

**SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection**

Occupation 09DVC.72 Truck Driver	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 a towing company in the business of towing. The worker provided his services to the firm in 2008 as a flatbed driver who answered AAA calls and received the Form 1099-MISC for these services.

The firm trained the worker to do all the tasks the job required which included non-paid training for two days on how to hook up vehicles, customer service, and scheduling for twelve hour shifts. The worker received his assignments from the firm and the firm determined the methods by which the assignments were performed. If problems or complaints arose the worker was required to contact the firm and the firm was responsible for problem resolution. The firm required the worker to submit a log including how many vehicles were towed, how many miles traveled per tow, and the reason for the towing. The worker has a set schedule arriving at the firm's towing yard daily, and was then instructed on which truck to use, and what calls to respond to. He provided his services personally on the firm's premises. The firm held sporadic monthly meetings and the penalty for not attending was a one day suspension. If additional help was required, the firm hired and compensated the helpers.

The firm provided all the necessary supplies and equipment the worker needed to provide his services. The worker did not lease any equipment nor were any business expenses incurred in the performance of his services. The worker was paid by both the number of calls completed and the mileage. The firm's customers paid the firm for the services the worker provided. The worker did not assume any financial risk in the relationship. The firm established the level of payment for the services the worker provided.

The worker did not perform similar services to others during the same time period. He provided his services under the firm's business name. Both parties retained the right to terminate the relationship without incurring liability. In fact, the relationship ended when the worker left.

---

## Analysis

---

The application of the three categories of common law evidence to the available facts of the relationship indicates that the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker in the performance of his services. Accordingly, the worker was an employee of the firm for purposes of Federal employment taxes.

Worker status is not something to be selected by either the firm or the worker. Worker status is determined by the examination of the actual working relationship as applied to Internal Revenue Service code.

Hence, to clarify the Federal Government's position on worker status, we will be determining this case based on their common law practices in which the actual relationship between the parties is the controlling factor.

The firm trained the worker regarding the performance of his services. 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 firm retained the right, if necessary to protect their business interest, to determine or change the methods used by the worker to perform his assignments. 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 facts show that the worker was subject to certain restraints and conditions that were indicative of the firm's control over the worker. A requirement that the worker submit regular or written reports to the person or persons for whom the services are performed indicates a degree of control. The worker had a continuous relationship with the firm as opposed to a single transaction. 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 rendered his services personally. 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. 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. 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. The worker's services were under the firm's supervision.

The firm provided the worker with the necessary equipment and materials. The fact that the person or persons for whom the services are performed furnish significant tools, materials, and other equipment tends to show the existence of an employer-employee relationship. His pay was based on both the number of calls completed and the mileage. The worker could not have incurred a loss in the performance of his services for the firm, and did not have any financial investment in a business related to the services performed.

The worker worked under the firm's name, and his work was integral to the firm's business operation. The above facts do not reflect a business presence for the worker, but rather, strongly reflect the firm's business. The fact that the worker was not closely monitored would not carry sufficient weight to reflect a business presence for the worker. In fact, many individuals are hired due to their expertise or conscientious work habits and close supervision is often not necessary. 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. Either the firm or the worker could terminate the agreement.

Based on the common-law principles, the firm had the right to direct and control the worker. The worker shall be found to be an employee for Federal tax purposes.