

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

03MIS Miscellaneous Laborers

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 from January 2018 to June 2018 as a laborer. The firm issued the worker Form 1099-MISC for 2018. The worker filed Form SS-8 as he believes he received Form 1099-MISC in error.

The firm's response states its business is to install paint booths from the manufacturer. The worker was engaged as a technician. The services performed included installing machines and paint booths. The worker was paid as an independent contractor based on his request to be paid as such. A written agreement between the parties was not applicable.

The firm stated it instructed the worker to read blueprints and to follow directions. The firm provided work assignments. The manufacturer determined the methods by which assignments were performed. If problems or complaints arose, the firm was contacted and assumed responsibility for resolution. Reports and meetings were not required. The worker's routine consisted of assembling pre-manufactured paint booths with nuts and bolts. Services were performed at customer locations. The firm did not require the worker to personally perform services. The firm was responsible for hiring substitutes or helpers. The worker stated the firm trained him and provided specific instruction related to when and how the work was to be done. The firm determined the methods by which assignments were performed. Reports included text messages, phone calls, and in-person communications. His day typically started at 7 am when the firm would lay out the work to be done. Services were also performed at the firm's premises. The firm required he attend a daily morning staff meeting. The firm required he personally perform services.

The firm stated it provided equipment, supplies, and tools. The worker provided some tools. The worker did not lease equipment, space, or a facility. 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 incurring economic loss or financial risk was not applicable. The worker did not establish the level of payment for the services provided. The worker stated the firm provided all as he was not allowed to bring his personal tools. The firm reimbursed him for airfare, food, and lodging. The firm established the level of payment for the services provided.

The firm stated the work relationship could be terminated by either party without incurring liability or penalty. The worker did not perform similar services for others or advertise. There was no agreement prohibiting competition between the parties. The work relationship ended when the worker quit. The worker stated the firm sometimes 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, a statement that a worker is an independent contractor pursuant to a written or verbal 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. Furthermore, whether there is an employment relationship is a question of fact and not subject to negotiation between the parties.

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 services performed by the worker were integral to the firm's business operation. The firm provided work assignments 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 education, 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.