

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

07ESW.9 Therapist

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**

It is our usual practice in cases of this type to solicit information from both parties involved. Upon the submission of the Form SS-8 from the worker, we requested information from the firm concerning this work relationship. The firm responded to our request for completion of Form SS-8.

From the information provided the firm is a safety and security placement company and the worker was engaged to provide on-call private security services. The worker's duties included providing services at short notice events such as weddings, ball games, religious group meetings or sporting events or he may be engaged for emergency requests for service. The firm maintains a list of on-call workers who receive a text or call from them if there is a shift available. These individuals could also call in to the firm to check to see if there was a shift open. The firm states the worker was offered individual shifts and he was free to accept or deny the assignments. The firm states the customer determined how the worker performed his services. The worker personally performed his services at the firm's clients' locations. The worker did not have a set routine or schedule. The clients paid the firm for services rendered by the worker and the firm paid the worker at an hourly rate. The firm reported the worker's earnings on a Form 1099-MISC. The worker was required to notify the firm if any problems or complaints arose for their resolution. The worker was not required to submit reports while on his shift unless there was an incident and he was not required to attend meetings. The firm believes the worker was an independent contractor because he decided when and where to work and whether to work and they exercised no control over the worker.

The firm states they provided no equipment, supplies, or materials to the work relationship. The worker provided a uniform. The worker did not have an investment in a business related to services performed and he did not have an opportunity to incur a loss or realize a profit as a result of his services. The firm states they carried workers' compensation insurance on the worker. Either party could terminate the work relationship at any time without either party incurring a liability.

Analysis

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, the worker was experienced in this line of work and did not require training or detailed instructions from the firm. The need to direct and control a worker and his services should not be confused with the right to direct and control. The worker provided his services on behalf of and under the firm's business name rather than an entity of his own. The firm was responsible for the quality of the work performed by the worker and for the satisfaction of their clients. This gave the firm the right to direct and control the worker and his services in order to protect their financial investment, their business reputation, and their relationship with their clients.

The firm's statement that the worker performed services on an as-needed basis and therefore, an independent contractor is without merit as both employees (seasonal) and independent contractors can perform services when the needs of a business warrants. A continuing relationship was established rather than a one-time transaction taking place. A continuing relationship may exist where work is performed in frequently recurring although irregular intervals. The existence of a continuing relationship indicates an employer/employee relationship was established.

While the firm provided the worker with freedom of action as to when he performed his services, this in and of itself does not determine the worker's status as an independent contractor. The whole relationship needed to be analyzed to determine the worker's correct employment tax status. An important factor of determining a worker's status is who had the contractual relationship with the client and whom did the client pay. In this case, that relationship was between the firm and their clients.

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 the firm's business. The firm is engaged in the business of providing security services and so holds itself out to the general public. Businesses or individuals desiring security guard services look to the firm for duly trained and qualified guards. The guard services are essential to the firm's business and the security guards advance their business interests. In addition, the firm's income is derived from their share of the guard fees. Both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a liability.

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, co-adventurer, 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.

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.