

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Occupation 06AAS.16 Aide/Assistant | 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

Information provided indicates [REDACTED] is an operating dental practice located in [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] DMD responded to our request for information. She indicated [REDACTED] was kept on when she purchased the dental practice from the prior owner. She continued to perform services as a part time dental hygienist. The previous owner reported the income on Form W-2 as an employee. [REDACTED] reported the income in 2013 on Form 1099-MISC. The firm confirmed they scheduled all patient appointments. The firm provided all supplies and equipment. The worker was paid by the hour and the patients continued to pay the firm. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a penalty or liability.

The withholding of income tax or the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (FICA) tax from an individual's wages is "treatment" of the individual as an employee, whether or not the tax is paid over to the Government. The filing of an employment tax return and Form W-2 for a period with respect to an individual, whether or not tax was withheld from the individual, is "treatment" of the individual as an employee for that period.

The worker received a Form W-2 and a Form 1099-MISC from the business in the course of the work relationship, and the services did not substantially change. As previously stated, the issuance of Form W-2 and/or the withholding of taxes on income for an individual would be considered treatment of the individual as an employee, and would apply in this case. The firm indicated she had purchased the business from the prior owner. The new owner continued to do business under the same business name, under the same business identification number, and retained at least this person who had previously been employed by the prior owner as an employee, on a part time basis.

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 continued to retain 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.