## Benesch

December 2020



For the fourth time, Benesch has been named **Law Firm of the Year** in Transportation Law by Best Law Firms/ U.S. News & World Report.

The U.S. News & World Report/Best Lawyers® "Best Law Firms" rankings are based on an evaluation process that includes the collection of client and lawyer evaluations, peer review from leading attorneys in their field, and review of additional information provided by law firms as part of the formal submission process.

For more information on Best Lawyers, please visit www.bestlawyers.com.



## FLASH NO. 80 CALIFORNIA APPEALS COURT RULES TRUCKERS ARE NOT EXEMPT FROM INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR CLASSIFICATION TEST





Richard A. Plewacki Jordan J. Call

In November 2020, a California state appeals court ruled in People of the State of California v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County and Cal Cartage Transportation Express, LLC that the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act ("FAAAA") does not preempt application of "ABC" test set forth in California Assembly Bill 5 ("AB 5") as to truck drivers. In reaching this holding, the California Court of Appeals, Second District,

stated that the "ABC test is a law of general application," and AB 5 "does not mandate the use of employees for any business or hiring entity." The state appeals court in Cal Cartage concluded that AB 5 does not amount to a ban of independent contractors in the trucking industry. The appeals court based this conclusion on ways in which companies can purportedly thread the needle such as the business-to-business exemption, despite the fact that, in practice, it is quite difficult for trucking companies to classify truckers as independent contractors and also comply with AB 5. In holding that the FAAAA does not preempt AB 5, this decision reversed the California state court's ruling from which a group of truckers appealed.

As a reminder, the California "ABC" test codified in AB 5 sets forth that hiring entities must classify workers as employees unless they meet all of the following three conditions:

- A. The person is free from the control and direction of the hiring entity in connection with the performance of the work, both under the contract for the performance of the work and in fact.
- B. The person performs work that is outside the usual course of the hiring entity's business.
- C. The person is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, or business of the same nature as that involved in the work performed.

Previously in January 2020, California state trial court Judge William Highberger issued an opinion holding that the FAAAA preempts use of California's version of the "ABC" test (as adopted by the California Supreme Court in Dynamex Operations West Inc. v. Superior Court, which California later codified in AB 5) with respect to classification of independent contractors in the trucking industry. The state trial court held that "[b]ecause Prong B of the ABC Test ... prohibits motor carriers from using independent contractors to provide

www.beneschlaw.com (continued) transportation services, the ABC Test has an impermissible effect on motor carriers' 'price[s], route[s], [and] service[s]' and is preempted by the FAAAA." As stated above, the California state appeals court disagreed with this ruling. The appeals court's opinion likely will be subject to further appellate review, as several parties involved in the case have indicated an intent to seek review from the California Supreme Court.

Also, review of the FAAAA's preemption of the AB 5 contractor classification test is pending in the federal court system in the matter captioned CTA v. Becerra. Relatedly and shortly after the state trial court's decision issued in Cal Cartage in January 2020, federal district court Judge Roger Benitez granted a preliminary injunction upon CTA's request, thereby preventing the state from enforcing the AB 5 classification test with respect to truckers. This decision is currently pending on appeal before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. The parties to the federal appeal have both submitted letters to the Ninth Circuit citing the Cal Cartage decision and urging different interpretations. Still, the Cal Cartage decision is not binding on the Ninth Circuit. At this point in time, legal commentators generally have not predicted with any confidence whether the Ninth Circuit will rule one way or another. Some commentators believe that, in the event the Ninth Circuit does not affirm the preliminary injunction, any decision not to affirm will be due to a desire for a more developed record at the district court level. A more developed record could substantiate the impact of AB 5 on prices, routes, and services, and consequently whether the FAAAA preempts AB 5. Upon the Ninth Circuit's issuance of an opinion, the issue also potentially could reach the United States Supreme Court.

As parallel appeals could reach both the United States Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court, this issue continues to remain in limbo.

For more information on this topic, contact a member of the firm's Transportation & Logistics and Labor & Employment Groups.

Richard A. Plewacki at rplewacki@beneschlaw.com or (216) 363-4159. Jordan J. Call at jcall@beneschlaw.com or (216) 363-6169.

