

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 01FRW.27 Farm/RanchWorker	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

Facts of Case

The worker initiated the request for a determination of his work status as a rider to jog and train horses in tax years 2011 through 2016. The firm's business is described as harness horse racing.

The firm's response was signed by a partner of the business. The firm's business is described as harness horse racing – train and race horses. The worker performed services as an assistant horse trainer.

The firm and worker acknowledged the firm did not provide training; the worker was instructed as to the training of the horses, when to transport to the field or a race, and when to return the horses to the barn. The barn manager determined the worker's job assignments and was the person the worker was to contact in the event the worker encountered any problems or complaints that required resolution. The worker's daily routine was to train horses – it varied from day-to-day. The worker stated that he generally started at 7 a.m. to exercise horses, transport three to six horses to a farm about 25 miles away, and return 3 or 4 hours later to pick up the horses to return to the barn, as instructed by the firm. Both parties agreed that the worker was to perform the services personally.

The firm provided truck, trailer, and horses and all equipment to train the individual horses. The worker furnished nothing. The worker did not lease equipment, space, or facilities and did not incur expenses in the performance of the job. The firm paid the worker a weekly salary. The customers paid the firm. The firm and worker responded that the worker was not covered under the firm's workers' compensation insurance policy. The firm and worker indicated the worker was not a risk for a financial loss in this work relationship. The firm established the level of payment for services provided.

The firm stated there were no benefits extended to the worker; the worker stated that he had been given a Christmas bonus and a paid vacation. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a liability or penalty. The worker was not performing same or similar services for others during the same time frame.

Analysis

A worker who is required to comply with another person's instructions about when, where, and how he or she is to work is ordinarily an employee. This control factor is present if the person or persons for whom the services are performed have the right to require compliance with instructions. Some employees may work without receiving instructions because they are highly proficient and conscientious workers or because the duties are so simple or familiar to them. Furthermore, the instructions, that show how to reach the desired results, may have been oral and given only once at the beginning of the relationship.

If the services must be rendered personally, presumably the person or persons for whom the services are performed are interested in the methods used to accomplish the work as well as in the results.

A continuing relationship between the worker and the person or persons for whom the services are performed indicates that an employer-employee relationship exists. A continuing relationship may exist where work is performed in frequently recurring although irregular intervals.

The establishment of set hours of work by the person or persons for whom the services are performed is a factor indicating control. If the nature of the occupation makes fixed hours impractical, a requirement that workers be on the job at certain times is an element of control.

Payment by the hour, week, or month generally points to an employer-employee relationship, provided that this method of payment is not just a convenient way of paying a lump sum agreed upon as the cost of a job. In such instances, the firm assumes the hazard that the services of the worker will be proportionate to the regular payments. This action warrants the assumption that, to protect its investment, the firm has the right to direct and control the performance of the workers. Also, workers are assumed to be employees if they are guaranteed a minimum salary or are given a drawing account of a specified amount that need not be repaid when it exceeds earnings.

A person who can realize a profit or suffer a loss as a result of his or her services is generally an independent contractor, while the person who cannot is an employee. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The risk that a worker will not receive payment for his or her services, however, is common to both independent contractors and employees and, thus, does not constitute a sufficient economic risk to support treatment as an independent contractor. If a worker loses payment from the firm's customer for poor work, the firm shares the risk of such loss. Control of the firm over the worker would be necessary in order to reduce the risk of financial loss to the firm. The opportunity for higher earnings or of gain or loss from a commission arrangement is not considered profit or loss.

The firm's statement that the worker was an independent contractor is without merit. For federal employment tax purposes, it is the actual working relationship that is controlling and not the terms of the contract (oral or written) between the parties.

We have considered the information provided by both parties. In this case, the firm retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment and business reputation and to ensure its customers' satisfaction and that its contractual obligations were met. The worker was not operating a separate and distinct business; the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks, and therefore, did not have the opportunity to realize a profit or incur a loss as a result of the services provided. Integration of the worker's services into the business operations generally shows that the worker is subject to direction and control. When the success or continuation of a business depends to an appreciable degree upon the performance of certain services, the workers who perform those services must necessarily be subject to a certain amount of control by the owner of the business. In this case, the worker was not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of the firm's business.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the firm had the right to exercise direction and control over the worker to the degree necessary to establish that the worker was a common law employee, and not an independent contractor operating a trade or business.