

1 DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT

2 Department of Industrial Relations

3 State of California

4 BY: BARTON L. JACKA, SBN 154116

5 2031 Howe Avenue, Suite 100

6 Sacramento, CA 95825

7 Telephone: (916) 263-2918

8 Fax: (916) 263-2920

9 E-mail: bjacka@dir.ca.gov

10 Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

11 **BEFORE THE DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT**

12 **DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS**

13 **STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

14 Case No.: TAC 30631

15 ADOLFO ALVAREZ, a minor by and through his  
16 guardian ad litem, JOSE ALVAREZ,

17 Petitioner,

18 v.

19 TIFFANY ATWOOD, an individual; RPM  
20 TALENT GROUP / THE AGENCY, LLC, a  
21 California limited liability company dba RPM  
22 TALENT; and DOES 1-5, inclusive,

23 Respondents.

**DETERMINATION OF  
CONTROVERSY (LABOR CODE §  
1700.44(a))**

Petition filed: February 19, 2013

1 **DETERMINATION**

2 I.

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 On February 19, 2013, Adolfo Alvarez (“Adolfo”), a minor by and through his guardian  
5 ad litem, Jose Alvarez (“Mr. Alvarez”), filed with the Labor Commissioner (the “Labor  
6 Commissioner”), Division of Labor Standards Enforcement, Department of Industrial  
7 Relations, State of California a petition (the “Petition”) to determine controversy pursuant to  
8 Labor Code Section 1700.44. The Petition was brought against Tiffany Atwood (also known  
9 as “Tiffany Richer”) and what was described as “RPM Talent Group, a corporation”; the  
10 description of the latter entity was corrected at hearing to be: “RPM Talent Group / The  
11 Agency, LLC, a California limited liability company dba RPM Talent” (“RPM”) (Ms. Atwood  
12 and RPM collectively “Respondents”).

13 The Petition was heard on December 3, 2015 in the Los Angeles office of the Labor  
14 Commissioner. Barton L. Jacka, an attorney for the Labor Commissioner from the Sacramento  
15 office, heard the matter on assignment by the Labor Commissioner. Mr. Alvarez appeared;  
16 Debbie DeOliveira appeared as a potential witness for Adolfo; Mayra Alvarez, Adolfo’s  
17 mother, also was present. Adolfo was represented by counsel Mark Brifman. Ms. Atwood  
18 appeared for herself and for RPM. Homero Cano provided interpretive services.

19 On December 15, 2015, the Hearing Officer issued an Order (the “December 15, 2016  
20 Order”) that allowed Adolfo and Respondents to submit and serve additional evidence and  
21 objections to such evidence and to request a second session of the hearing on the Petition. As  
22 of March 1, 2016, no party took such action; the Hearing Officer seeing no need for a second  
23 session of hearing, the record was deemed closed so that this Determination could be issued.

24 II.

25 **PLEADINGS AND HEARING**

26 A. **Allegations of the Petition.**

27 The Petition alleges in pertinent part that Adolfo resides in Los Angeles County,  
28 California and is an “artist” as defined in Section 1700.4 of the Labor Code; each Respondent

1 acted in relation to Adolfo as a “talent agency”. On May 5, 2012, the Parties entered into a  
2 written contract (the “Contract”). Respondents, pursuant to the Contract, have collected nine  
3 checks for residual payments to Adolfo and have failed and refused to pay him a total of  
4 \$25,982.10 that they owed him from those checks.

5 **B. Facts to which the Parties stipulated at hearing.**

6 Although witnesses were sworn at the December 3, 2015 hearing, no actual testimony  
7 was taken. After opening arguments and agreement on some predicate facts, the Parties met  
8 without the Hearing Officer. Following that meeting, the Parties stipulated to the truth of  
9 certain additional facts and agreed on the scope of facts that were disputed and on a process by  
10 which they each could submit additional evidence or request a second session of the hearing.

