Miles E. Locker, CSB #103510 DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT Department of Industrial Relations State of California 455 Golden Gate Avenue, 9th Floor San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 703-4863 4 (415) 703-4806 Fax: 5 Attorney for State Labor Commissioner 6 7 BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER 8 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 1Í SUSAN ODOM, as quardian ad litem ) No. TAC 10-03 for HALEY ARTHUR SHINN, a minor 12 Petitioner, 13 vs. 14 CMT TALENT AGENCY, DETERMINATION OF 15 CONTROVERSY

Respondent.

The above-captioned matter, a petition to determine controversy under Labor Code §1700.44, came on regularly for hearing on June 18, 2003, in Los Angeles, California, before the Labor Commissioner's undersigned hearing officer. Petitioner appeared in propria persona; respondent failed to appear. Based on the evidence presented at this hearing and on the other papers on file in this mater, the Labor Commissioner hereby adopts the following decision.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. CMT TALENT AGENCY (hereinafter "CMT" or "respondent" ) was most recently licensed as a talent agency by the State Labor

TAC 10-03 Decision

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Commissioner from July 25, 2001 to July 24, 2002. It was licensed as a partnership, owned by ALBERTA SELLERS and BYRON GARRETT, with a business address at 8344 ½ W. 3rd Street, Los Angeles, California. CMT has not been licensed at any time since July 24, 2002.

- 3. On or about July 30, 2002, petitioner HALEY ARTHUR SHINN, a minor, by and through her guardian ad litem SUSAN ODOM, entered into a written agreement with CMT, under which she engaged the services of CMT as a talent agency for a period of one year, to negotiate contracts for the petitioner in the rendition of professional services as a model and in all other fields in the entertainment industry, for which CMT would be entitled to commissions.
- 4. Through CMT's efforts, petitioner obtained a print modeling job for an Audi commercial. Petitioner performed modeling services in connection with the photo shoot on July 31, 2002. Petitioner made repeated requests to CMT for payment for this job. In September 2002, CMT agent and accountant Philip Johnson told petitioner that payment hadn't arrived yet from Isle 8 Pictures, the production company, and assured petitioner that she would be paid by CMT as soon as CMT received payment from Isle 8. Over the next few months, further calls and letter from petitioner to CMT went unanswered. In February 2003, the petitioner contacted Isle 8 and discovered that Isle 8 paid CMT \$480.00 on September 5, 2002 for petitioner's modeling services.
- 5. This petition was filed on February 27, 2003, and served on CMT at its business address on March 10, 2003. CMT did not file any answer. Notices of the hearing were sent to the parties

## 

TAC 10-03 Decision

## LEGAL\_ANALYSIS

- 1. Petitioner is an "artist" within the meaning of Labor Code section 1700.4(b). Respondent is a "talent agency" within the meaning of Labor Code section 1700.4(a). The Labor Commissioner has jurisdiction to issue this determination pursuant to Labor Code section 1700.44.
- 2. Labor Code section 1700.5 provides that "[n]o person shall engage in or carry on the occupation of a talent agency without first procuring a license . . . from the Labor Commissioner." By continuing to operate as a talent agency after the expiration of its license on July 24, 2002, and in particular, by entering into an agreement with petitioner to serve as her talent agency by procuring employment on her behalf, and by procuring such employment without a license, CMT violated Labor Code section 1700.5.
- 3. An agreement that violates the licensing requirement of the Talent Agencies Act is illegal and unenforceable. "Since the clear object of the Act is to prevent improper persons from becoming [talent agents] and to regulate such activity for the protection of the public, a contract between an unlicensed [agent] and an artist is void." Buchwald v. Superior Court (1967) 254 Cal.App.2d 347, 351. Having determined that a person or business entity procured, promised or attempted to procure employment for an artist without the requisite talent agency license, "the [Labor] Commissioner may declare the contract [between the unlicensed agent and the artist] void and unenforceable as involving the services of an unlicensed person

in violation of the Act." Styne v. Stevens (2001) 26 Cal.4th 42, 55. "[A]n agreement that violates the licensing requirement is illegal and unenforceable . . . " Waisbren v. Peppercorn Productions, Inc. (1995) 41 Cal.App.4th 246, 262. Moreover, the artist that is party to such an agreement may seek disgorgement of amounts paid pursuant to the agreement, and "may . . . [be] entitle[d] . . to restitution of all fees paid the agent." Wachs v. Curry (1993) 13 Cal.App.4th 616, 626.

- 4. We therefore hold that CMT must disgorge to petitioner the entire \$480 received from Isle 8 for petitioner's modeling services, and that CMT is not entitled to retain any part of the \$480 as an agency fee or commission. Also, in accordance with Civil Code sections 3287 and 3289, we conclude that petitioner is entitled to interest on the wrongfully withheld funds, at the rate of 10% per annum, from September 5, 2002, the date the funds were received by CMT.
- 5. We note that even if CMT had been licensed when it procured this employment for petitioner, its failure to remit the funds received from Isle 8 on behalf of petitioner would constitute a violation of Labor Code section 1700.25. This statute provides that a licensed talent agency that receives any payment of funds on behalf of an artist shall immediately deposit that amount in a trust fund account maintained by him or her in a bank, and shall disburse those funds, less the agent's commission, to the artist within 30 days after receipt. Section 1700.25 further provides that if, in a hearing before the Labor Commissioner on a petition to determine controversy, the

disburse these amounts within the required time, the Commissioner may award interest on the wrongfully withheld funds at the rate of 10% per annum, and reasonable attorney's fees.

- 6. Respondent's failure to disburse the amounts paid by Isle 8 on behalf of petitioner for the Audi commercial constitutes a willful violation of Labor Code section 1700.25.
- 7. As a result of CMT's failure to pay amounts due to petitioner, she was forced to file this petition to determine controversy, and in order to prosecute this petition, she was forced to incur costs in the amount of \$35 in order to have a process server serve the petition on CMT. Petitioner is entitled to reimbursement for this cost.
- 8. The parties who are jointly and severally liable for the amounts owed to petitioner include CMT TALENT AGENCY, a partnership, and its owners, ALBERTA SELLERS and BYRON GARRETT.

16 | //

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

11

13

17 | //

18 //

19 //

20 //

21 //

22 //

23 //

24 //

25 //

26 //

27 //

//

## ORDER

For the reasons set forth above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Respondents CMT TALENT AGENCY, a partnership; ALBERTA SELLERS; and BYRON GARRETT, shall pay the following amounts to petitioner SUSAN ODOM, guardian ad litem for HALEY ARTHUR SHINN, a minor:

- 1. \$480.00 for unlawfully withheld earnings;
- 2. \$50.50 interest on the unlawfully withheld earnings;
- 3. \$35.00 for reimbursement of costs;

for a total of \$565.50.

Dated: 9/24/03

MILES E. LOCKER

Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

ADOPTED AS THE DETERMINATION OF THE LABOR COMMISSIONER:

Dated: 9-24-03

ARTHUR S. LUJAN

State Labor Commissioner