Commissioner has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Labor Code §1700.44.

2. Labor Code §1700.40 provides that "no talent agency shall collect a registration fee." Labor Code §1700.2(b) defines the term "registration fee" to include, "any charge made ... to an artist for ... registering or listing an applicant for employment in the entertainment industry ... photographs, film strips, video tapes, or other reproductions of the applicant" By collecting \$375 from petitioner for "portfolios," respondent violated Labor Code §1700.40

3. Labor Code §1700.40 further provides that if a talent agency collects any fee or expenses from an artist in connection with the agency's efforts to obtain employment for the artist, and the artist fails to procure the employment, or fails to be paid for the employment, the agency must, upon demand, repay to the artist the fees and expenses that were paid. If repayment of such fee is not made within 48 hours of the demand, §1700.40 requires the talent agency to "pay to the artist an additional sum equal to the amount of the fee," as a penalty for the agency's failure to make prompt repayment.

4. Pursuant to Civil Code §§3287(a) and 3289(b), petitioner is entitled to interest on any amounts paid by petitioner to respondent, at the rate of 10% per year, from December 12, 1995.

Order

It is hereby ordered that respondent AMERICAN TALENT NETWORK pay to petitioner the sum of Three Hundred and Seventy-five and no/100 Dollars (\$375) for reimbursement of unlawfully collected fees, Fifty-six and 71/100 Dollars (\$56.71) for interest, and Three Hundred and Seventy-five and no/100 Dollars (\$375) as a penalty pursuant to Labor Code §1700.40, for a total sum of Eight Hundred and Six and 71/100 Dollars (\$806.71).

della la

nDated June 17, 1997 JAMES G. PATTILLO Attorney for the Labor Commissioner Adoption By The Labor Commissioner The above determination is adopted by the Labor Commissioner in its entirety. Dated: _, 1997. Print Name Toh For the Labor Commissioner wpdocs\tac's\kohier.dcn

....