11 These stipulations and agreements were as follows:

- 12 • Adolfo, during the pertinent period, was a minor and a talent client of both Ms. Atwood  
13 and RPM under two May 5, 2012 contracts (the “Contracts”) – each of which was  
14 entitled “American Federation of Television and Radio Artists Standard AFTRA  
15 Exclusive Agency Contract” and which was appended to the Petition; the contract  
16 between Adolfo and RPM pertained to RPM’s agency of Adolfo for “the television and  
17 radio industries” and the contract between Adolfo and Ms. Atwood pertained to Ms.  
18 Atwood’s agency of Adolfo for “television and radio commercials”. Ms. Atwood,  
19 during the pertinent period, was a licensed talent agent who did business as “RPM  
20 Talent” and signed both contracts.<sup>1</sup>
- 21 • The Contracts afforded each Respondent a 10% commission on gross (pre-tax) sums  
22 received by Adolfo pursuant to that Respondent’s respective agency; Respondents were  
23 to receive the appropriate payroll check for the net (post-tax) amount for Adolfo from  
24

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Both RPM and Ms. Atwood appear to have done business as “RPM Talent”. For purposes of this Determination,  
27 there appears to be no dispute that whatever liability exists, it is either entirely borne by Ms. Atwood or is jointly  
28 and severally borne by Ms. Atwood and by RPM. With respect to each job, there was only one “agent” and one  
commission owed.

1 Talent Partners (a payroll processing agency for Adolfo's employers), take out the 10%  
2 commission from the (pre-tax) gross (a single 10% commission, depending on whether  
3 owed to Ms. Atwood or to RPM), issue a check to Adolfo for the remaining 90% and  
4 send that check to Mr. or Ms. Alvarez.

- 5 • At some point a dispute arose over Respondents' payments to Adolfo; Adolfo left  
6 Respondents' agencies and hired Ms. DeOliveira as his agent. Ms. DeOliveira met with  
7 Ms. Atwood and received from her a set of documents that purport to show that Adolfo  
8 had deposited into his account nine checks (collectively the "Disputed Checks"),  
9 totaling \$25,982.10, that Respondents assert they mailed to Mr. or Ms. Alvarez (usually  
10 to the former).
- 11 • Each document, according to Ms. Atwood, was obtained by her through her on-line  
12 access to Respondents' bank accounts and contains printed information about the  
13 Disputed Check (posting date, account number, check number, amount) provided by the  
14 bank, as well as a copy of the obverse and reverse of the Disputed Check. (Counsel for  
15 Mr. Alvarez argued that one could not necessarily know that the obverse and reverse  
16 shown on each document was of the same Disputed Check.)
- 17 • The documentation for each Disputed Check is accompanied, on a separate page, by a  
18 copy of the appropriate pay stub from Respondents. Finally, with respect to one of the  
19 alleged payments by Respondents to Adolfo, the documentation from Talent Partners to  
20 Respondents also was admitted into evidence so that one could determine the normal  
21 sequence of events from payment from Talent Partners to Respondents and from  
22 Respondents to Adolfo.
- 23 • Six of the nine Disputed Checks, totaling \$16,708.75, appear to be drawn on RPM's  
24 account with Chase; each shows an alleged endorsement by "Alonso Alvarez" (on one  
25 check, for \$3,417.50) and by "Adolfo Alvarez<sup>2</sup>" on the remaining five (totaling  
26

27  
28 <sup>2</sup> Mr. Alvarez testified that his normal practice was to sign Adolfo's name (but not to indicate an account number)  
on the back of a check made out to Adolfo before depositing it into Adolfo's account.

1 \$13,291.25); none of the reverse sides of these six Disputed Checks contains an  
2 indication (e.g., bank stamp) that the Disputed Check was deposited; in addition, the  
3 printed information allegedly provided by Chase on the same document as the image of  
4 the Disputed Check contains the notation "N/A" under "Posting Date".

