

# SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 09DVC.124 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 offers a comprehensive model of programs, including health, literacy, enrichment, tutoring, and mentoring to over 900 inner city, under-deprived youth throughout the city of [REDACTED]. The worker was engaged to perform services as a driver, responsible for the pick up and drop off of program participants, and clinic patients. The firm treated the worker status as independent contractor, and issued to the worker a Form 1099-MISC at year-end, to report the monies received for his services as non-employee compensation.

The firm did not provide the worker with specific training or instructions on how to perform his services. The firm provided the work assignments and routes to the worker. Work methods were determined by both the firm and worker. The worker was required to contact the firm's program directors regarding problems and complaints that needed resolution. The worker was required to perform the services personally.

The firm provided for the vehicles, fuel, and insurance needed to perform the services. The worker provided his own CDL license. The worker did not incur work related expenses. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker incurred economic loss or financial risk with regard to the services he performed for the firm. The worker's remuneration was based on a pre-negotiated fee per route driven.

The firm carried workers' compensation insurance on the worker. Employment benefits were not made available to the worker. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker advertised his services to the public while engaged by the firm. The work relationship was continuous as opposed to a one-time transaction.

---

**Analysis**

---

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's behavioral control of the work relationship. The worker followed the firm's instructions, work methods, schedule, and routine in the performance of his services. The worker's services were performed personally, at locations designated by the firm. The worker used the firm's equipment, tools, and supplies and represented the firm's business operations in the performance of his services. As a result, the firm retained the right to direct and control the worker to the extent necessary to protect its investment, and the reputation of its business operations.

The facts provided for this case do not evidence the worker's financial control of the work relationship. The worker's remuneration was negotiated between the parties as a fee per route. There was no information provided to evidence that the worker bid on the jobs performed, or that he invoiced the firm for payment of his services. The worker had no opportunity for profit or loss as a result of the services performed for the firm. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The worker did not have a significant investment in the facilities, equipment, tools, or supplies used to perform his services for the firm. The term "significant investment" does not include tools, instruments, and clothing commonly provided by employees in their trade; nor does it include education, experience, or training. Also, if the firm has the right to control the equipment, it is unlikely the worker had an investment in facilities.

The worker performed services as requested by the firm, for an indefinite period of time, and both parties retained the right to terminate the work relationship at any time without incurring liabilities. The facts provided for this case do not evidence that the worker was engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather show that he performed his services as a necessary and integral part of the firm's business operations. 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.

Based on common law principles, the worker shall be found to be an employee for Federal employment tax purposes. For correction assistance, you may refer to Publication 4341, which can be obtained at [www.irs.gov](http://www.irs.gov)