

## Wage and Hour Division, Labor

## § 785.19

effectively for his own purposes. It belongs to and is controlled by the employer. In all of these cases waiting is an integral part of the job. The employee is engaged to wait. (See: *Skidmore v. Swift*, 323 U.S. 134, 137 (1944); *Wright v. Carrigg*, 275 F. 2d 448, 14 W.H. Cases (C.A. 4, 1960); *Mitchell v. Wigger*, 39 Labor Cases, para. 66,278, 14 W.H. Cases 534 (D.N.M. 1960); *Mitchell v. Nicholson*, 179 F. Supp. 292, 14 W.H. Cases 487 (W.D.N.C. 1959))

### § 785.16 Off duty.

(a) *General*. Periods during which an employee is completely relieved from duty and which are long enough to enable him to use the time effectively for his own purposes are not hours worked. He is not completely relieved from duty and cannot use the time effectively for his own purposes unless he is definitely told in advance that he may leave the job and that he will not have to commence work until a definitely specified hour has arrived. Whether the time is long enough to enable him to use the time effectively for his own purposes depends upon all of the facts and circumstances of the case.

(b) *Truck drivers; specific examples*. A truck driver who has to wait at or near the job site for goods to be loaded is working during the loading period. If the driver reaches his destination and while awaiting the return trip is required to take care of his employer's property, he is also working while waiting. In both cases the employee is engaged to wait. Waiting is an integral part of the job. On the other hand, for example, if the truck driver is sent from Washington, DC to New York City, leaving at 6 a.m. and arriving at 12 noon, and is completely and specifically relieved from all duty until 6 p.m. when he again goes on duty for the return trip the idle time is not working time. He is waiting to be engaged. (*Skidmore v. Swift*, 323 U.S. 134, 137 (1944); *Walling v. Dunbar Transfer & Storage*, 3 W.H. Cases 284; 7 Labor Cases para. 61,565 (W.D. Tenn. 1943); *Gifford v. Chapman*, 6 W.H. Cases 806; 12 Labor Cases para. 63,661 (W.D. Okla., 1947); *Thompson v. Daugherty*, 40 Supp. 279 (D. Md. 1941))

### § 785.17 On-call time.

An employee who is required to remain on call on the employer's premises or so close thereto that he cannot use the time effectively for his own purposes is working while "on call". An employee who is not required to remain on the employer's premises but is merely required to leave word at his home or with company officials where he may be reached is not working while on call. (*Armour & Co. v. Wantock*, 323 U.S. 126 (1944); *Handler v. Thrasher*, 191 F. 2d 120 (C.A. 10, 1951); *Walling v. Bank of Waynesboro, Georgia*, 61 F. Supp. 384 (S.D. Ga. 1945))

## REST AND MEAL PERIODS

### § 785.18 Rest.

Rest periods of short duration, running from 5 minutes to about 20 minutes, are common in industry. They promote the efficiency of the employee and are customarily paid for as working time. They must be counted as hours worked. Compensable time of rest periods may not be offset against other working time such as compensable waiting time or on-call time. (*Mitchell v. Greinetz*, 235 F. 2d 621, 13 W.H. Cases 3 (C.A. 10, 1956); *Ballard v. Consolidated Steel Corp., Ltd.*, 61 F. Supp. 996 (S.D. Cal. 1945))

### § 785.19 Meal.

(a) *Bona fide meal periods*. Bona fide meal periods are not worktime. Bona fide meal periods do not include coffee breaks or time for snacks. These are rest periods. The employee must be completely relieved from duty for the purposes of eating regular meals. Ordinarily 30 minutes or more is long enough for a bona fide meal period. A shorter period may be long enough under special conditions. The employee is not relieved if he is required to perform any duties, whether active or inactive, while eating. For example, an office employee who is required to eat at his desk or a factory worker who is required to be at his machine is working while eating. (*Culkin v. Glenn L. Martin, Nebraska Co.*, 97 F. Supp. 661 (D. Neb. 1951), aff'd 197 F. 2d 981 (C.A. 8, 1952), cert. denied 344 U.S. 888 (1952); *Thompson v. Stock & Sons, Inc.*, 93 F. Supp. 213 (E.D. Mich 1950), aff'd 194 F.