

**SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection**

Occupation

03TRA Tradespersons

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**

Information provided indicates the firm is cleaning company. The worker provided cleaning services for tax years 2016 and 2017. The firm issued Form 1099-MISC for tax year 2017. The firm indicated no training was given. The work assignments were given to the worker via phone. Services were performed during the day time not before eight-thirty and no later than five-thirty-six o'clock. The firm stated the services were performed at their customer locations. The worker is to perform her services personally. The firm indicated they hired and paid all workers. The firm indicated the client provided all supplies. The worker was paid on a piece work basis. No additional benefits were provided. The customer paid the firm. The firm indicated she was represented as a contractor. The firm indicated the worker quit.

The worker indicated she was given on the job training by the firm. Work assignments are given verbally from the owner of the company. Her schedule was varied, depending on the firm's need. Services were performed at the firm's customer locations, twenty to twenty-five hours per week. She agreed she was to perform her services personally. The firm hired and paid all individuals. She indicated the firm provided the cleaning supplies, equipment and transportation. She agreed she was paid on a piece work basis. The customer paid the firm. All work was performed under the firm's company name. She agreed she quit.

**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.

-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. Often, because of the nature of an occupation, the person or persons for whom the services are performed do not set the order of the services or set the order infrequently. However, 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.

-Control over the place of work is indicated when the person or persons for whom the services are performed have the right to compel the worker to travel a designated route, to canvass a territory within a certain time, or to work at specific places as required.

-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.

---

## 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. All work was performed as assigned by the firm, for the firm's clients. The worker was paid on a piece work basis, and the customer paid the firm for the services received. The firm and/or the clients provided the equipment and cleaning supplies. The worker had no financial investment in operating costs, therefore was not in a position to incur a profit or suffer a financial loss.