- 5 • The three remaining Disputed Checks, totaling \$9,273.35, appear to be drawn on an  
6 "RPM Talent" account with Bank of America: the reverse of one (for \$2,453.49) shows  
7 no endorsement but contains a bank stamp stating that the check was credited to the  
8 payee (Adolfo); the reverse of another (for \$2,118.80) contains an endorsement by  
9 "Adolfo Alvarez" along with a stamp of some sort that cannot be deciphered; and the  
10 reverse of the third (for \$4,701.06) shows no endorsement but contains a bank stamp  
11 indicating that it was deposited (although not clearly, as with the first of these three, to  
12 the payee).
- 13 • In contrast to the documentation for the 6 Chase Disputed Checks, the documentation  
14 for the 3 Bank of American Disputed Checks shows a "Posting Date" that is relatively  
15 close to and after the date the Disputed Check allegedly was issued.
- 16 • Mr. Alvarez testified that neither he nor Ms. Alvarez received any of the Disputed  
17 Checks. Ms. DeOliveira testified that her and Mr. Alvarez' inquiries to Respondents'  
18 banks (Ms. DeOliveira to Chase and Mr. Alvarez to Bank of America) led to Mr. and  
19 Ms. Alvarez' sending a November 7, 2012 letter to Ms. Atwood that said: "Bank of  
20 America and Chase informed us that the checks [with the 9 check numbers at issue] do  
21 not exist in their systems and have never been paid out of or deposited into any  
22 accounts on record." (The Parties agreed that Respondents' account numbers, shown  
23 on the Disputed Checks, are genuine.) Specifically, Ms. DeOliveira testified that the  
24 Chase branch manager/vice president told her that although she could not give Ms.  
25 DeOliveira information, without authorization, about Respondents' bank accounts, none  
26 of the six Disputed Check numbers appeared to be for a check drawn on Respondents'  
27 account. Mr. Alvarez did not testify about any statement from Bank of America to him  
28 on this issue.

- 1 • The Parties discussed filing a fraud claim with Bank of America and/or Chase if Mr. or  
2 Ms. Alvarez did not receive the checks soon after their inquiry to Ms. Atwood; Mr.  
3 Alvarez testified that neither he nor Ms. Alvarez ever received the checks and the  
4 Parties agreed that no one filed a fraud claim.

5 The Parties agreed, at the conclusion of the hearing, to cooperate in obtaining from  
6 Chase and Bank of America documentation that would help establish whether any of the  
7 Disputed Checks had been deposited into Adolfo's bank account (or at least had been  
8 negotiated by Mr. or Ms. Alvarez). They also agreed to the terms of a December 15, 2015  
9 Order following December 3, 2015 hearing on petition that said:

10 1. Any Party, by February 16, 2016, may submit and serve additional evidence  
11 (whether or not supported by declaration or stipulation) in support or of in defense of the  
12 allegations of the Petition;

13 2. Any Party, by March 1, 2016, may submit and serve objections to any evidence  
14 submitted in accord with Item #1 above; and

15 3. Any Party, by March 1, 2016, may request a second session of the hearing of the  
16 Petition.

17 4. The Hearing Officer retains the discretion, whether as a consequence of  
18 evidence, objections or requests made, or otherwise, to order a second session of the hearing of  
19 the Petition but if nothing is submitted by any Party by February 16, 2016 then, unless the  
20 Parties notify the Hearing Officer that they have settled the matter, the Hearing Officer will  
21 issue a Determination, in accordance with Labor Code Section 1700.44, based on the record as  
22 it existed as of the close of the December 3, 2015 hearing.

23 No Party submitted additional evidence or objections or requested a second session of  
24 the hearing on the Petition.

25 **III.**

26 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

27 1. Ms. Atwood was during the relevant period licensed as a talent agent under the  
28 name "Tiffany Richer" and was doing business as "RPM Talent". In addition to using the

1 name "RPM Talent", Ms. Atwood also used RPM<sup>3</sup> (which was not separately licensed as an  
2 agent although that issue was not raised by Mr. Alvarez) as a mechanism through which she  
3 worked as an agent.

4 2. During the relevant period, Adolfo was an artist and, through the Contracts  
5 (entered through Mr. Alvarez) retained Respondents as his talent agents; only one Respondent  
6 was Adolfo's agent for each job, depending on whether the job involved "the television and  
7 radio industries" (RPM) or "television and radio commercials" (Ms. Atwood).

