

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

Case No.: 02-00045 (SRC) (TJB)

SHAWN LENAHAN and JOSEPH
KAPCSOS, On Behalf of Themselves and
All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SEARS, ROEBUCK and CO.,

Defendant.

**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AS TO LIABILITY**

William J. Pinilis (WJP2130)
KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
237 South Street
Morristown, NJ 07960
Telephone: 973-656-0222
Fax: 973-401-1114

Laurence D. King
Linda M. Fong
Lori S. Brody
KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP
555 Montgomery Street, Suite 1501
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415-772-4700
Fax: 415-772-4707

Todd M. Schneider
Guy B. Wallace
N. William Metke
SCHNEIDER & WALLACE
1700 California Street, Suite 340
San Francisco, California 94109
Telephone: 415-440-3440
Fax: 415-440-3640

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	RELEVANT PROCEDURAL HISTORY	3
III.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	4
	A. Sears, Roebuck & Co.	4
	B. How The Techs Operated Prior To The Program.	4
	C. The Pilot Program	5
	D. The Home Dispatch Program.....	5
	1. Objectives	5
	2. The Program Requires Techs to Transport Specialized Equipment.	6
	3. Normal Commute Time	6
	4. Morning Procedure	7
	5. Running the Route	8
	6. Evening Procedure	9
	7. The Managers Monitor The Technician's Timekeeping And Are Careful In Approving Overtime.....	10
	8. The Routing Program Does Not Allocate Any Time For Non- Service Related Tasks Such As Sorting Parts.....	11
	9. Tech and Manager Bonuses Encourage Techs To Work Off-the- Clock to Maximize Bonuses	11
	E. Sears Anticipated That Techs Would React Negatively To The Program, And They Did.	12
	F. This Action And Sears' Response.	13
	G. Sears Deems the Program a Success.....	14
IV.	ARGUMENT	14

SEARS REFUSAL TO PAY TECHNICIANS FOR ALL HOURS WORKED VIOLATES THE FLSA AND NEW JERSEY WAGE AND HOUR LAWS	14
A. Sears' Home Dispatch Program Requires Plaintiffs To Work Without Pay	15
1. Sears "Knows Or Has Reason To Believe" The Techs Are Working Before And After Their Scheduled Shifts.	16
2. The Work Which Techs Perform Off-The-Clock Is Compensable Because It Is Not <i>De Minimis</i> And Must Therefore Be Compensated As A Matter of Law	17
B. It Is Well-Settled That Employers Must Pay Their Employees For All Otherwise Compensable Time Spent Between The First And Last Work Activities Of The Work Day.....	22
C. Even If The Court Were To Find That The Tasks Performed By The Techs At the Beginning And End Of Their Day Is Not Compensable, The Work Of Driving To The First Customer Of The Day And Home From The Last Customer Not Exempted By The Portal-To-Portal Act As Amended By The Employee Commuting Flexibility Act Because It Constitutes A Principal Activity Of The Techs Job.	24
1. The Techs' Use Of The Vans Is Neither "Travel" Nor "Incidental To The Use Of Such Vehicle For Commuting" Because Driving The Van To And From Customers' Homes Is An Integral Part Of Their Job	25
a. Sears Requires The Technicians To Transport Tools, Parts And Other Equipment To And From The Customers' Homes.....	26
b. The Home Dispatch Program Is Predominately For The Benefit Of The Employer.....	27
c. The Task of Driving To The Customer's Home Is Indispensable To The Tech's Primary Job Goal	27
V. CONCLUSION.....	28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Albanese v. Bergen County, New Jersey</i> , 991 F.Supp. 410, 422 (D.N.J. 1998)	18
<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986).....	14
<i>Apperson v. Exxon Corp.</i> , 1979 WL 1979, *12 (E.D. Cal. 1979).....	23
<i>Armour & Co. v. Wantock</i> , 323 U.S. 126, 132-33 (1944)	15
<i>Baker v. GTE North Inc</i> , 927 F.Supp 1104, 1113 (N.D.Ind 1996), reversed on other grounds by <i>Baker v. GTE North, Inc.</i> , 110 F.3d 28, (7th Cir.1997).....	23, 26, 27
<i>Barrentine v. Arkansas-Best Freight System, Inc.</i> , 750 F. 2d 47, 50 (8th Cir. 1984)	15, 24
<i>Bobo v. United States</i> , 37 Fed.Cl. 690 (1997).....	26
<i>Brusstar v. Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority</i> , 1988 WL 85657, *5 (E.D. Pa. 1988)	18
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317 (1986).....	14
<i>Chao v. Virginia Dep't of Transp.</i> , 157 F. Supp. 2d 681, 689 (E.D. Va 2001)	27
<i>Crenshaw v. Quarles Drilling Corporation</i> , 798 F.2d 1345, 1350 (10th Cir.1986)	26
<i>D A & S Oil Well Servicing Inc. v. Mitchell</i> , 262 F.2d 552, 555 (10th Cir.1958)	26
<i>Dunlop v. City Elec., Inc.</i> , 527 F.2d 394, 398 (5th Cir. 1976)	24
<i>Glenn L. Martin Nebraska Co. v. Culkin</i> , 197 F.2d 981, 987 (8th Cir. 1952), cert. denied, 344 U.S. 866 (1952), rehearing denied, 344 U.S. 888 (1952).....	17

