

SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation 05PHC.12 Animal/Pest Handler	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 worker initiated the request for a determination of her work status as a pet groomer in tax year 2014. The firm's business is described as dog grooming business.

The firm did respond to the request for information; the firm's response was not signed. The firm's business is pet grooming services for dogs. The worker was a dog groomer.

According to the firm, the worker was not given training; the only instruction was the firm's hours of operation. The worker booked her own dogs to groom and determined the methods by which she performed her services. The worker resolved any customer complaints. The worker's services were rendered on the firm's premises. The worker was required to perform the services personally; although, the worker could hire and pay for additional help.

The worker stated she was offered training on her days off without pay and only accepted once. She indicated that any problems were directed to the firm for resolution. She was required to perform the services personally. Any additional personnel could be hired by worker (a bather); but, the firm's approval would be necessary – it never happened.

Both parties acknowledged that the firm provided salon space, utilities, bathtub, shampoo, towels, kennels, and dryers. The worker furnished her table, shears, brushes (typical for groomer). It was confirmed by both the firm and worker that the worker did not lease equipment, space, or facilities. She did incur the expense for specific clippers and attachments and her uniform embroidered with firm's name on it. The firm paid the worker a commission; the customers paid the firm for the pet grooming services. The worker was not at risk for a financial loss in this work relationship. It was agreed by both parties that the firm established the level of payment for services provided or products sold.

There were no benefits extended to the worker. Either party could terminate the work relationship without incurring a liability or penalty. The firm responded the worker was performing same or similar services for others during the same time frame; the worker disagreed. The worker had no responsibility in soliciting new customers; the firm provided leads to the worker.

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.

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.

Payment by the hour, week, or month generally points to an employer-employee relationship, provided that this method of payment is not just a convenient way of paying a lump sum agreed upon as the cost of a job. In such instances, the firm assumes the hazard that the services of the worker will be proportionate to the regular payments. This action warrants the assumption that, to protect its investment, the firm has the right to direct and control the performance of the workers. Also, workers are assumed to be employees if they are guaranteed a minimum salary or are given a drawing account of a specified amount that need not be repaid when it exceeds earnings.

A person who can realize a profit or suffer a loss as a result of his or her services is generally an independent contractor, while the person who cannot is an employee. "Profit or loss" implies the use of capital by a person in an independent business of his or her own. The risk that a worker will not receive payment for his or her services, however, is common to both independent contractors and employees and, thus, does not constitute a sufficient economic risk to support treatment as an independent contractor. If a worker loses payment from the firm's customer for poor work, the firm shares the risk of such loss. Control of the firm over the worker would be necessary in order to reduce the risk of financial loss to the firm. The opportunity for higher earnings or of gain or loss from a commission arrangement is not considered profit or loss.

We have considered the information provided by both parties and have applied the above law to this work relationship. In this case, the firm retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment and business reputation and to ensure its customers' satisfaction. The worker was not operating a separate and distinct business; 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. 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. 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.

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.