8 3. Under the Contracts, both as written and as performed by the Parties, Talent  
9 Partners, which worked as the payroll processing agent for Adolfo's employers, sent to the  
10 appropriate Respondent a check for Adolfo's wages, net of taxes; the appropriate Respondent  
11 retained a commission equal to 10% of the gross wage (i.e., before taxes were withheld) and  
12 was to mail to either Mr. or Ms. Alvarez a check equal to the remainder.

13 4. Three of the Disputed Checks (totaling \$9,273.35) were received and  
14 successfully negotiated by either Mr. or Ms. Alvarez.

15 5. Six of the Disputed Checks (totaling \$16,708.75), whether or not received by  
16 Mr. or Ms. Alvarez, were not successfully negotiated by either Mr. or Ms. Alvarez.

17 **IV.**

18 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

19 Labor Code Section 1700.44(a) states: "In cases of controversy arising under this  
20 chapter [4, of Part 6 of Division 2 of the Labor Code], the parties involved shall refer the  
21 matters in dispute to the Labor Commissioner, who shall hear and determine the same, subject  
22 to an appeal within 10 days after determination, to the superior court where the same shall be  
23 heard de novo. To stay any award of money, the party aggrieved shall execute a bond  
24 approved by the superior court in a sum not exceeding twice the amount of the judgment. In all  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>3</sup> It was not established that RPM was licensed as a talent agent but the issue of whether RPM was unlicensed was  
not raised by Mr. Alvarez.

1 other cases the bond shall be in a sum of not less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and  
2 approved by the superior court.”

3 Pursuant to Section 1700.25:

4 (a) A licensee who receives any payment of funds on behalf of an artist shall  
5 immediately deposit that amount in a trust fund account maintained by him or her in a  
6 bank or other recognized depository. The funds, less the licensee’s commission, shall  
7 be disbursed to the artist within 30 days after receipt. However, notwithstanding the  
8 preceding sentence, the licensee may retain the funds beyond 30 days of receipt in  
9 either of the following circumstances: ...

10 (2) When the funds are the subject of a controversy pending before the  
11 Labor Commissioner concerning a fee alleged to be owed by the artist to the licensee.  
12 ...

13 (b) A separate record shall be maintained of all funds received on behalf of an  
14 artist and the record shall further indicate the disposition of the funds.

15 (c) If disputed by the artist and the dispute is referred to the Labor  
16 Commissioner, the failure of a licensee to disburse funds to an artist within 30 days of  
17 receipt shall constitute a "controversy" within the meaning of Section 1700.44.

18 (d) Any funds specified in subdivision (a) that are the subject of a controversy  
19 pending before the Labor Commissioner under Section 1700.44 shall be retained in the  
20 trust fund account specified in subdivision (a) and shall not be used by the licensee for  
21 any purpose until the controversy is determined by the Labor Commissioner or settled  
22 by the parties.

23 (e) If the Labor Commissioner finds, in proceedings under Section 1700.44, that  
24 the licensee's failure to disburse funds to an artist within the time required by  
25 subdivision (a) was a willful violation, the Labor Commissioner may, in addition to  
26 other relief under Section 1700.44, order the following:

27 ...  
28

1 (2) Award interest to the prevailing artist on the funds wrongfully  
2 withheld at the rate of 10 percent per annum during the period of the violation.

3 “[I]t is the general rule that an allegation of nonpayment, though necessary to the  
4 sufficiency of the complaint, need not be proved, since it is a negative allegation. The plaintiff  
5 need only prove the existence of the obligation. The burden of proving payment then rests on  
6 the defendant, even though he has denied the allegation of nonpayment.” Giesler v. Berman, 6  
7 Cal. App. 3d 919, 930 (1970).

