| Form ' | 1443 | 80-A |
|--------|------|------|
|--------|------|------|

Department of the Treasury - Internal Revenue Service

| (July 2013) | SS-8 Determination—L | Determination | for Public Inspection |
|---|--|---|---|
| Occupation 02OFF.176 Office Worker | r | Determination: X Employee | Contractor |
| UILC | | Third Party Communicat X None | tion: Yes |
| Facts of Case | | • | |
| as a case worker for tax ye d/b, retained to contact clients and clie she would get the each case. The worker per attended monthly meeting firm provided the office m work relationship without. The worker indicated she parrival each shift. She was stated she performed servi | cates the firm assists clients obtain Social Securicars 2011 through 2013. The firm reported the index and a weekly, bi-weekly basis, obtaining informations, order medical information from medical sout at new client. The owner of the firm was response if she was available; there were no penalties for eachines and paper. The worker was paid on a continuring a penalty or liability. School became a performed services as a personal secretary and cast strained how to handle the individual cases. She cast part time and full time. All services were performed services. The client paid the firm. Either | . It was ion reference their cases. So rees. The firm stated as new sible for problem resolution e was a college student. She reproduced the resolution a priority and she could not was manager. Work assignment a provided periodic oral reported on the firm premise provided on the firm premise. | as one work relationship. The worker had been he would make phone calls, mail information various forms were required for the worked four to six hours per day. She worked four to six hours per day. She wired to perform her services personally. The paid the firm. Either party could terminate the work anymore. The paid the firm the party could terminate the work anymore. The paid the firm the party could terminate the work anymore. |
| particular case along with chiefly from court decision independent contractor or control the worker in the p | n individual is an independent contractor or an e the application of law and regulations for worke ns and is a major part of the justice system of the an employee originates from the legal definition performance of his or her duties. Section 3121(d y using the usual common law rules. | classification issues, know Under the cost developed in the law and in | n as "common law." Common law flows ommon law, the treatment of a worker as an t depends on the payer's right to direct and |
| Generally, the relationship | of employer and employee exists when the pers | on for whom the services ar | e performed has the right to control and direct |

the individual who performs the services, not only as to what is to be done, but also how it is to be done. It is not necessary that the employer actually direct or control the individual, it is sufficient if he or she has the right to do so.

In determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor under the common law, all evidence of both control and lack of control or independence must be considered. We must examine the relationship of the worker and the business. We consider facts that show a right to direct or control how the worker performs the specific tasks for which he or she is hired, who controls the financial aspects of the worker's activities, and how the parties perceive their relationship. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the context in which the services are performed.

Therefore, your 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.

ANALYSIS

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. This control factor is present if the person or persons for whom the services are performed have the right to require compliance with instructions. Some employees may work without receiving instructions because they are highly proficient and conscientious workers or because the duties are so simple or familiar to them. Furthermore, the instructions, that show how to reach the desired results, may have been oral and given only once at the beginning of the relationship.

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.

Analysis

continued...

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 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. 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.

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 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.