## Additional Information

For additional information, please contact:

## **Transportation & Logistics Practice Group**

Eric L. Zalud, Co-Chair at (216) 363-4178 or ezalud@beneschlaw.com

Marc S. Blubaugh. Co-Chair at (614) 223-9382 or mblubaugh@beneschlaw.com

Michael J. Barrie at (302) 442-7068 or mbarrie@beneschlaw.com

Dawn M. Beery at (312) 212-4968 or dbeery@beneschlaw.com

Allyson Cady at (216) 363-6214 or acady@beneschlaw.com

Kevin M. Capuzzi at (302) 442-7063 or kcapuzzi@beneschlaw.com

Kristopher J. Chandler at (614) 223-9377 or kchandler@beneschlaw.com

Nora Cook at (216) 363-4418 or ncook@beneschlaw.com

John N. Dagon at (216) 363-6124 or jdagon@beneschlaw.com

William E. Doran at (312) 212-4970 or wdoran@beneschlaw.com

John C. Gentile at (302) 442-7071 or jgentile@beneschlaw.com

Joseph N. Gross at (216) 363-4163 or jgross@beneschlaw.com

Jennifer R. Hoover at (302) 442-7006 or ihoover@beneschlaw.com

Trevor J. Illes at (312) 212-4945 or tilles@beneschlaw.com

Whitney Johnson at (628) 600-2239 or wjohnson@beneschlaw.com

Peter N. Kirsanow at (216) 363-4481 or pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com

Ryan M. Krisby at (216) 363-6240 or rkrisby@beneschlaw.com

David M. Krueger at (216) 363-4683 or dkrueger@beneschlaw.com

Charles B. Leuin at (312) 624-6344 or cleuin@beneschlaw.com

Ashleigh Morpeau at (312) 624-6390 or amorpeau@beneschlaw.com

Michael J. Mozes at (614) 223-9376 or mmozes@beneschlaw.com

Kelly E. Mulrane at (614) 223-9318 or kmulrane@beneschlaw.com

Margo Wolf O'Donnell at (312) 212-4982 or modonnell@beneschlaw.com

Lianzhong Pan at (011-8621) 3222-0388 or lpan@beneschlaw.com

Megan J. Parsons at (216) 363-6177 or mparsons@beneschlaw.com

Martha J. Payne at (541) 764-2859 or mpayne@beneschlaw.com

Joel R. Pentz at (216) 363-4618 or jpentz@beneschlaw.com

Richard A. Plewacki at (216) 363-4159 or rplewacki@beneschlaw.com

Julie M. Price at (216) 363-4689 or jprice@beneschlaw.com

David A. Rammelt at (312) 212-4958 or drammelt@beneschlaw.com

Abby Riffee at (614) 223-9387 or ariffee@beneschlaw.com

Helen M. Schweitz at (312) 624-6395 or hschweitz@beneschlaw.com

Peter K. Shelton at (216) 363-4169 or pshelton@beneschlaw.com

Reed W. Sirak at (216) 363-6256 or rsirak@beneschlaw.com

Deana S. Stein at (216) 363-6170 or dstein@beneschlaw.com

Clare Taft at (216) 363-4435 or ctaft@beneschlaw.com

Joseph G. Tegreene at (216) 363-4643 or jtegreene@beneschlaw.com

Jonathan R. Todd at (216) 363-4658 or jtodd@beneschlaw.com

As a reminder, this Advisory is being sent to draw your attention to issues and is not to replace legal counseling.

UNITED STATES TREASURY DEPARTMENT CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE: TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY THE IRS, WE INFORM YOU THAT, UNLESS EXPRESSLY STATED OTHERWISE, ANY U.S. FEDERAL TAX ADVICE CONTAINED IN THIS COMMUNICATION (INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS) IS NOT INTENDED OR WRITTEN TO BE USED, AND CANNOT BE USED, FOR THE PURPOSE OF (i) AVOIDING PENALTIES UNDER THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE, OR (ii) PROMOTING, MARKETING OR RECOMMENDING TO ANOTHER PARTY ANY TRANSACTION OR MATTER ADDRESSED HEREIN.