employee of a motor carrier is not exempted as a “helper” when he rides on such a vehicle, not as a matter of fixed duty, but merely as a convenient means of getting himself to, from, or between places where he performs his assigned work. (See Pyramid Motor Freight Corp. v. Ispass, 330 U.S. 695, modifying, on other grounds, 152 F. (2d) 619 (C.A. 2).)

§ 782.5 Loaders.

(a) A “loader,” as defined for Motor Carrier Act jurisdiction (Ex parte Nos. MC–2 and MC–3, 28 M.C.C. 125, 133, 134, 139), is an employee of a carrier subject to section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act (other than a driver or driver’s helper as defined in §§782.3 and 782.4) whose duties include, among other things, the proper loading of his employer’s motor vehicles so that they may be safely operated on the highways of the country. A “loader” may be called by another name, such as “dockman,” “stacker,” or “helper,” and his duties will usually also include unloading and the transfer of freight between the vehicles and the warehouse, but he engages, as a “loader,” in work directly affecting “safety of operation” so long as he has responsibility when such motor vehicles are being loaded, for exercising judgment and discretion in planning and building a balanced load or in placing, distributing, or securing the pieces of freight in such a manner that the safe operation of the vehicles on the highways of the country or foreign commerce will not be jeopardized. (Levinson v. Spector Motor Service, 300 U.S. 649; Pyramid Motor Freight Corp. v. Ispass, 330 U.S. 695; Walling v. Gordon’s Transport (W.D. Tenn.), 10 Labor Cases, par. 62,934; affirmed 162 F. (2d) 203 (C.A. 6) certiorari denied 332 U.S. 774; Tinerella v. Des Moines Transp. Co., 41 F. Supp. 798.) Where a checker, foreman, or other supervisor plans and immediately directs the proper loading of a motor vehicle as described above, he may come within the exemption as a partial-duty loader. (Levinson v. Spector Motor Service, 330 U.S. 649; Walling v. Gordon’s Transports (W.D. Tenn.); 10 Labor Cases, par. 62,934; affirmed 162 F. (2d) 203 (C.A. 6) certiorari denied 332 U.S. 774; Walling v. Huber & Huber Motor Express, 67 F. Supp. 885; Walling v. Silver Fleet Motor Express, 67 F. Supp. 846; Crean v. Moran Transporation Lines, 57 F. Supp. 212 (W.D. N.Y.). See also 9 Labor Cases, par. 62,416; Walling v. Commercial Motor Freight (S.D. Ind.), 11 Labor Cases, par. 63,451; Hogla v. Porter (E.D. Okla.), 11 Labor Cases, par. 63,389 6 W. H. Cases 608.)

(c) An employee is not exempt as a loader where his activities in connection with the loading of motor vehicles are confined to classes of work other than the kind of loading described above, which directly affects “safety of operation.” (Pyramid Motor Freight Corp. v. Ispass, 330 U.S. 695; Levinson v. Spector Motor Service, 330 U.S. 649) The mere handling of freight at a terminal, before or after loading, or even the placing of certain articles of freight on a motor carrier truck may form so trivial, casual, or occasional a part of an employee’s activities, or his activities may relate only to such articles or to such limited handling of them, that his activities will not come within the kind of “loading” which directly affects “safety of operation.” Thus the following activities have been held to provide no basis for exemption: Unloading; placing freight in convenient places in the terminal, checking bills
of lading; wheeling or calling freight being loaded or unloaded; loading vehicles for trips which will not involve transportation in interstate or foreign commerce within the meaning of the Motor Carrier Act; and activities relating to the preservation of the freight as distinguished from the safety of operation of the motor vehicles carrying such freight on the highways. (Pyramid Motor Freight Corp. v. Ispass, 330 U.S. 695; Levinson v. Spector Motor Service, 330 U.S. 649; Porter v. Poindexter, 158 F. (2d) 728 (C.A. 10); McKeown v. Southern Calif. Freight Forwarders, 49 F. Supp. 543; Walling v. Gordon's Transports (W.D. Tenn.), 10 Labor Cases, par. 62,934, affirmed 62,934 (2d) (1940).) It seems apparent from opinion in Ex parte Nos. MC–2 and MC–3, 28 M.C.C. 125, 132, 133. Ex parte No. MC–204 (Sub. No. 2), 88 M.C.C. 710 (repair of refrigeration equipment). See also Morris v. McComb, 332 U.S. 422.) It has been determined that the safety of operation of such motor vehicles on

§ 782.6 Mechanics.

(a) A “mechanic,” for purposes of safety regulations under the Motor Carrier Act is an employee who is employed by a carrier subject to the Secretary’s jurisdiction under section 204 of the Motor Carrier Act and whose duty it is to keep motor vehicles operated in interstate or foreign commerce by his employer in a good and safe working condition. (Ex parte Nos. MC–2 and MC–3, 28 M.C.C. 125, 132, 133. Ex parte No. MC–40 (Sub. No. 2), 88 M.C.C. 710 (repair of refrigeration equipment). See also Morris v. McComb, 332 U.S. 422.) It has been determined that the safety of operation of such motor vehicles on