

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

03TRA.46 Laborer/Trades

Determination:

Employee

Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

None

Yes

Facts of Case

The worker initiated the request for a determination of his work status as a repair person on golf carts in tax year 2013. The firm's business is described as golf cart repair and customization.

The firm's response was signed by [REDACTED], owner. The firm's business is described as repair and service golf carts; the worker did repairs and servicing of golf carts.

According to the firm, there was no training given to the worker. The firm responded that the worker determines the methods to be used to perform services. Any problems or complaints encountered by the worker are directed to firm for resolution. Both parties acknowledge the services are rendered on the firm's premises. The worker indicated that services were rendered at a customer's location when warranted. The worker responded that he generally works Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m..

The firm responded that no tools, equipment, or supplies were provided; the worker has his own equipment and tools. The firm indicated that the worker does not lease equipment, space, or a facility and incurs no expenses in the performance of his job unless he breaks a tool. Both parties agree that the firm pays the worker an hourly wage and the customers pay the firm. The firm and worker concurred that the worker is not at risk for a financial loss in this work relationship and that the worker does not establish the level of payment for services rendered or products sold.

The firm stated the worker is not entitled to benefits. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a liability or penalty. The worker is not performing same or similar services for others. The firm indicated the worker is still performing services as of July 2014 when firm responded to the Form SS-8.

Analysis

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. Some employees may work without receiving instructions because they are highly proficient and conscientious workers or because the duties are so simple or familiar to them. Furthermore, the instructions, that show how to reach the desired results, may have been oral and given only once at the beginning of the relationship. See, for example, Rev. Rul. 68-598, 1968-2 C.B. 464, and Rev. Rul. 66-381, 1966-2 C.B. 449.

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. See Rev. Rul. 74-389, 1974-2 C.B. 330.

If the work is performed on the premises of the person or persons for whom the services are performed, that factor suggests control over the worker, especially if the work could be done elsewhere. See Rev. Rul. 56-660, 1956-2 C.B. 693. Work done off the premises of the person or persons receiving the services, such as at the office of the worker, indicates some freedom from control. However, this fact by itself does not mean that the worker is not an employee. The importance of this factor depends on the nature of the service involved and the extent to which an employer generally would require that employees perform such services on the employer's premises. 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. See Rev. Rul. 56-694, 1956-2 C.B. 694.

A person who can realize a profit or suffer a loss as a result of his or her services is generally an independent contractor, while the person who cannot is an employee. See Rev. Rul. 70-309, 1970-1 C.B. 199. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The risk that a worker will not receive payment for his or her services, however, is common to both independent contractors and employees and, thus, does not constitute a sufficient economic risk to support treatment as an independent contractor. If a worker loses payment from the firm's customer for poor work, the firm shares the risk of such loss. Control of the firm over the worker would be necessary in order to reduce the risk of financial loss to the firm. The opportunity for higher earnings or of gain or loss from a commission arrangement is not considered profit or loss.

We have considered the information provided by both parties and have applied the above law to this work relationship. In this case, the firm retains the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment and business reputation and to ensure its customers' satisfaction and that its contractual obligations are met. The worker is not operating a separate and distinct business. The worker did not invest capital or assume business risks, and therefore, does not have the opportunity to realize a profit or incur a loss as a result of the services provided. 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 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.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the firm has the right to exercise direction and control over the worker to the degree necessary to establish that the worker is a common law employee, and not an independent contractor operating a trade or business.