J.F.
Law 34 Final Paper
Unpaid Overtime
December 2014

The issue in this case is that many individuals work overtime and do not receive compensation. The facts forthcoming in this document are facts that have arisen in the 20th and 21st Century.

The Rule in the United States Supreme Court for unpaid overtime is:

After certifying a class of 260 plaintiffs, the trial court devised a plan to determine the extent of USB's liability to all class members by extrapolating from a random sample. In the first phase of trial, the court heard testimony about the work habits of 21 plaintiffs. USB was not permitted to introduce evidence about the work habits of any plaintiff outside this sample. Nevertheless, based on testimony from the small sample group, the trial court found that the entire class had been misclassified. After the second phase of trial, which focused on testimony from statisticians, the court extrapolated the average amount of overtime reported by the sample group to the class as a whole, resulting in a verdict of approximately $15 million and an average recovery of over $57,000 per person.

Why do people work unpaid overtime? Using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel, we show that remarkable long-term labor earnings gains are associated with unpaid overtime in West Germany. A descriptive analysis suggests that over a 10-year period workers with unpaid overtime experience on average at least a 10 percentage points higher increase in real labor earnings than their co-workers. Applying panel data models this result generally holds. Furthermore, we find some evidence for gender specific differences with respect to the effects of unpaid overtime worked. Our results point to the importance of investment in current working hours beyond the standard work week to enhance real earnings prospects.

Hence, here is one that was in the 20th Century: Alden v. Maine, 527 US 706 - Supreme Court 1999. There are facts that would have relevance to this matter. In 1992, petitioners, a group of probation officers, filed suit against their employer, the State of Maine, in the United States District Court for the District of Maine. The officers alleged the State had violated the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA), 52 Stat. 1060, as 712*712 amended, 29 U. S. C. § 201 et seq. (1994 ed. and Supp. III), and sought compensation and liquidated damages. While the suit was pending, this Court decided Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida, 517 U. S. 44 (1996), which made it clear that Congress lacks power under Article I to abrogate the States' sovereign immunity from suits commenced or prosecuted in the federal courts. Upon consideration of Seminole Tribe, the District Court dismissed petitioners' action, and the Court of Appeals affirmed. Mills v. Maine, 118 F. 3d 37 (CA1 1997). Petitioners then filed the same action in state court. The state trial court dismissed the suit on the basis of sovereign immunity, and the Maine Supreme Judicial Court affirmed. 715 A. 2d 172 (1998).

Back in the 1970's there was a case: Falk v. Brennan, 414 US 190 - Supreme Court 1973. And, this one had a scope of the real estate business. The Secretary of Labor initiated this action against the petitioners, partners in a real estate management company, for an injunction against future violations of various provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 52 Stat. 1060, as amended, 29 U. S. C. § 201 et seq., and for back wages allegedly due to employees affected by past violations of the Act.[1] The petitioners' defense was that they are not "employers"[2] of the employees involved, and that their business is not a single "enterprise" that is subject to the Act's requirements. This latter contention brought together two separate arguments. First, the

petitioners contended that their combined 192*192 activities do not constitute an "enterprise," as that term is defined in § 3 (r), 29 U. S. C. § 203 (r). Second, the petitioners argued, even if their business activities do amount to an "enterprise," they are not an "[e]nterprise engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce," as that term is defined in § 3 (s), 29 U. S. C. § 203 (s), because they do not have an "annual gross volume of sales made or business done" of $500,000.[3]

Under the partnership name of Drucker & Falk (D & F), the petitioners render management services for the owners of a number of apartment complexes in the State of Virginia. Under its contracts with the apartment owners, D & F agrees to perform, on behalf of each owner and under his nominal supervision, virtually all management functions that are ordinarily required for the proper functioning of an apartment complex.[4] These contracts are for a stated term of not less than one year. Each party can terminate the arrangement by giving the other party 30 days' notice of his intent to do so. Neither D & F nor any of its partners hold any property interest in the buildings that D & F manages. D & F receives as compensation a fixed 193*193 percentage of the gross rentals collected from each project.[5]

Much to my surprise, there was a lot of misconduct in the business world, with greedy companies vying to have their nickel over the hard-working associates.

Now, in the 21st Century we find more companies are having class action lawsuits. Many people are receiving notable settlements and now regretting that they have disgruntled the company that they worked for.

A question that lingers on, what is the workforce going to look like in the 2030 era? That is a question that many will have to wait to see.

Cases:

Marshall v. Safeway, 88 A. 3d 735 - Md:

Court of Appeals, (2014)

Alden v. Maine, 527 US 706 - Supreme Court (1999),

Seminole Tribe of Fla. v. Florida, 517 U. S. 44 (1996),

Falk v. Brennan, 414 US 190 - Supreme Court (1973),

Duran v. US Bank National Assn.,325 P. 3d 916, 59 Cal. 4th 1, 172 Cal. Rptr. 3d … - Cal: Supreme (2014)