

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 04FSC.25 Overseer	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> Yes

Facts of Case

The firm is in business as a moving company. The worker was engaged by the firm to perform moving services. The firm reported the worker's remuneration on Form 1099-MISC for 2014.

Information from the parties supports that the firm trained the worker on its expectations. The firm provided the worker with his work assignments. If problems or complaints occurred, the worker contacted the firm for resolution. The worker was required to submit completed job sheets. The worker's schedule was dependent upon the firm's needs. He performed his services on the clients' premises. The worker was required to perform his services personally. If additional personnel were needed, the firm was responsible for hiring and compensating them.

The firm provided the moving truck and packing equipment and materials. The worker used his personal truck and tools. The firm reimbursed the worker for fuel costs. It paid the worker at an hourly rate. The firm did not cover the worker under workers' compensation. Customers paid the firm directly at prices established by the firm. Neither party indicated an investment by the worker in the firm or a related business, or the risk of the worker incurring a financial loss beyond the normal loss of compensation.

The firm did not make benefits available to the worker. Both parties reserved the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a penalty or liability. The worker performed similar services for others during the same time period. There is no evidence presented that the worker advertised his services or maintained a business listing. Any advertising or soliciting was for the benefit of the firm.

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, the firm's 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.

Factors that illustrate whether there was a right to control how a worker performed a task include training and instructions. In this case, the firm trained the worker. It retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment. Training a worker indicates that the person or persons for whom the services are performed want the services performed in a particular method or manner. The worker followed the schedule set by the firm. He performed his services on the firm's 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. The worker was required to perform his services personally, meaning he could not engage and pay others to perform services for the firm on his 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 the firm 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 bid on jobs, 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. The firm paid the worker at an hourly rate. Payment by the hour generally points to an employer-employee relationship. These facts show that the firm 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 his services on a continuing basis. 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. The worker performed his services under the firm's name. He was not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the moving services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of the firm's moving 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 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. Although the firm did not provide benefits to the worker, neither party incurred a liability when the work relationship ended, a factor indicating an employer-employee relationship. These facts show that the firm retained control over the work relationship and services of the worker.

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.