

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

Information provided indicated the firm is a farming business and does property maintenance. The worker performed services as a maintenance man for the firm in 2017. The worker indicated he also collected rents for the firm. The firm reported the income on Form 1099-MISC as they felt he was an independent contractor as services were performed were not consistent. He worked on demand and could refuse at any time. He was instructed the location and what was to be done. The firm indicated work was performed on firm premises 100% of the time. The worker was required to perform services personally. The worker had no authority to hire. The firm indicated they provided yard supplies. The worker was paid by the hour, the customer paid the firm. The firm stated they did provide workers' compensation insurance on the worker. No additional benefits were given. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability. The firm indicated the work was done for the owner of the firm. The firm stated the worker stopped showing up.

The worker stated he completed a W-4 form when hired. The worker indicated he followed the instructions given for the day. The worker indicated he worked five days a week from eight-thirty to four-thirty. Services were performed at various building locations in different towns. Morning meetings were held for assignments. The worker agreed he was to perform his services personally and had no authority to hire. The worker agreed the firm provided all equipment and supplies. He agreed he was paid by the hour, the customer paid the firm. If he collected rent, that money was turned over to the firm. He agreed the firm carried workmen's compensation insurance. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability. The worker stated he was injured on the job and the firm refused to pay workman's compensation. He indicated he was represented as an employee. He was injured on the job and eventually fired.

ANALYSIS

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.

-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. If a worker must perform services in the order or sequence set by the person or persons for whom the services are performed, that factor shows that the worker is not free to follow the worker's own patterns of work. If the person or persons retain the right to control the order or sequence of the work, this is sufficient to indicate an employer-employee relationship.

-A continuing relationship between the worker and the person or persons for whom the services are performed indicates that an employer-employee relationship exists. A continuing relationship may exist where work is performed in frequently recurring although irregular intervals.

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. Although services may have been sporadic, they were performed in the order assigned by the firm, under the firm's business name, utilizing the firm's equipment and supplies. The worker was paid by the hour, indicating no opportunity for profit or loss. No indication was given or found to indicate the worker owned his own business, to provide services to others.