

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 09CME.4 Crew Member	Determination: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Employee <input type="checkbox"/> Contractor
UILC	Third Party Communication: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> None <input type="checkbox"/> 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

The firm is in business as a layout company renting mats for the film industry, and a cleaning service for pre/post location clean-up. The worker was engaged by the firm to lay out boards and mats. The firm reported the worker's remuneration on Forms 1099-MISC for 2012, 2013 and 2014.

Information from the parties supports that the firm provided the worker with on-the-job training. It provided him with his work assignments. The worker performed his services according to the firm's clients' directions. If problems or complaints occurred, the worker initially contacted the client's location manager for resolution, and if necessary, the firm. The worker's schedule was based upon the firm's needs. He provided his services on the firm's clients' filming locations. The worker was required to perform his services personally.

The firm provided the vans, mats, and the worker's uniform. The worker did not lease space or equipment, or incur expenses in the performance of his services. The firm paid the worker at an hourly rate plus an unearned bonus for each job. It covered him 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 general benefits available to the worker. The worker could have provided similar services for others during the same time period, but would have been required to get permission from the firm. The worker did not advertise his services or maintain a business listing. He provided his services under the firm's name. Both parties reserved the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring a penalty or liability, and in fact, the worker terminated the work relationship.

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. If a firm has to make a worker "understand" or even if a worker "agreed to" being an independent contractor (as in a verbal or written agreement), this factor does not determine the worker's status as an independent contractor. An individual knows they are in business for themselves offering their services to the public and does not need to be made aware of, understand, or agree to be an independent contractor.

Factors that illustrate whether there was a right to control how a worker performed a task include training and instructions. In this case, you trained the worker. You retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect your financial investment. Training a worker by requiring an experienced employee to work with the worker, by corresponding with the worker, by requiring the worker to attend meetings, or by using other methods, indicates that the person or persons for whom the services are performed want the services performed in a particular method or manner. This is true even if the training was only given once at the beginning of the work relationship. The worker performed his services at locations designated by the firm. His schedule was dependent upon the firm's business needs. 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 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 services performed by the worker were a necessary and integral part of the firm's 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. Although the firm did not provide general benefits to the worker, the worker terminated the work relationship without incurring a liability. If the worker has the right to end his or her relationship with the person for whom the services are performed at any time he or she wishes without incurring liability, that factor indicates 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.