mechanics, and partsmen primarily engaged in selling or servicing automobiles, trucks, trailers, farm implements, or aircraft, employed by non-manufacturing establishments primarily engaged in the business of selling such vehicles to ultimate purchasers are specifically exempt from the overtime pay provisions under section 13(b)(10) of the Act. Section 779.372 discusses the exemption provided by section 13(b)(10) and its application whether or not the establishment meets the Act’s definition of a retail or service establishment. The automobile dealer is used here only as an example of the type of franchise arrangement which, within the intent of the Congress, does not result in creating a larger enterprise.) The methods of operation of the independent automobile dealer are widely known. While he operates under a franchise to sell a particular make of automobile and also may be required to stock certain parts and to maintain specified service facilities, it is clear that he retains the control of the management of his business in those respects which characterize an independent businessman. He determines the prices for which he sells his merchandise. Even if prices are suggested by the manufacturer, it is well known that the dealer exercises wide discretion in this respect, free of control by the manufacturer or distributor. Also the automobile dealer retains control with respect to the management of his business, the determination of his employment practices, the operation of his various departments, and his business policies. The type of business in which he is engaged leaves him wide latitude for the exercise of his judgment and for decisions with respect to important aspects of his business upon which its success or failure depends. On the basis of these considerations, it is evident why the independent automobile dealer was cited as an example of the type of franchise which does not create a larger enterprise encompassing the dealer, the manufacturer or the distributor. Similar facts will lead to the same conclusion in other such arrangements.

§ 779.232 Franchise or other arrangements which create a larger enterprise.

(a) In other instances, franchise arrangements do result in bringing a dealer’s business into a larger enterprise with the one granting the franchise. Where the franchise arrangement results in vesting control over the operations of the dealer’s business in the one granting the franchise, the result is to place the dealer in a larger enterprise with the one granting the franchise. Where there are multiple units to which such franchises have been granted, the several dealers are considered to be subject to the common control of the one granting the franchise and all would be included in the same larger enterprise.

(b) It is not possible to lay down specific rules to determine whether a franchise or other agreement is such that a single enterprise results because all the facts and circumstances must be examined in the light of the definition of the term “enterprise” as discussed above in this subpart. However, the following example illustrates a franchising company and independently owned retail establishments which would constitute a single enterprise:

1. The franchisor had developed a system of retail food store operations, built up a large volume of buying power, formulated rules and regulations for the successful operation of stores together constituting a system which for many years proved in practice to be of commercial value to the separate stores; and

2. The franchisor desired to extend its business through the operation of associated franchise stores, by responsible persons in various localities to act as limited agents, and to be parts of the system, to the end that the advantages of and the profits from the business could be enjoyed by those so associated as well as by the franchisor; and

3. The stores were operated under the franchise as part of the general system and connected with the home office of the franchisor from which general administrative jurisdiction was exercised over all franchised stores, wherever located; and
§ 779.233 Independent contractors performing work “for” an enterprise.

(a) The definition in section 3(r) specifically provides that the “enterprise” shall not include “the related activities performed for such enterprise by an independent contractor.” This exclusion will apply where the related activities are performed “for” the enterprise and if such activities are performed by “an independent contractor.” This provision is discussed generally in part 776 of this chapter.

(b) The Senate Report in referring to this exception states as follows:

> It does not include the related activities performed for such an enterprise by an independent contractor, such as an independent accounting firm or sign service or advertising company, * * * (S. Rept. No. 145, 87th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 40).

The term “independent contractor” as used in section 3(r) has reference to an independent business which performs services for other businesses as an established part of its own business activities. The term “independent contractor” as used in 3(r) thus has reference to an independent business which is a separate “enterprise,” and which deals in the ordinary course of its own business operations, at arms length, with the enterprises for which it performs services.

(c) There are many instances in industry where one business performs activities for separate businesses without becoming a part of a larger enterprise. In addition to the examples cited in the Report they may include such services as repairs, window cleaning, transportation, warehousing, collection services, and many others. The essential test in each case will be whether such services are performed “for” the enterprise by an independent, separate enterprise, or whether the related activities are performed for a common purpose through unified operation or common control. In the latter case the activities will be considered performed “by” the enterprise, rather than “for” the enterprise, and will be a part of the enterprise. The distinction in the ordinary case will be readily apparent from the facts. In those cases where questions arise a determination must be made on the basis of all the facts in the light of the statute and the legislative history.

§ 779.234 Establishments whose only regular employees are the owner or members of his immediate family.

Section 3(s) provides that any “establishment which has as its only regular employees the owner thereof or the parent, spouse, child, or other