

1 DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT  
2 Department of Industrial Relations  
3 State of California  
4 BY: MILES E. LOCKER, Attorney No. 103510  
5 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 3166  
6 San Francisco, California 94102  
7 Telephone: (415) 703-4150  
8  
9 Attorney for the Labor Commissioner

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
BEFORE THE LABOR COMMISSIONER  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

10	H. LEE BURTON,	)	No. TAC 56-94
11		)	
12	Petitioner,	)	
13		)	
14	vs.	)	DETERMINATION OF
15		)	CONTROVERSY
16	RUBY EDISON and DARLENE SAN PEDRO	)	
17	dba PRESTIGE MODEL & TALENT	)	
18	MANAGEMENT,	)	
19		)	
20	Respondents.	)	
21		)	

22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
INTRODUCTION

29 The above-captioned petition was filed on August 8,  
30 1994 by H. LEE BURTON (hereinafter "Petitioner" or "BURTON")  
31 alleging that PRESTIGE MODEL & TALENT AGENCY (hereinafter  
32 "Respondent" or "PRESTIGE") violated the Talent Agencies Act  
33 (Labor Code §1700, et seq.) by acting in the capacity of a talent  
34 agency without a license and by failing to pay Petitioner for  
35 modeling services that were provided in connection with an  
36 assignment that had been procured by Respondent. By his  
37 petition, BURTON seeks "full back pay and maximum penalties  
38 allowed by law".  
39 ///

1 Respondent, although having been served with the  
2 petition, failed to file an answer. A hearing was thereupon  
3 scheduled for September 21, 1994 in San Francisco, California,  
4 before the undersigned attorney for the Labor Commissioner.  
5 Petitioner appeared in propria persona. Respondent appeared  
6 through DARLENE SAN PEDRO. Based upon the testimony and evidence  
7 presented at this hearing, the Labor Commissioner adopts the  
8 following Determination of Controversy.

9 FINDINGS OF FACT

10 1. Sometime in mid-May 1994, Petitioner and Wendie  
11 Steffies, an employee of PRESTIGE, entered into an oral agreement  
12 under which Respondent agreed to attempt to procure modeling  
13 assignments for Petitioner. On or about May 30, 1994, Riva  
14 Pidge, another PRESTIGE employee, telephoned Petitioner and  
15 informed him that Respondent had obtained a modeling assignment  
16 for him that would pay \$100, with the work to be performed on  
17 June 1, 1994 at the Neptune Society Columbarium. Pidge did not  
18 say anything to BURTON as to how PRESTIGE would be compensated  
19 for having procured this assignment.

20 2. Petitioner reported to the modeling assignment on  
21 June 1, 1994. He observed about a dozen other models at the  
22 photo shoot. He performed his modeling assignment, which took  
23 about two hours, and returned to Respondent's office later that  
24 day with a voucher showing that he had completed the job. He  
25 turned in the voucher, on which his address had been written, and  
26 was told by Lisa, another PRESTIGE employee, that a payment check  
27 would be mailed to him.

28 3. Respondent received full payment from the Neptune

1 Society in late June 1994. This payment was for the services of  
2 all of the models provided by PRESTIGE, not just Petitioner.  
3 According to DARLENE SAN PEDRO, PRESTIGE charged the Neptune  
4 Society \$100 for Petitioner's services. PRESTIGE failed to  
5 disburse the amount due to Petitioner.

6 4. On June 6, 1994, Respondent filed an application  
7 with the Labor Commissioner for a talent agency license.  
8 Respondent was not licensed as a talent agent at any time until  
9 June 9, 1994, when it received a temporary license from the Labor  
10 Commissioner. A second temporary license expired on October 18,  
11 1994 and presently, Respondent is not licensed. Its application  
12 for a permanent license is still pending.

13 5. In August 1994, Petitioner met with DARLENE SAN  
14 PEDRO to demand payment. She promised to send him a check.  
15 However, no money was provided to Petitioner until immediately  
16 prior to the commencement of the hearing on September 21, 1994,  
17 when SAN PEDRO gave Petitioner a check for \$80. At the hearing,  
18 SAN PEDRO testified that she deducted 20% from Petitioner's  
19 earnings of \$100 because the agency charges a 20% fee on all  
20 earnings for work procured by the agency. At the conclusion of  
21 the hearing, after the undersigned attorney explained that an  
22 unlicensed talent agent is not permitted to charge any fee for  
23 procuring work, and that Petitioner should be reimbursed for this  
24 fee, SAN PEDRO provided Petitioner with a second check in the  
25 amount of \$20.