8 The evidence is undisputed that the sum represented by the Disputed Checks  
9 (\$25,982.10) was owed by Respondents (again, without regard to which Respondent) to  
10 Adolfo. The evidence about whether the Disputed Checks were tendered (mailed to Mr. or Ms.  
11 Alvarez) is equivocal. It is, however, Respondents’ burden to prove actual payment by  
12 showing that the Disputed Checks were successfully negotiated and it is Respondents’  
13 responsibility, pursuant to Section 1700.25(b) to maintain the records needed to avoid this kind  
14 of dispute by, for example, maintaining contemporaneous records of checks that had cleared.

15 Respondents could have met their burden by submitting copies of cancelled checks or  
16 of their bank records, by subpoenaing and submitting bank records of Adolfo or of Mr. or Ms.  
17 Alvarez or by providing copies of Respondents’ bank statements. It is not clear, despite the  
18 Parties’ agreement at the close of the December 3, 2015 hearing, why none of this was done.

19 Nevertheless, it was not, and accordingly the record stands on the basis of the evidence  
20 submitted on December 3, 2015.

21 It appears more likely than not that the three Disputed Checks (totaling \$9,273.35)  
22 drawn on the “RPM Talent” account with Bank of America were negotiated; the bank records  
23 appear authentic (and never were challenged by Mr. Alvarez other than by innuendo) and  
24 suffice to show payment.

25 The remaining six Disputed Checks (totaling \$16,708.75) drawn on RPM’s account  
26 with Chase, however, even if they were tendered, do not appear to have been negotiated:  
27 taking at face value the documents Respondents provided that purport to be Chase records, no  
28 bank stamp appears on any of the checks and no posting date is shown. The fact that the

1 checks were accessible on-line to Respondents (assuming that is the case) begs the question of  
2 how Chase could make them available on-line if they had not been deposited by someone but  
3 there simply is not enough evidence that any of the six Disputed Checks actually was deposited  
4 by Mr. or Ms. Alvarez or by Adolfo to warrant the conclusion that Adolfo was paid.

5 That said, there is no evidence of "willfulness" here (see § 1700.25(e)) that would justify  
6 a finding that the sums were wrongfully withheld and therefore to warrant an award of interest.

7 V.

8 **ORDER**

9 The relief sought in the Petition is granted as follows:

10 Adolfo Alvarez, an individual, shall recover, jointly and severally, from Tiffany  
11 Atwood, an individual; and RPM Talent Group / The Agency, LLC, a California limited  
12 liability company, the sum of: **\$16,708.75**.

13  
14 **Respectfully submitted:**

15  
16 Dated: October 3, 2016

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS  
ENFORCEMENT, Department of Industrial Relations,  
State of California

17  
18  
19 By: Barton L. Jacka

20 BARTON L. JACKA  
21 Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

22 **Adopted as the determination of the Labor Commissioner:**

23  
24 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
25 JULIE A. SU  
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR COMMISSIONER  
27  
28

1 checks were accessible on-line to Respondents (assuming that is the case) begs the question of  
2 how Chase could make them available on-line if they had not been deposited by someone but  
3 there simply is not enough evidence that any of the six Disputed Checks actually was deposited  
4 by Mr. or Ms. Alvarez or by Adolfo to warrant the conclusion that Adolfo was paid.

5 That said, there is no evidence of "willfulness" here (see § 1700.25(e) that would justify  
6 a finding that the sums were wrongfully withheld and therefore to warrant an award of interest.

7 V.

8 **ORDER**

9 The relief sought in the Petition is granted as follows:

10 Adolfo Alvarez, an individual, shall recover, jointly and severally, from Tiffany  
11 Atwood, an individual; and RPM Talent Group / The Agency, LLC, a California limited  
12 liability company, the sum of: **\$16,708.75**.

13  
14 **Respectfully submitted:**

15  
16 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS  
17 ENFORCEMENT, Department of Industrial Relations,  
18 State of California

19 By: \_\_\_\_\_  
20 BARTON L. JACKA  
21 Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

22 **Adopted as the determination of the Labor Commissioner:**

23 Dated: 10-03-2014  
24   
25 JULIE A. SU  
26 CALIFORNIA LABOR COMMISSIONER  
27  
28

PROOF OF SERVICE  
(C.C.P. 1013)

**CASE NAME:** *Adolfo Alvarez v. Tiffany Atwood; RPM Talent Group/The Agency, LLC; and Does 1-5 inclusive*  
**CASE NO:** TAC - 30631

I, David Spicer, hereby certify that I am employed in the County of Sacramento, over 18 years of age, not a party to the within action, and that I am employed at and my business address is: DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT, Legal Unit, 2031 Howe Avenue, Suite 100, Sacramento, California 95825.

