

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

01PLW Plant & Land Maintenance Workers

Determination:

☒ Employee☐ Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

☒ None☐ Yes

I have read Notice 441 and am requesting:

- ☐ Additional redactions based on categories listed in section entitled "Deletions We May Have Made to Your Original Determination Letter"
- ☐ Delay based on an on-going transaction
- ☐ 90 day delay

For IRS Use Only:**Facts of Case**

The worker submitted a request for a determination of worker status in regard to services performed for the firm as a landscaper/lawn maintenance worker. According to copies provided by the firm, it issued the worker Form 1099-MISC for 2016 and 2017. The worker filed Form SS-8 as he believes he erroneously received Form 1099-MISC.

The firm's response states its business is lawn maintenance. The worker was engaged as a lawn maintenance helper in 2016 and 2017. The worker was classified as an independent contractor per his request to not have taxes withheld from his earnings. There was no written agreement between the parties.

The firm stated it provided the worker specific training and/or instruction related to the proper maintenance of lawn services. The firm provided work assignments, determined the methods by which assignments were performed, and assumed responsibility for problem resolution. Reports and meetings were not required. The worker's daily routine consisted of him calling the firm in the morning to see if he was needed. Services were performed at multiple property locations. The firm was responsible for hiring and paying substitutes or helpers. The worker stated he performed services on a part-time basis, i.e. 5 - 6 hours per day, 3 - 4 days per week. The firm required him to personally perform services.

The firm stated it provided all lawn equipment. The worker provided a saw and multiple carpentry tools. The worker did not lease equipment, space, or a facility. The worker did not incur expenses in the performance of services for the firm. Customers paid the firm. The firm paid the worker an hourly rate of pay; a drawing account for advances was not allowed. The firm did not carry workers' compensation insurance on the worker. The worker did not incur economic loss or financial risk. The firm established the level of payment for the services provided. The worker stated the firm provided all equipment, lawn mower, trimmers, and tools needed.

The firm stated benefits were not provided. The work relationship could be terminated by either party without incurring liability or penalty. It is unknown if the worker performed similar services for others. The worker did not advertise. There was no agreement prohibiting competition between the parties. The firm represented the worker as a helper to its customers. Services were performed under the firm's business name. The worker no longer performs services for the firm. The worker stated he did not perform similar services for others. The firm represented him as an employee to its customers.

Analysis

Generally, the relationship of employer and employee exists when the person for whom the services are performed has the right to control and direct the individual who performs the services, not only as to what is to be done, but also how it is to be done. It is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the individual, it is sufficient if he or she has the right to do so.

Section 31.3121(d)-1(a)(3) of the regulations provides that if the relationship of an employer and employee exists, the designation or description of the parties as anything other than that of employer and employee is immaterial. Thus, if an employer-employee relationship exists, any contractual designation of the employee as a partner, coadventurer, agent, or independent contractor must be disregarded.

Therefore, the firm's statement that the worker was an independent contractor pursuant to his verbal request 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.

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. In this case, the firm provided specific training and instruction related to the services to be performed. The firm provided work assignments, determined the methods by which assignments were performed, and assumed responsibility for problem resolution. These facts evidence the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to ensure satisfactory job performance in a manner acceptable to the firm. Based on the worker's past work experience and work ethic the firm may not have needed to frequently exercise its right to direct and control the worker; however, the facts evidence the firm retained the right to do so if needed.

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. In this case, the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks. The term "significant investment" does not include tools, instruments, and clothing commonly provided by employees in their trade; nor does it include education, experience, or training. As acknowledged by the firm, the worker did not incur economic loss or financial risk. Based on the hourly rate of pay arrangement the worker could not realize a profit or incur a loss.

Factors that illustrate how the parties perceive their relationship include the intent of the parties as expressed in written contracts; the provision of, or lack of employee benefits; the right of the parties to terminate the relationship; the permanency of the relationship; and whether the services performed are part of the service recipient's regular business activities. 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. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability. There is no evidence to suggest the worker performed similar services for others as an independent contractor or advertised business services to the general public during the term of this work relationship. The classification of a worker as an independent contractor should not be based primarily on the fact that a worker's services may be used on a temporary, part-time, or as-needed basis. As noted above, common law factors are considered when examining the worker classification issue.

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.

The firm can obtain additional information related to worker classification online at www.irs.gov; Publication 4341.