26 6. SAN PEDRO testified that PRESTIGE failed to pay  
27 Petitioner in a timely manner because of the confusion resulting  
28 from staff turnover and her inability to find Petitioner's

1 address. She did admit that BURTON's address was listed on the  
2 petition, and that she had been served with this petition on  
3 August 9, 1994, but stated that she "thought it would be best to  
4 pay him at the hearing."

5 7. A day or two following the hearing, BURTON  
6 contacted the undersigned attorney's office, claiming that one or  
7 both of the checks provided to him by SAN PEDRO could not be  
8 cashed by reason of non-sufficient funds in Respondent's bank  
9 account.

10 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

11 1. Petitioner is an "artist" within the meaning of  
12 Labor Code §1700.4(b). Respondent is a "talent agency" within  
13 the meaning of Labor Code §1700.4(a), which defines "talent  
14 agency" as a person who "engages in the occupation of procuring,  
15 offering, promising, or attempting to procure employment or  
16 engagements for an artist". The Labor Commissioner has  
17 jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Labor Code §1700.44.

18 2. Labor Code §1700.5 provides that "no person shall  
19 engage in or carry on the occupation of a talent agency without  
20 first procuring a license therefor from the Labor Commissioner".  
21 An unlicensed talent agent is not entitled to retain any  
22 commissions purportedly earned pursuant to an agreement with an  
23 artist, as any such agreement is void. Buchwald v. Superior  
24 Court (1967) 254 Cal.App.2d 347, 351. Respondent therefore had  
25 no right to retain any commissions on amounts earned by  
26 Petitioner.

27 3. In 1994, prior to its recent amendment, Labor Code  
28 §1700.25 provided that whenever a talent agency receives payment

1 of funds on behalf of an artist, the agent must immediately  
2 deposit the funds in a trust account and, within 15 days after  
3 receipt of the funds, make full disbursement, less the agent's  
4 commission, to the artist. (As discussed above, an unlicensed  
5 agent is not entitled to retain any commissions.) Respondent's  
6 failure to promptly disburse the funds it received on behalf of  
7 Petitioner constitutes an inexcusable and willful violation of  
8 Labor Code §1700.25. The "excuses" asserted by DARLENE SAN PEDRO  
9 at the hearing are wholly inadequate and underscore the  
10 reprehensible manner in which this agency abrogated its fiduciary  
11 duty.

12 4. Although the petition seeks "maximum penalties  
13 allowed by law", the Labor Code does not provide for penalties in  
14 a case such as this. Labor Code §203, which allows for the  
15 imposition of penalties against an employer who willfully fails  
16 to pay wages owed to an employee does not apply to a payment  
17 dispute between an artist and a talent agency. An artist is not  
18 an employee of the talent agency but rather, is employed by the  
19 client who procures his or her services. A talent agency is not  
20 the employer of an artist but rather, is the artist's agent for  
21 the purpose of procuring employment from employers. Penalties  
22 cannot be imposed by the Labor Commissioner absent statutory  
23 authorization. Because there is no statute which would allow for  
24 the imposition of penalties, the Labor Commissioner is unable to  
25 provide for such a remedy.

26 ORDER

27 For all of the above-stated reasons, IT IS HEREBY  
28 ORDERED that Respondent DARLENE SAN PEDRO and RUBY EDISON dba

1 PRESTIGE MODEL & TALENT MANAGEMENT pay Petitioner H. LEE BURTON  
2 \$100 for his unpaid earnings, unless the two checks totalling  
3 \$100 have been negotiated, in which case Respondent is directed  
4 to immediately provide the Labor Commissioner with proof that  
5 these checks have been negotiated.

6  
7 DATED: January 12, 1995

Miles E. Locker  
MILES E. LOCKER, Attorney for  
the Labor Commissioner

8  
9  
10  
11 The above Determination is adopted by the Labor  
12 Commissioner in its entirety.

13  
14 DATED: 1-17-95

Victoria Bradshaw  
VICTORIA BRADSHAW  
State Labor Commissioner

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