On October 05, 2016 I served the following document:

*Determination of Controversy*

**A. First Class Mail** - I caused each such envelope, with first-class postage thereon fully prepaid, to be deposited in a recognized place of deposit of the U.S. mail in Sacramento, California, for collection and mailing to the office of the addressee on the date shown below following ordinary business practices.

**B. By Facsimile Service** - I caused a true copy thereof to be transmitted on the date shown below from telecopier (916) 263-2920 to the telecopier number published for the addressee.

**C. By Overnight Delivery** - I caused each document identified herein to be picked up and delivered by Federal Express (FedEx), for collection and delivery to the addressee on the date shown below following ordinary business practices.

**D. By Personal Service** - I caused, by personally delivering, or causing to be delivered, a true copy thereof to the person(s) and at the address(es) set forth below.

**E. By Certified Mail** - I caused each such envelope, with fully prepaid postage thereon for certified mail, to be deposited in a recognized place of deposit of the U.S. mail in Sacramento, California, for collection and mailing to the office of the addressee on the date shown below following ordinary business practices.

Type of Service

Addressee

E

Mark A. Brifman  
Brifman Law Corporation  
15545 Devonshire St.  
Mission Hills, CA 91345

Tiffany Atwood  
239 N. California Street  
Burbank, CA 91505

RPM Talent Group / The Agency, LLC  
c/o Tiffany Atwood, Agent for Service  
2600 W. Olive Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Burbank, CA 91505

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 5, 2016 at Sacramento, California.



David Spicer  
Assistant to Barton Jacka

5640125

**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:  
 Mark Britman  
 Britman Law Corporation  
 15545 Devonshire St.  
 Mission Hills, CA 91345



2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY**

- A. Signature  
 X  Agent  
 Addressee
- B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery
- D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes  
 If YES, enter delivery address below:  No

3. Service Type
- Priority Mail Express®
  - Adult Signature
  - Registered Mail™
  - Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
  - Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Certified Mail®
  - Return Receipt for Merchandise
  - Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation™
  - Collect on Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery
  - Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
  - Insured Mail
  - Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

PS Form 3811, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

5640124

**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:  
 RPM Talent Group / The Agency LLC  
 c/o Tiffany Atwood, Agent for Service  
 2600 W. Olive Ave., 5th Floor  
 Burbank, CA 91505



2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY**

- A. Signature  
 X  Agent  
 Addressee
- B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery
- D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes  
 If YES, enter delivery address below:  No

3. Service Type
- Priority Mail Express®
  - Adult Signature
  - Registered Mail™
  - Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
  - Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Certified Mail®
  - Return Receipt for Merchandise
  - Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation™
  - Collect on Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery
  - Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
  - Insured Mail
  - Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

PS Form 3811, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt

5640126

**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:  
 Tiffany Atwood  
 239 N. California St.  
 Burbank, CA 91505



2. Article Number (Transfer from service label)

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY**

- A. Signature  
 X  Agent  
 Addressee
- B. Received by (Printed Name) C. Date of Delivery
- D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes  
 If YES, enter delivery address below:  No

3. Service Type
- Priority Mail Express®
  - Adult Signature
  - Registered Mail™
  - Adult Signature Restricted Delivery
  - Registered Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Certified Mail®
  - Return Receipt for Merchandise
  - Certified Mail Restricted Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation™
  - Collect on Delivery
  - Signature Confirmation Restricted Delivery
  - Collect on Delivery Restricted Delivery
  - Insured Mail
  - Insured Mail Restricted Delivery (over \$500)

PS Form 3811, April 2015 PSN 7530-02-000-9053

Domestic Return Receipt