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 (415) 703-4806 Fax: 5 Attorney for State Labor Commissioner 6 7 8 BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 DAVID SHAUGHNESSY, an individual; No. TAC 24-03 DNA ENTERPRISES, INC., a California 12 corporation 13 Petitioners, 14 VS. 15 ARTISTS AGENCY, INC., a New York ) DETERMINATION OF corporation, ) CONTROVERSY 16 Respondent. 17 18 The above-captioned matter, a petition to determine 19 controversy under Labor Code \$1700.44, came on regularly for 20 hearing on May 27, 2004, in San Francisco, California, before the Labor Commissioner's undersigned hearing officer. Petitioners 21 were represented by Robert Heller, and Respondent was represented 22 by Lawrence C. Hinkle II. Based on the evidence presented at 23 this hearing and on the papers on file in this mater, the Labor 25 Commissioner hereby adopts the following decision.

## FINDINGS OF FACT

1. ARTISTS AGENCY, INC. (hereinafter "AAI" OR "Respondent") was most recently licensed as a talent agency by the State Labor

TAC 24-03 Decision

26

27

Commissioner from August 8, 2000 to February 26, 2001. Following expiration of its license on February 26, 2001, it was not licensed at any time by the Labor Commissioner. It first became licensed by the Labor Commissioner on November 30, 1988, and applied for and obtained annual renewals of its license over the next 12 years. It was licensed at all times from November 30, 1988 to February 26, 2001, except for gaps in licensure from April 15 to August 25, 1999 and February 27 to August 8, 2000. AAI specialized in the representation of writers, directors and producers. At all times while licensed, AAI maintained an office in Los Angeles, California. Application forms that were filed with the Labor Commissioner by AAI show that Jonathan Russo was AAI's president.

2. DAVID SHAUGNESSY has resided in California since 1986. Prior to that, he lived in England and worked as an actor and director in theater. After moving to California, he was employed as an actor in movies and television series, did voice-overs, and occasionally, directed theatrical productions. By the late 1980's, Shaugnessy became interested in obtaining work as a producer and/or director for a daytime television show. At this time, Shaugnessy's wife was working as a television writer, and she was represented by Jonathan Russo of AAI. Shaugnessy met with Russo to see if AAI would represent him in order to obtain employment for a job as a daytime television producer and/or director. Shaugnessy and Russo entered into an oral agreement whereby AAI would serve as Shaugnessy's talent agency, and would attempt to obtain employment and negotiate the terms of employment for Shaugnessy, for which Shaughnessy would pay

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

25 26

24

27 28 commissions to AAI in the amount of 10% of his earnings.

- DNA ENTERPRISES, INC. ("DNA") is a loan-out company for Shaugnessy's services. It was established in 1991, and since that time, agreements under which a production company contracted for Shaugnessy's services specified that Shaugnessy's services were provided through DNA. Under such agreements, the production company would show payments made to DNA for Shaugnessy's services, and Shaugnessy would be paid as an employee of DNA.
- In 1990, a friend of Shaugnessy introduced him to the executive producer of 'The Young and the Restless,' a daytime soap opera. A few months later, the executive producer telephoned Shaugnessy, told him the producer was leaving the show, and asked if he wanted to join the show as the producer. Shaugnessy asked Russo to negotiate the deal for employment as a producer on the show, and after several weeks of negotiations between Russo and the production company, CPT Holdings, Inc. ("CPT"), Shaugnessy signed a contract for employment as the producer and director for The Young and the Restless.
- 5. As a producer and director for this soap opera, Shaugnessy supervised all creative aspects of the show, making decisions which takes to use, directed actors on how to perform their roles, told directors of photography or lighting how to shoot or light scenes, and made a myriad of creative choices on a day-to-day basis.
- In 1994, 1997 and 2000, Shaugnessy signed renewal agreements with CPT, extending his employment as the producer and director of The Young and the Restless. Each of these renewal agreements was negotiated by Russo/AAI, and it took about 2 or 3

- 7. In late 2001, the executive producer of The Young and The Restless left the show. Shaugnessy was asked if he wanted to take over as the executive producer. He contacted Russo, and around November 2001, Russo/AAI began negotiations with CPT leading to an agreement, 4 or 5 weeks later, between Shaugnessy/DNA and CPT under which Shaugnessy became the show's executive producer. The agreement had a one year term, starting November 26, 2001, with three additional years of successive one year option periods, with each option to renew automatically unless notice was given of intent not to renew. Shaugnessy was to receive compensation at the rate of \$21,615 per week for the first year, with specified increases for following option periods. As noted above, AAI's last talent agency license expired in February 2001, so at the time it negotiated this employment agreement on behalf of Shaugnessy, AAI was unlicensed.
- 8. By letter dated October 22, 2003, CPT declined to renew its second of three options for Shaugnessy's services, so his employment agreement with CPT terminated at the conclusion of the first option year.
- 9. At all times relevant herein, The Young and The Restless was produced and filmed in the Los Angeles area. Every employment agreement that AAI had negotiated for Shaugnessy was for employment in California.
- 10. As executive director, Shaugnessy had final say in the show's creative issues, including decisions about how scenes should be acted and filmed, how voice overs and music should be used, whether changes should be made to scripts, etc. Only 5% of

4

11

12

8

13 14

1.5

16

17 18

19 20

2223

21

2425

26

27

Shaughnessy's work as executive producer consisted of "administrative" matters, while 95% of his work involved creative issues.

