

Wage and Hour Lawsuits Pose an Ongoing Threat

May 22, 2014

Wage and hour cases continue to flood the courts. During the yearlong period ending March 31, 2014, approximately 8,126 lawsuits [were filed](#) seeking relief under the federal [Fair Labor Standards Act](#). In the prior year, the number was 7,764. This upward trend dates back several years and shows no sign of relenting. These figures don't account for the numerous wage and hour cases filed in state courts, under state laws. No business is immune from the risk of these lawsuits. On May 12, a federal judge in New York preliminarily approved a \$6.9 million settlement between Merrill Lynch & Co. and at least 500 field financial advisers regarding claims that they were misclassified as exempt from overtime pay ([Zeltser v. Merrill Lynch & Co.](#), S.D.N.Y. No. 1:13-cv-01531). In 2013, Merrill Lynch & Co. agreed to pay \$12 million to about 12,000 "client associates" as part of the settlement of a wage and hour lawsuit. On May 19, in another case, the U.S. Labor Department announced that Paul Johnson Drywall Inc. [agreed to pay](#) \$600,000 in back wages, damages, and penalties to settle a sub-contractor's alleged misclassification of workers as independent contractors instead of employees. The Labor Department [website](#) lists numerous other six- and seven-figure settlements of wage and hour cases. This data underscores the importance of reviewing classification and pay practices. These reviews may lead to the discovery of unintended mistakes in classification or other pay practices. The review may be especially helpful in litigation to support an argument that the court should not impose liquidated (double) damages because the review established the employer acted in subjective good faith and had reasonable grounds for believing it was in compliance with wage and hour laws.

Authored By



James M. Sconzo



James R. Wiley

Related Practices

[Labor & Employment](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.