

New Georgia Law Says Franchisors Generally Not Employers of Franchisees or Franchisees' Workers

By Jonathan J. Spitz, Jason R. Carruthers and Kathleen M. Tinnerello

May 5, 2016

The “Protecting Georgia Small Businesses Act” amends Georgia’s Labor and Industrial Relations Code to provide that neither a franchisee nor a franchisee’s employee is considered an employee of a franchisor for “any purpose.” However, the amendment does not apply to the Georgia Workers’ Compensation Code. The Act goes into effect on January 1, 2017.

The Georgia Legislature reportedly passed the Act in response to the National Labor Relations Board’s ruling in *Browning-Ferris Industries of California, Inc.*, 362 NLRB No. 186 (Aug. 27, 2015). In that case, the NLRB broadened its definition of a “joint-employer” to include any entity that: (1) could exercise control over another entity’s employees’ terms and conditions of employment, whether it actually does so or not, or (2) exercises any such control through a third party.

In the wake of *Browning-Ferris*, several states have introduced legislation aimed at protecting businesses from the wide-ranging effects of the NLRB’s aggressive decision. For example, seven states (Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, and Utah) have passed legislation that, like the Georgia law, prohibit a franchisor from being considered an employer or co-employer of franchisee employees. (S.B. 652, 84th Leg., Reg. Sess. (Tex. 2015); La. Rev. Stat. 23:921(F)(2) (2015); Tenn. Code Ann. § 50-1-208(a) (2015); Wisconsin S.B. 422, 2015-2016 Session; (Michigan) MCL 421.1, *et seq.*; Section 41(11); 8 MCL 408.411, *et seq.*, Section 2(d); 9 MCL 408.1001, *et seq.*, Section 5(2); 10 MCL 408.471 *et seq.*, Section 1(d); 11 MCL 418.101 *et seq.*; Indiana House Bill 1218 (2016); Utah H.B. 116, 2016 General Session.)

Similar legislative efforts have been introduced in California, Colorado, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Virginia. (California (AB 545), Colorado (HB 16-1154), Massachusetts (HB 3513), Oklahoma (HB 3164), Pennsylvania (HB 1620), Vermont (HB 694), and Virginia (HB 18).) Legislators in Wyoming, North Carolina, Arizona, and Colorado are evaluating similar efforts.

Although the Protecting Georgia Businesses Act, and other state legislative actions, likely are preempted by the National Labor Relations Act, they represent yet another example of lawmakers’ attempts to rein in what has been described as an “activist” NLRB.

Jackson Lewis attorneys are available to answer inquiries regarding this and other developments.

Meet the Authors



Jonathan J. Spitz
Principal
Atlanta

404-586-1835
SpitzJ@jacksonlewis.com



Jason R. Carruthers
Associate
Atlanta

404-586-1861
Jason.Carruthers@jacksonlewis.com



Kathleen M. Tinnerello
Associate
Cleveland

216-750-4335
Kathleen.Tinnerello@jacksonlewis.com

©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. This Update is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended as legal advice nor does it create an attorney/client relationship between Jackson Lewis and any readers or recipients. Readers should consult counsel of their own choosing to discuss how these matters relate to their individual circumstances. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the express written consent of Jackson Lewis.

This Update may be considered attorney advertising in some states. Furthermore, prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

Jackson Lewis P.C. represents management exclusively in workplace law and related litigation. Our attorneys are available to assist employers in their compliance efforts and to represent employers in matters before state and federal courts and administrative agencies. For more information, please contact the attorney(s) listed or the Jackson Lewis attorney with whom you regularly work.

Related Articles You May Like

April 22, 2016

Labor Department: Changes to Interpretation of Advice Exemption Apply Only to Agreements, Arrangements Entered Into After July 1

The United States Department of Labor published its final rule relating to “persuader” activity under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act on March 24, 2016. Under the DOL’s new interpretation, employers/clients as well as consultants/attorneys would be required to report to the DOL all arrangements in... [Read More](#)

April 18, 2016

Congress Seeks to Block ‘Persuader’ Rule

Republicans in the House of Representatives have introduced a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 87) expressing congressional disapproval and seeking to block implementation of the United States Department of Labor’s controversial Final Rule relating to “persuader” activity under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure... [Read More](#)

April 11, 2016

2016 Utah Legislative Session Employment Law Update

In its 2016 session, the Utah Legislature passed a handful of bills that Utah employers will need to take into account in their workplace policies and procedures. The three bills discussed below were passed by the legislature, signed by the Governor, and are scheduled to go into effect on May 10, 2016. In addition to the following,... [Read More](#)

Related Practices

Labor and
Preventive
Practices

©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. All rights reserved. Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. No client-lawyer relationship has been established by the posting or viewing of information on this website.
*Honolulu, Hawai'i is through an affiliation with Jackson Lewis P.C., a Law Corporation