

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

| | |
|--|---|
| Occupation 01PLW.4 PlantLandMaintenance | 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 landscaping assistant in tax year 2013. The firm's business is described as lawn mowing, snow removal/salting, aeration, and home repair/maintenance.

The firm's response was signed by [REDACTED], owner/operator. The firm's business is described as seasonal landscaping services. The worker performed mowing, trimming, installation of mulch, planting flowers, etc.

According to the firm, no formal training was given to the worker other than to ensure the worker knows how to use a weedeater and mower in a proper and safe manner. The worker rides with the firm to each job site and the firm assigned the tasks at each job site. The firm is on site at all jobs and therefore dealt with any problems or complaints that could arise. The hours varied week to week. The worker was to perform the services personally with the firm hiring and paying for additional personnel.

The firm provided 100% of supplies, equipment, and materials. The worker did not lease facilities or equipment. The firm paid the worker an hourly wage; the customer paid the firm. The firm indicated the worker was not at risk for a loss in this work relationship. The firm determined the level of payment for services rendered.

There were no benefits extended to the worker. 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. The worker was a full-time college student who was employed by the firm during spring and summer months while on break from classes. The firm issued the worker Form 1099-MISC to report his earnings.

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. See, for example, Rev. Rul. 68-598, 1968-2 C.B. 464, and Rev. Rul. 66-381, 1966-2 C.B. 449.

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. See Rev. Rul. 74-389, 1974-2 C.B. 330.

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. See Rev. Rul. 70-309, 1970-1 C.B. 199. "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.

We have considered the information provided by both parties and have applied the above law to this work relationship. 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.