LATHAM&WATKINS

Client Alert

Latham & Watkins Benefits, Compensation and Employment Practice April 13, 2016 | Number 1952

Sitting on the Job: When California Employers Must Provide Seats

Employees are entitled to sit at work when the nature of the work reasonably permits the use of seats.

On April 4, 2016, the California Supreme Court, in an opinion authored by Justice Carol A. Corrigan, clarified California's rules for determining when employees are entitled to sit at work. The opinion held that California law requires employers to provide seating when the nature of the work "reasonably permits the use of seats." The court clarified that the nature of the work "reasonably permits the use of seats" if being seated does not interfere with the employee's task at hand.

Questions the Ninth US Circuit Court of Appeals certified to the California Supreme Court prompted the decision. Several lawsuits involving employees' claims asserting they were wrongfully denied seating were appealed to the Ninth Circuit from United States district courts, including class actions brought by cashiers at CVS drug store (*Kilby v. CVS Pharmacy, Inc.*) and Chase Bank (*Henderson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank NA*). Due to the lack of clear authority on this issue, the Ninth Circuit asked California's highest court for an opinion clarifying California law.

The Court's Holding

The California Supreme Court addressed the following questions from the Ninth Circuit: (1) Does the phrase "nature of work" refer to individual tasks performed throughout the workday, or to the entire range of an employee's duties performed during a given day or shift? (2) When determining whether the nature of the work "reasonably permits" use of a seat, what factors should courts consider? Specifically, are an employee's business judgment, the physical layout of the workplace, and the characteristics of a specific employee relevant factors? (3) If an employer has not provided any seat, must a plaintiff prove a suitable seat is available in order to show the employer has violated the seating provision? The Court answered that:

- The "nature of the work" refers to an employee's tasks performed at a given location for which a right to a suitable seat is claimed, rather than a "holistic" consideration of the entire range of an employee's duties anywhere on the jobsite during a complete shift. If the tasks being performed at a given location reasonably permit sitting, and provision of a seat would not interfere with performance of any other tasks that may require standing, a seat is called for.
- Whether the nature of the work reasonably permits sitting is a question to be determined objectively based on the totality of the circumstances. An employer's business judgment and the physical layout

Latham & Watkins operates worldwide as a limited liability partnership organized under the laws of the State of Delaware (USA) with affiliated limited liability partnerships conducting the practice in the United Kingdom, France, Italy and Singapore and as affiliated partnerships conducting the practice in Hong Kong and Japan. The Law Office of Salman M. Al-Sudairi is Latham & Watkins associated office in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. Under New York's Code of Professional Responsibility, portions of this communication contain attorney advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Results depend upon a variety of factors unique to each representation. Please direct all inquiries regarding our conduct under New York's Disciplinary Rules to Latham & Watkins LLP, 885 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10022-4834, Phone: +1.212.906.1200. © Copyright 2016 Latham & Watkins. All Rights Reserved.

of the workplace are relevant but not dispositive factors. The inquiry focuses on the nature of the work, not an individual employee's characteristics.

• The nature of the work aside, if an employer argues there is no suitable seat available, the burden is on the employer to prove unavailability.

Practical Considerations for California Employers

The California Supreme Court decision makes clear that if an employer wishes to avoid providing seating, the employer must demonstrate that suitable seating is not available.

An employer cannot escape the seating requirement because some of the employee's tasks cannot be performed while seated. Nor must an employer provide seating simply because some discrete task could possibly be performed while seated. The standard is whether some of the work can "reasonably" be performed while seated, which is looked at based on a "totality of the circumstances," including the: frequency and duration of tasks; feasibility and practicality of providing seating; employer's evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of overall job performance; and physical layout of the workspace. However, neither the employer or its customers' preferences, nor physical differences among employees, are appropriate considerations.

Employers that do not provide seating should re-examine whether seating can be provided without interfering with the performance of job duties, and may need to alter their work environments to provide seats for employees. This decision most obviously impacts retail and hospitality industries, as well as other industries with cashiers and tellers; however, the decision is not limited to those environments.

Even if the job duties cannot reasonably be performed while seated, importantly, when requested, employers must provide seating when an employee is still on the job, but not actively engaged in any duties.

Finally, while keeping in mind that the considerations outlined in the California Supreme Court opinion will lead to different results depending on the specific job, employers should no longer assume that certain job positions cannot be done from a seated position.

If you have questions about this *Client Alert*, please contact one of the authors listed below or the Latham lawyer with whom you normally consult:

Joseph B. Farrell joe.farrell@lw.com +1.213.891.7944 Los Angeles

Linda M. Inscoe

linda.inscoe@lw.com +1.415.395.8028 San Francisco

Hannah Withers

hannah.withers@lw.com +1.415.646.7837 San Francisco

Christina P. Teeter

christina.teeter@lw.com +1.415.395.8897 San Francisco

You Might Also Be Interested In

Link: http://www.courts.ca.gov/opinions/documents/S215614.PDF

Client Alert is published by Latham & Watkins as a news reporting service to clients and other friends. The information contained in this publication should not be construed as legal advice. Should further analysis or explanation of the subject matter be required, please contact the lawyer with whom you normally consult. The invitation to contact is not a solicitation for legal work under the laws of any jurisdiction in which Latham lawyers are not authorized to practice. A complete list of Latham's *Client Alerts* can be found at <u>www.lw.com</u>. If you wish to update your contact details or customize the information you receive from Latham & Watkins, visit <u>http://events.lw.com/reaction/subscriptionpage.html</u> to subscribe to the firm's global client mailings program.