

Massachusetts High Court: Employees Can't Reap Commonwealth's Wage Act Protections Solely for FLSA Violations

April 18, 2022

On April 14, 2022, the [Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court held](#) that employees seeking to recover damages solely for violations of the federal overtime law are precluded from alternatively pursuing remedies under the notoriously strict Massachusetts Wage Act. The holding brings clarity to the interplay between the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and the Massachusetts Wage Act.

In *Devaney v. Zucchini Gold, LLC*, three plaintiffs who worked at a restaurant alleged violations of the FLSA for failure to pay overtime wages, violations of the Massachusetts Wage Act for failure to pay the FLSA overtime wages in a timely manner, and violations of the federal and state minimum wage laws. The plaintiffs did not assert violation of the Massachusetts Wage Act for failure to pay overtime because, unlike the FLSA, the Massachusetts Wage Act exempts restaurant workers from its purview. Thus, the plaintiffs sought to hold their employer liable under the Massachusetts Wage Act for late payment of overtime wages required only by the FLSA. At the trial court, the plaintiffs recovered treble damages and attorney's fees and costs under the Massachusetts Wage Act for the FLSA overtime claims.

On appeal, the Supreme Judicial Court remanded for recalculation of damages, despite the "host" of case law under which plaintiffs have brought state law and FLSA claims for the same wage violations. Associate Justice Dalila A. Wendlandt reasoned that the remedial scheme of the FLSA, which provides for the **possibility** of double damages, conflicts with the remedial scheme of the Massachusetts Wage Act, which **mandates** treble damages and reasonable attorney's fees. The federal and state laws further conflict with respect to the statute of limitations: Under the FLSA, employees generally can bring claims for two years after a wage claim arises, while under the Massachusetts Wage Act, employees can generally bring claims for three years after the belated payment. Thus, to avoid preemption, the Supreme Judicial Court concluded that a plaintiff seeking to recover payment for overtime solely based on the FLSA is not also privy to the more severe remedial scheme of the Massachusetts Wage Act.

The Supreme Judicial Court also took issue with the trial court's calculation of damages for the FLSA claim. The FLSA provides for overtime at the rate of one and one-half times the regular rate of pay. The trial court, however, calculated damages by multiplying the regular rate of pay by one and one-half without accounting for the regular rate of pay already received by the plaintiffs. The Supreme Judicial Court confirmed that the FLSA's multiplier should only be applied after accounting for amounts already paid in connection with the regular rate of pay.

This decision brings clarity to the relationship between the Massachusetts Wage Act and the FLSA. The Supreme Judicial Court's holding also takes treble damages off the table for employers whose employees are otherwise exempt from the commonwealth's strict overtime laws.

Please contact the Cooley employment team if you have questions about this ruling.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute

legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our [legal notices](#).

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.