



ALERTS

California Supreme Court Ruling To Give More Workers Employee Status

May 1, 2018 | [Atlanta](#) | [Chicago](#) | [Columbus](#) | [Dallas](#) | [Delaware](#) | [Elkhart](#) | [Fort Wayne](#) | [Grand Rapids](#) | [Indianapolis](#) | [Los Angeles](#) | [Minneapolis](#) | [New York](#) | [San Diego](#) | [South Bend](#)

On April 30, the California Supreme Court issued an opinion effectively expanding the number of workers that will be deemed as employees for purposes of California wage orders, ultimately granting such workers benefits, minimum wage, and overtime compensation, as well as rest and meal breaks.

The court issued a unanimous decision in *Dynamex Operations West Inc. v. The Superior Court of Los Angeles County*, Case No. S222732, a lawsuit in which two delivery drivers, on behalf of themselves and other drivers similarly situated, sued Dynamex Operations West, Inc., a nationwide packaging and document delivery company, alleging that Dynamax had misclassified its delivery drivers as independent contractors. Dynamex originally classified its drivers as employees, but reclassified them as independent contractors in 2004, and was subsequently sued in 2005. Since then, the case has been working its way through the California lower courts.

The court's opinion turned away from the *Borello* multifactor test, which, in determining a worker's status, looked at an employer's control over its workers and has been the standard over the last three decades based on the 1989 California Supreme Court ruling in *S.G. Borello & Sons Inc. v. Department of Industrial Relations*.

The court's ruling in *Dynamex* adopted California Industrial Welfare Commission's definition of employment, which makes an employee anyone whom a business "engage[s], suffer[s] or permit[s]" to work. The opinion held that under this "suffer or permit to work" standard, a court

RELATED PEOPLE



Kenneth J. Yerkes

Partner
Indianapolis

P 317-231-7513
F 317-231-7433
ken.yerkes@btlaw.com



William A. Nolan

Partner
Columbus

P 614-628-1401
F 614-628-1433
bill.nolan@btlaw.com



Mark S. Kittaka

Partner
Fort Wayne, Columbus

P 260-425-4616
F 260-424-8316
mark.kittaka@btlaw.com



Robert W. Sikkel Of Counsel (Retired)

P 616-742-3978
robert.sikkel@btlaw.com



“presumptively considers all workers to be employees, and permits workers to be classified as independent contractors only if the hiring business demonstrates that the worker in question satisfies each of three conditions: (a) that the worker is free from the control and direction of the hirer in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for the performance of the work and in fact; and (b) that the worker performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity’s business; and (c) that the worker is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as that involved in the work performed.” The California Supreme Court further said, “[t]he hiring entity’s failure to prove any one of these three prerequisites will be sufficient in itself to establish that the worker is an included employee, rather than an excluded independent contractor, for purposes of the wage order.”

This decision is likely to create challenges for California employers as it will undoubtedly increase the number of individuals who should be considered employees, particularly those who work in the “gig economy.”

Visit us on Twitter [@BTLawLE](#), and don’t forget to bookmark our blogs, [Labor Relations](#) and [Currents](#).

© 2018 Barnes & Thornburg LLP. All Rights Reserved. This page, and all information on it, is proprietary and the property of Barnes & Thornburg LLP. It may not be reproduced, in any form, without the express written consent of Barnes & Thornburg LLP.

This Barnes & Thornburg LLP publication should not be construed as legal advice or legal opinion on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general informational purposes only, and you are urged to consult your own lawyer on any specific legal questions you may have concerning your situation.

Visit us online at www.btlaw.com and follow us on Twitter [@BTLawNews](#).

John T.L. Koenig

Partner

Atlanta

P 404-264-4018

F 404-264-4033

john.koenig@btlaw.com



Peter A. Morse, Jr.

Partner

Indianapolis, Washington, D.C.

P 317-231-7794

F 317-231-7433

pete.morse@btlaw.com



Scott J. Witlin

Partner

Los Angeles

P 310-284-3777

F 310-284-3894

scott.witlin@btlaw.com



David B. Ritter

Partner

Chicago

P 312-214-4862

F 312-759-5646

david.ritter@btlaw.com



Teresa L. Jakubowski

Partner

Washington, D.C.

P 202-371-6366

F 202-289-1330

teresa.jakubowski@btlaw.com



Janilyn Brouwer Daub

Partner

South Bend, Elkhart

P 574-237-1139

F 574-237-1125

janilyn.daub@btlaw.com

RELATED PRACTICE AREAS

Labor and Employment