

that the positions stated will serve as “a practical guide to employers and employees as to how the office representing the public interest in its enforcement will seek to apply it.”<sup>2</sup> These interpretations contain the construction of the law which the administrator believes to be correct and which will guide him in the performance of his duties under the Act, unless and until he is otherwise directed by authoritative decisions of the courts or he concludes upon reexamination of an interpretation that it is incorrect. To the extent that prior administrative rulings, interpretations, practices, and enforcement policies relating to sections 3 (d), (e) and (g) of the Act, which define the terms “employer”, “employee”, and “employ”, are inconsistent or in conflict with the principles stated in this part they are hereby rescinded. The interpretations contained in this part may be relied upon in accordance with section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act,<sup>3</sup> so long as they remain effective and are not modified, amended, rescinded, or determined by judicial authority to be incorrect.

[23 FR 5905, Aug. 5, 1958]

#### § 791.2 Joint employment.

(a) A single individual may stand in the relation of an employee to two or more employers at the same time under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, since there is nothing in the act which prevents an individual employed by one employer from also entering into an employment relationship with a different employer. A determination of whether the employment by the employers is to be considered joint employment or separate and distinct employment for purposes of the act depends upon all the facts in the particular case. If all the relevant facts establish that two or more employers are acting entirely independently of each other and are completely disassociated

provisions (other than the child labor provisions) of the act are issued by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division on the advice of the Solicitor of Labor. See 15 FR 3290.

<sup>2</sup> *Skidmore v. Swift and Company*, 323 U.S. 134, 138.

<sup>3</sup> 61 Stat. 84; 29 U.S.C. 251-262.

with respect to the employment of a particular employee, who during the same workweek performs work for more than one employer, each employer may disregard all work performed by the employee for the other employer (or employers) in determining his own responsibilities under the Act.<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, if the facts establish that the employee is employed jointly by two or more employers, i.e., that employment by one employer is not completely disassociated from employment by the other employer(s), all of the employee's work for all of the joint employers during the workweek is considered as one employment for purposes of the Act. In this event, all joint employers are responsible, both individually and jointly, for compliance with all of the applicable provisions of the act, including the overtime provisions, with respect to the entire employment for the particular workweek.<sup>5</sup> In discharging the joint obligation each employer may, of course, take credit toward minimum wage and overtime requirements for all payments made to the employee by the other joint employer or employers.

(b) Where the employee performs work which simultaneously benefits two or more employers, or works for two or more employers at different times during the workweek, a joint employment relationship generally will be considered to exist in situations such as:

<sup>4</sup> *Walling v. Friend, et al.*, 156 F. 2d 429 (C. A. 8).

<sup>5</sup> Both the statutory language (section 3(d) defining “employer” to include anyone acting directly or indirectly in the interest or an employer in relation to an employee) and the Congressional purpose as expressed in section 2 of the Act, require that employees generally should be paid overtime for working more than the number of hours specified in section 7(a), irrespective of the number of employers they have. Of course, an employer should not be held responsible for an employee's action in seeking, independently, additional part-time employment. But where two or more employers stand in the position of “joint employers” and permit or require the employee to work more than the number of hours specified in section 7(a), both the letter and the spirit of the statute require payment of overtime.

## Wage and Hour Division, Labor

## § 793.1

(1) Where there is an arrangement between the employers to share the employee's services, as, for example, to interchange employees;<sup>6</sup> or

(2) Where one employer is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of the other employer (or employers) in relation to the employee;<sup>7</sup> or

(3) Where the employers are not completely disassociated with respect to the employment of a particular employee and may be deemed to share control of the employee, directly or indirectly, by reason of the fact that one employer controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the other employer.<sup>8</sup>

[23 FR 5905, Aug. 5, 1958, as amended at 26 FR 7732, Aug. 18, 1961]

### PART 793—EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN RADIO AND TELEVISION STATION EMPLOYEES FROM OVERTIME PAY REQUIREMENTS UNDER SECTION 13(b)(9) OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

#### INTRODUCTORY

Sec.

793.0 Purpose of interpretative bulletin.

793.1 Reliance upon interpretations.

793.2 General explanatory statement.

#### REQUIREMENTS FOR EXEMPTION

793.3 Statutory provision.

793.4 General requirements for exemption.

793.5 What determines application of the exemption.

793.6 Exemption limited to employees in named occupations.

793.7 "Announcer."

793.8 "News editor."

793.9 "Chief engineer."

<sup>6</sup>*Mid-Continent Pipeline Co., et al. v. Hargrave*, 129 F. 2d 655 (C.A. 10); *Slover v. Wathen*, 140 F. 2d 258 (C.A. 4); *Mitchell v. Bowman*, 131 F. Supp., 520 (M.D. Ala. 1954); *Mitchell v. Thompson Materials & Construction Co., et al.*, 27 Labor Cases Para. 68, 888; 12 WH Cases 367 (S.D. Calif. 1954).

<sup>7</sup>Section 3(d) of the Act; *Greenberg v. Arsenal Building Corp., et al.*, 144 F. 2d 292 (C.A. 2).

<sup>8</sup>*Dolan v. Day & Zimmerman, Inc., et al.*, 65 F. Supp. 923 (D. Mass. 1946); *McComb v. Midwest Rust Proof Co., et al.*, 16 Labor Cases Para. 64, 927; 8 WH Cases 460 (E.D. Mo. 1948); *Durkin v. Waldron., et al.*, 130 F. Supp., 501 (W.D. La. 1955). See also *Wabash Radio Corp. v. Walling*, 162 F. 2d 391 (C.A. 6).

793.10 Primary employment in named occupations.

793.11 Combination announcer, news editor and chief engineer.

793.12 Related and incidental work.

793.13 Limitation on related and incidental work.

793.14 Employed by.

793.15 Duties away from the station.

793.16 "Radio or television station."

793.17 "Major studio."

793.18 Location of "major studio."

#### WORKWEEK APPLICATION OF EXEMPTION

793.19 Workweek is used in applying the exemption.

793.20 Exclusive engagement in exempt work.

793.21 Exempt and nonexempt work.

AUTHORITY: Secs. 1-19, 52 Stat. 1060, as amended; 75 Stat. 65; 29 U.S.C. 201-219.

SOURCE: 26 FR 10275, Nov. 2, 1961, unless otherwise noted.

#### INTRODUCTORY

### § 793.0 Purpose of interpretative bulletin.

This part 793 constitutes the official interpretative bulletin of the Department of Labor with respect to the meaning and application of section 13(b)(9) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended. This section provides an exemption from the overtime pay provisions of the Act for certain employees employed by certain small market radio and television stations. This exemption was added to the Act by the 1961 amendments. It is the purpose of this bulletin to make available in one place the interpretations of the provisions in section 13(b) (9) which will guide the Secretary of Labor and the Administrator in the performance of their duties under the Act unless and until they are otherwise directed by authoritative decisions of the courts or conclude, upon re-examination of an interpretation, that it is incorrect.

### § 793.1 Reliance upon interpretations.

The interpretations of the law contained in this part are official interpretations which may be relied upon as provided in section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. All prior opinions, rulings and interpretations which are inconsistent with the interpretations in this bulletin are rescinded and withdrawn.