

---

## 29 C.F.R. § 780.810

---

### Employees not “engaged in” ginning.

---

Since an employee must actually be “engaged in” ginning of cotton to come within the exemption, an employee engaged in other tasks, not an integral part of “ginning” operations, will not be exempt. (See, for rule that only the employees performing the work described in the exemption are exempt, *Wirtz v. Burton Mercantile and Gin Co., Inc.*, 234 F. Supp. 825, aff'd per curiam 338 F. 2d 414, cert. denied 380 U.S. 965; *Wirtz v. Kelso Gin Co., Inc.* (E.D. Ark.) 50 Labor Cases 31, 631, 16 WH Cases 663; *Mitchell v. Stinson*, 217 F. 2d 210; *Phillips v. Meeker Cooperative Light and Power Ass'n* 63 F. Supp. 743, affirmed 158 F. 2d 698; *Jenkins v. Durkin*, 208 F. 2d 941; *Heaburg v. Independent Oil Mill, Inc.*, 46 F. Supp. 751; *Abram v. San Joaquin Cotton Oil Co.*, 46 F. Supp. 969.) The following activities are among those not within the meaning of the term “engaged in ginning of cotton”:

This document is only available to subscribers. Please [log in](#) or [purchase access](#).

[Purchase Login](#)