

 [Click to Print](#) or Select 'Print' in your browser menu to print this document.

Page printed from: [The Recorder](#)

Homejoy Draws Another Suit

Ross Todd, The Recorder

July 24, 2015

SAN FRANCISCO — Homejoy Inc., which cited a wave of lawsuits it faces as a prime reason it will shut down at the end of July, was sued again Thursday.

Lesley Weaver of Block & Leviton sued Homejoy on behalf a Berkeley man who claims the San Francisco-based home-cleaning platform violated state and federal laws by failing to give workers 60 days advance notice of their termination.

The [proposed class action](#) filed in U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California seeks 60 days' pay and benefits under state and federal WARN Acts. The laws require employers conducting a mass layoff to give 60 days notice before the terminations are set to take effect. The law also requires that notice be given to social service and government organizations because of the effect on the local economy.

Homejoy [announced earlier this month](#) that it will cease operations on July 31. In an interview with Re/Code, company co-founder Adora Cheung blamed lawsuits alleging that the company's cleaners had been misclassified as independent contractors rather than employees. Among the suits Cheung referenced were [two filed](#) by lawyers at Goldstein, Borgen, Dardarian & Ho and Browne Labor Law in San Francisco Superior Court in March—one a proposed class action and the other filed under the Private Attorneys General Act. Shannon Liss-Riordan of Lichten & Liss-Riordan, who is heading up federal misclassification suits against ride-hailing companies Uber Technologies Inc. and Lyft Inc., [filed a class action in federal court](#) bringing similar claims against Homejoy later in March.

Lawyers at Paul Hastings who have been defending Homejoy in the suits recently asked to withdraw from the cases. U.S. District Judge Edward Chen denied their request to withdraw from the federal suit on Tuesday, asking that they show they had informed Homejoy of the possibility of default and other potential negative consequences of withdrawal. A spokesperson for Homejoy declined to comment on Thursday's filing or what firm it will use going forward, citing a company policy against speaking about pending litigation.

Weaver said Friday that Homejoy's actions were "particularly egregious" in light of [last](#)

[month's decision from the California Labor Commissioner](#) finding that an Uber driver was an employee rather than a contractor.

"To not give its employees and the local economy notice of termination after that ruling simply to save a month's pay to those workers calls into question why we have accepted the moniker 'sharing economy,'" Weaver said. "Some of these people will not be able to find work in just two weeks."

Contact the reporter at rtodd@alm.com.

Copyright 2015. ALM Media Properties, LLC. All rights reserved.