

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 02OFF.196 Receptionist	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

Information provided indicated the firm is a practicing law firm. The firm indicated the worker was a bookkeeper/independent contractor after December 2011. She retired after 25 years of service on [REDACTED]. She had been bookkeeper and records clerk. The firm stated the worker agreed after retirement to do contract accounting services for the firm. The [REDACTED], stated the firm wished to continue their association with her on a part time basis as an independent contractor, to maintain the business records and financial accounts, as she had done for so many years. She would be paid at the rate of \$12.00 per hour for 21/2 days a week, or as needed. The firm stated she set her own hours. The services were still performed on the firm’s premises, utilizing the firm’s equipment. The firm indicated the worker billed them for the hours worked. The firm stated she advised due to advanced age and health she could no longer provide services.

The worker stated at no time had there been any changes in services. She was hired as an employee and worked for 25 years for the firm. It was [REDACTED] who decided that at her age she would not live long enough to collect Social Security so he made her contract labor. Her work was the same as when determined to be an employee. Her hours and her pay were cut. She indicated services continued to be performed on the firm’s premises 8:30 to 4:00. June 2015 she was told to go home, they would call her if they needed her.

The question of whether an individual is an independent contractor or an employee is one that is determined through consideration of the facts of a particular case along with the application of law and regulations for worker classification issues, known as “common law.” Common law flows chiefly from court decisions and is a major part of the justice system of the United States. Under the common law, the treatment of a worker as an independent contractor or an employee originates from the legal definitions developed in the law and it depends on the payer’s right to direct and control the worker in the performance of his or her duties. Section 3121(d)(2) of the Code provides that the term “employee” means any individual defined as an employee by using the usual common law rules.

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.

In determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor under the common law, all evidence of both control and lack of control or independence must be considered. We must examine the relationship of the worker and the business. We consider facts that show a right to direct or control how the worker performs the specific tasks for which he or she is hired, who controls the financial aspects of the worker’s activities, and how the parties perceive their relationship. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the context in which the services are performed.

Therefore, your statement that the worker was an independent contractor pursuant to an agreement 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.

The withholding of income tax or the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) tax from an individual’s wages is “treatment” of the individual as an employee, whether or not the tax is paid over to the Government. The filing of an employment tax return and Form W-2 for a period with respect to an individual, whether or not tax was withheld from the individual, is “treatment” of the individual as an employee for that period.

The worker received a Form W-2 and a Form 1099-MISC from you in the course of the work relationship, and the services did not substantially change. As previously stated, the issuance of Form W-2 and/or the withholding of taxes on income for an individual would be considered treatment of the individual as an employee, and would apply in this case.

Analysis

We have applied the above law to the information submitted. As is the case in almost all worker classification cases, some facts point to an employment relationship while other facts indicate independent contractor status. The determination of the worker's status, then, rests on the weight given to the factors, keeping in mind that no one factor rules. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the circumstances.

Evidence of control generally falls into three categories: behavioral control, financial control, and relationship of the parties, which are collectively referred to as the categories of evidence. In weighing the evidence, careful consideration has been given to the factors outlined below.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to control how a worker performs a task include training and instructions. In this case, you retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect your financial investment.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to direct and control the financial aspects of the worker's activities include significant investment, unreimbursed expenses, the methods of payment, and the opportunity for profit or loss. In this case, 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.

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 your business. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability.

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. The worker continued to perform the same services, only on a part time basis. At no time did she open her own accounting business. The worker continued to be performed on the firm premises, utilizing the firm's equipment. Had she opened her own business, she would have billed at a higher rate of pay (at least double) to account for the fact she was required to pay her own taxes, not actually take a cut in pay, plus have to cover her own taxes. We find this to be an erroneous misclassification of employment.