

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 03PMW Repair/Maintenance Workers	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 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 firm is in the business of cleaning commercial properties. As the owner of the firm, you engaged the worker to perform cleaning services. You reported the worker's remuneration on Forms 1099-MISC for 2016 and 2017.

Information submitted supports that the you relied upon the worker's prior training and experience to perform her services. You provided the worker with her work assignments. If problems or complaints occurred, the worker contacted you for resolution. The worker generally followed a routine schedule. She performed her services on your customers' premises and depended on you to unlock each property to be cleaned. The worker was required to perform her services personally. If additional personnel were needed, you or the worker could provide them; you were responsible for compensating them.

You provided the cleaning products, etc. The worker did not incur expenses in the performance of her services. You paid the worker at an hourly rate. Customers paid your firm directly at prices that you established. Neither party indicated an investment by the worker in your firm or a related business, or the risk of the worker incurring a financial loss beyond the normal loss of compensation.

You did not make benefits available to the worker. You did not prohibit the worker from performing similar services for others during the same time period. There is no evidence submitted showing the worker advertised her services or maintained a business listing. The worker performed her services under your firm's name. Both parties reserved the right to terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability, and in fact, the worker terminated the work relationship.

Analysis

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, 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. If a firm has to make a worker “understand” or even if a worker “agreed to” being an independent contractor (as in a verbal or written agreement), this factor does not determine the worker’s status as an independent contractor. An individual knows they are in business for themselves offering their services to the public and does not need to be made aware of, understand, or agree to be an independent contractor.

Factors that illustrate whether there was a right to control how a worker performed 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 and ensure your customers' satisfaction the work. The worker performed her services within the hours you set. She performed her services on your customers' premises. 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. There is no indication that the worker engaged and paid others to perform services for the firm on her behalf. 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. These facts show that you retained behavioral control over the services of the worker.

Factors that illustrate whether there was 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. “Profit or loss” implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. Lack of significant investment by a person in facilities or equipment used in performing services for another indicates dependence on the employer and, accordingly, the existence of an employer-employee relationship. You paid the worker at an hourly rate. Payment by the hour generally points to an employer-employee relationship. These facts show that you retained control over the financial aspects of the worker’s services.

Factors that illustrate how the parties perceived 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 were part of the service recipient’s regular business activities. In this case, the worker performed her services on a continuing basis. She performed her services under your business name. The worker not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the cleaning services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of your commercial cleaning business. 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. The worker could have performed similar services for others during the same time period; however, it is possible for a person to work for a number of people or firms concurrently and be an employee of one or all of them. These facts show that you retained control over the work relationship and services of the worker.

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that you 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.