UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 MAXINE ELLIS,)
12)
13 Plaintiff(s),)
14 v.)

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT SAFAR'S MOTION TO DISMISS

BZ

No. C10-1599

DOTNEXT INC.; LEAPFISH INC.;)
BEHNAM BEHROUZI; RUSSELL
SAFAR; DOES 1-10 inclusive,)

Defendant(s).

Before the Court is defendant Safar's motion to dismiss the fourth and seventh causes of action of plaintiff's complaint. Plaintiff concedes that the complaint is inadequate and requests leave to file an amended complaint which more specifically addresses Safar's status as her employer. Safar opposes granting leave on the grounds that it would be futile. For the following reasons, defendant's motion is **DENIED**.

Under the FLSA, "employer" is defined to include "any

person acting directly or indirectly in the interest of an employer in relation to an employee.... 29 U.S.C. § 203(d). "The definition of 'employer' under the FLSA is not limited by the common law concept of 'employer,' and is to be given an expansive interpretation in order to effectuate the FLSA's broad remedial purposes." Bonnette v. California Health & Welfare Agency, 704 F.2d 1465, 1469 (9th Cir. 1983). Ninth Circuit uses a four factor test to determine if an individual qualifies as an employer under the FLSA: "whether the alleged employer (1) had the power to hire and fire the employees, (2) supervised and controlled employee work schedules or conditions of employment, (3) determined the rate and method of payment, and (4) maintained employment records." Gilbreath v. Cutter Biological, Inc., 931 F.2d 1320, 1324 (9th Cir. 1991). Courts also consider ownership interest in making the determination. Boucher v. Shaw, 572 F.3d 1087, 1091-92 (9th Cir. 2009).

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The determination of whether an employer-employee relationship exists does not depend on 'isolated factors but rather upon the circumstances of the whole activity.' Rutherford Food Corp. v. McComb, 331 U.S. 722, 730(1947). The touchstone is the "economic reality" of the relationship. Goldberg v. Whitaker House Coop., Inc., 366 U.S. 28, 33 (1961).

Id. at 1091. In Lambert v. Ackerly the Court held that individual managers may in certain circumstances be held liable under the FLSA as employers. 180 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 1999). That holding was reaffirmed in Boucher, although the individual defendants in Boucher did not contest whether they could be held liable.

Despite Safar's factual disagreement with plaintiff's

proposed amended allegations, I cannot find as a matter of law that plaintiff's amendment would be futile. Plaintiff alleges that Safar participated in decisions regarding plaintiff's pay, schedule, discipline, and termination. Opp. p. 2. Such allegations are somewhat similar to those found sufficient in Lambert and Boucher. Further, there is significant case law which supports imposition of individual liability under the FLSA in a variety of circumstances. See e.g. cases collected in Solis v. Universal Project Management, Inc., 2009 WL 4043362, 4-6 (S.D.Tex. 2009).

The Court is mindful that defendant Safar vigorously disagrees with plaintiff's factual allegations contained in her proposed amended complaint. Such factual disagreements are better addressed in a motion for summary judgment rather than in a motion to dismiss. Safar's motion to dismiss is DENIED. Plaintiff shall file a single amended complaint which incorporates the supplemental complaint (Doc. No. 33) by JULY 30, 2010. Defendant Safar shall answer by AUGUST 20, 2010.

Dated: July 22, 2010

Bernard/Zimmerman

United States Magistrate Judge

G:\BZALL\-BZCASES\ELLIS V. DOXNEXT\ORD DENYING MOT TO DISMISSBZ.wpd

б