- 11. Relations soured between Shaugnessy and AAI in late 2002, with Shaugnessy becoming increasingly concerned that AAI was not acting in his best interests in dealings with CPT over various production issues, based on AAI's concurrent representation of two of the show's writers. These concerns lead Shaughnessy, through his attorneys, to send written notice to AAI on December 23, 2002, terminating AAI's services as his talent agency effective November 30, 2002.
- Prior to terminating AAI's services, Shaugnessy had been paying AAI its 10% commissions on his earnings in connection with The Young and The Restless. With his termination of AAI, Shaugnessy stopped paying these commissions. On April 16, 2003, AAI filed a lawsuit in the Los Angeles County Superior Court against Shauqnessy and DNA for unpaid commissions, asserting causes of action for breach of contract, quantum meruit, declaratory relief and an accounting. On June 6, 2003 Shaugnessy and DNA filed a demurrer to the complaint, asserting that the action should be abated pending the exhaustion of remedies before the State Labor Commissioner, and that since AAI was not licensed at the time it negotiated the employment agreement at issue, it is not entitled to any of the relief sought by the complaint. On June 9, 2003, Shaugnessy and DNA filed the instant petition to determine controversy with the State Labor Commissioner, seeking a determination that the agency agreement between petitioners and AAI is illegal and void under the Talent Agencies Act due to

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

California law, that Shaugnessy and DNA do not owe any further commissions to AAI under this agreement, and that commissions previously paid to AAI under this agreement be disgorged. early July 2003, AAI filed a dismissal without prejudice of its California lawsuit against Shaugnessy and DNA; however, on September 17. 2003, AAI filed a lawsuit in New York against Shaugnessy and DNA under the same theories and seeking the same relief as set out in the dismissed California lawsuit. action was removed to the United States district court for the Southern District of New York, where it is now pending.

During the one year period prior to the filing of the petition to determine controversy, Shaugnessy paid a total of \$55,687.50 in commissions to AAI, during which time AAI was not licensed as a talent agency.

## LEGAL ANALYSIS

- 1. Shaugnessy is an "artist" within the meaning of Labor Code section 1700.4(b). AAI is a "talent agency" within the meaning of Labor Code section 1700.4(a).
- The negotiation of an employment agreement for artistic services is an activity that falls within the scope of "procuring . . employment for an artist" as the term "procuring" is used in Labor Code §1700.4(a). By continuing to operate as a talent agency after the expiration of its license on February 26, 2001, and in particular, by negotiating the contract in November 2001 under which Shaughnessy became the executive producer of The Young and The Restless, AAI violated Labor Code section 1700.5, which prohibits persons from engaging in the occupation of a

talent agency without holding a valid license therefor.

- 3. An agreement that violates the licensing requirement of the Talent Agencies Act is illegal and unenforceable. 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. This remedy of restitution is, of course, subject to the one year limitations period set out at Labor Code §1700.44(c).
- 4. At the hearing, Respondent's attorney argued that the Labor Commissioner should exercise its discretion to allow AAI to keep the commissions that it received in the one year period prior to the filing of the petition to determine controversy. Though the Labor Commissioner may have such discretion, based

2

3

11 |

12 l

13

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

upon exceptional facts, to refuse to impose this standard remedy, we can see no reason for doing so under the facts herein. Talent Agencies Act is remedial legislation that is designed to protect artists. Allowing an unlicensed talent agency to keep commissions that were paid to it under a void agency agreement would not further the remedial purposes of this legislation, and would fail to serve as a disincentive to others to prevent violations of the Act. Here not only did AAI violate the Act by negotiating the November 2001 employment agreement when it was not licensed to do so; it compounded this violation by trying to enforce its purported right to payment of commissions under its void agency agreement -- first by filing a lawsuit in California, then by filing a lawsuit in New York, forcing the petitioners to retain counsel in both states to oppose AAI's claims for commissions for which it has no legal entitlement under California law.

## ORDER

For the reasons set forth above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

Upon the expiration of AAI's most recent license as a talent agency, on February 26, 2001, AAI's agreement to serve as Shaugnessy's talent agency became void and unenforceable, and as a consequence, AAI has no right to commissions or any other payments from Shaugnessy or DNA as to any employment agreements negotiated or otherwise procured by AAI at any time after February 26, 2001. Specifically, AAI has no right to payment of any further commissions on petitioners' earnings under the November 2001 contract for Shaugnessy's services as executive producer for The Young and The Restless; and,

2. AAI shall disgorge the \$55,687.50 in commissions that it received from petitioners during the one year period preceding the filing of this petition, and pay that amount to petitioners with interest at 10% per annum from the date of the filing of the petition.

Dated: 6/7/04

MILES E. LOCKER Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

ADOPTED AS THE DETERMINATION OF THE LABOR COMMISSIONER:

Dated: 6-11-4

GREGORY L. RUPP

Acting Deputy Chief Labor Commissioner