



Board of Administration

Agenda Item 9a14

November 17, 2021

Item Name: Proposed Decision – In the Matter of the Appeal of Membership Determination and Post Retirement Employment of TARLOCHAN SANDHU, Respondent, and CITY OF CAPITOLA; CITY OF ALAMEDA; CITY OF UNION CITY; CITY OF LOS ALTOS HILLS, Respondents.

Program: Employer Account Management Division

Item Type: Action

Parties' Positions

Staff argues that the Board of Administration should adopt the Proposed Decision, as modified. Respondent Tarlochan Sandhu's (Respondent Sandhu) position is included in Attachment C, if any.

Respondents City of Capitola; City of Alameda; City of Union City; City of Los Altos Hills' (Respondents) positions are included in Attachment C, if any.

Strategic Plan

This item is not a specific product of either the Strategic or Annual Plans. The determination of administrative appeals is a power reserved to the Board of Administration.

Procedural Summary

Respondent Sandhu submitted an appeal concerning CalPERS' determination that he was a common law employee of the City of Capitola, City of Alameda, City of Union City and City of Los Altos Hills from February 2015 through June 2016, and that his employment from February 1 through June 20, 2016, violated the PERL's post-retirement employment rules. The matter was heard by the Office of Administrative Hearings on March 9, 24, and 25, 2021. A Proposed Decision was issued on September 17, 2021, affirming CalPERS' determination and denying the appeal.

Alternatives

- A. For use if the Board decides to modify and adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, pursuant to Government Code section 11517 (c)(2)(C) which authorizes the Board to "make technical or other minor changes in the proposed decision," hereby modifies the Proposed Decision, to avoid ambiguity and ensure the "Conclusion" on page 29 is consistent with paragraph 4 on page 4, paragraph 47 and footnote 8 on page 18, paragraph 58 on page 21, and the "Order" on page 30, staff recommends the fifth line, of paragraph 18, on page 29, of the Proposed Decision, which states "and Union City (from September 1 to June 20, 2016, only) violated the PEPRA's post-" be changed to state "and Union City (from February 1 to June 20, 2016, only) violated the PEPRA's post- . . ." and hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated September 17, 2021, as modified, concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

B. For use if the Board decides to adopt the Proposed Decision as its own Decision:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System hereby adopts as its own Decision the Proposed Decision dated September 17, 2021, concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu Sandhu; RESOLVED FURTHER that this Board Decision shall be effective 30 days following mailing of the Decision.

C. For use if the Board decides not to adopt the Proposed Decision, and to decide the case upon the record:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated September 17, 2021, concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and determines to decide the matter itself, based upon the record produced before the Administrative Law Judge and such additional evidence and arguments that are presented by the parties and accepted by the Board; RESOLVED FURTHER that the Board's Decision shall be made after notice is given to all parties.

D. For use if the Board decides to remand the matter back to the Office of Administrative Hearings for the taking of further evidence:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, after consideration of the Proposed Decision dated September 17, 2021, concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu, hereby rejects the Proposed Decision and refers the matter back to the Administrative Law Judge for the taking of additional evidence as specified by the Board at its meeting.

E. Precedential Nature of Decision (two alternatives; either may be used):

1. For use if the Board wants further argument on the issue of whether to designate its Decision as precedential:

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System requests the parties in the matter concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu, as well as interested parties, to submit written argument regarding whether the Board's Decision in this matter should be designated as precedential, and that the Board will consider the issue whether to designate its Decision as precedential at a time to be determined.

2. For use if the Board decides to designate its Decision as precedential, without further argument from the parties.

RESOLVED, that the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System, hereby designates as precedential its Decision concerning the appeal of Tarlochan Sandhu.

Budget and Fiscal Impacts: Not applicable

Attachments

Attachment A: Proposed Decision

Attachment B: Staff's Argument

Attachment C: Respondent(s) Argument(s)

Anthony Suine
Deputy Executive Officer
Customer Services and Support