DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY Reemployment Assistance Appeals PO BOX 5250 TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-5250

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. – 1440704 ANN WELLER CPA PA 2625 PONCE DE LEON BLVD STE 240 CORAL GABLES FL 33134-6018

PROTEST OF LIABILITY DOCKET NO. 0023 0320 86-02

RESPONDENT:

State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY
c/o Department of Revenue

ORDER

This matter comes before me for final Department Order.

Having fully considered the Special Deputy's Recommended Order and the record of the case and in the absence of any exceptions to the Recommended Order, I adopt the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law as set forth therein. A copy of the Recommended Order is attached and incorporated in this Final Order.

In consideration thereof, it is ORDERED that the determination dated April 22, 2014, is REVERSED.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Any request for judicial review must be initiated within 30 days of the date the Order was filed. Judicial review is commenced by filing one copy of a *Notice of Appeal* with the DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY at the address shown at the top of this Order and a second copy, with filing fees prescribed by law, with the appropriate District Court of Appeal. It is the responsibility of the party appealing to the Court to prepare a transcript of the record. If no court reporter was at the hearing, the transcript must be prepared from a copy of the Special Deputy's hearing recording, which may be requested from the Office of Appeals.

Cualquier solicitud para revisión judicial debe ser iniciada dentro de los 30 días a partir de la fecha en que la Orden fue registrada. La revisión judicial se comienza al registrar una copia de un *Aviso de Apelación* con la Agencia para la Innovación de la Fuerza Laboral [DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY] en la dirección que aparece en la parte superior de este Orden y una segunda copia, con los honorarios de registro prescritos por la ley, con el Tribunal Distrital de Apelaciones pertinente. Es la responsabilidad de la parte apelando al tribunal la de preparar una transcripción del registro. Si en la audiencia no se encontraba ningún estenógrafo registrado en los tribunales, la transcripción debe ser preparada de una copia de la grabación de la audiencia del Delegado Especial [Special Deputy], la cual puede ser solicitada de la Oficina de Apelaciones.

Nenpòt demann pou yon revizyon jiridik fèt pou l kòmanse lan yon peryòd 30 jou apati de dat ke Lòd la te depoze a. Revizyon jiridik la kòmanse avèk depo yon kopi yon *Avi Dapèl* ki voye bay DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY lan nan adrès ki parèt pi wo a, lan tèt *Lòd* sa a e yon dezyèm kopi, avèk frè depo ki preskri pa lalwa, bay Kou Dapèl Distrik apwopriye a. Se responsabilite pati k ap prezante apèl la bay Tribinal la pou l prepare yon kopi dosye a. Si pa te gen yon stenograf lan seyans lan, kopi a fèt pou l prepare apati de kopi anrejistreman seyans lan ke Adjwen Spesyal la te fè a, e ke w ka mande Biwo Dapèl la voye pou ou.

DONE and ORDERED at Tallahassee, Florida, this

day of December, 2014.



Magnus Mines,

RA Appeals Manager,

Reemployment Assistance Program

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

FILED ON THIS DATE PURSUANT TO § 120.52, FLORIDA STATUTES, WITH THE DESIGNATED DEPARTMENT CLERK, RECEIPT OF WHICH IS HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGED.

DEPUTY CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that true and correct copies of the foregoing Final Order have been furnished to the persons listed below in the manner described, on the 1010 day of December, 2014.

SHANEDRA Y. BARNES, Special Deputy Clerk DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC **OPPORTUNITY** Reemployment Assistance Appeals PO BOX 5250 TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-5250

By U.S. Mail:

ANN WELLER CPA PA 2625 PONCE DE LEON BLVD STE 240 CORAL GABLES FL 33134-6018

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE WILLA DENNARD CCOC BLDG #1 SUITE 1400 2450 SHUMARD OAK BLVD TALLAHASSEE FL 32399

MERCEDES FAJARDO FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE 8175 NW 12TH STREET STE 119 DORAL FL 33126-1828

JOSE ROUCO FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE 8175 NW 12TH STREET STE 418 DORAL FL 33126-1828

State of Florida DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY c/o Department of Revenue

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY Reemployment Assistance Appeals PO BOX 5250 TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-5250

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. – 1440704 ANN WELLER CPA PA 2625 PONCE DE LEON BLVD SUITE 240 CORAL GABLES FL 33134-6018

> PROTEST OF LIABILITY DOCKET NO. 0023 0320 86-02

RESPONDENT:

State of Florida
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY
c/o Department of Revenue

RECOMMENDED ORDER OF SPECIAL DEPUTY

TO: Magnus Hines
Appeals Manager,
Reemployment Assistance Program
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

This matter comes before the undersigned Special Deputy pursuant to the Petitioner's protest of the Respondent's determination dated April 22, 2014.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on September 15, 2014. The Petitioner, represented by its president, appeared and testified.

The record of the case, including the recording of the hearing and any exhibits submitted in evidence, is herewith transmitted. Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law were not received.

ISSUE: Whether services performed for the Petitioner constitute employment pursuant to §443.036(19); 443.036(21); 443.1216, Florida Statutes.

Findings of Fact:

- 1. The Petitioner, Ann Weller, CPA, P.A., is a corporation which operates the accounting practice of Ann Weller, a Certified Public Accountant, located in Coral Gables, Florida.
- 2. In 2012 the Petitioner used the bookkeeping services offered by an individual, David Durbin, who operated a bookkeeping business from his home located in Okeechobee, Florida.
- 3. David Durbin performed the bookkeeping services for the Petitioner on an as-needed basis. When the Petitioner had a need for bookkeeping services the Petitioner's president contacted David Durbin and mailed the source documents to him. David Durbin performed the work from his own location using his own computer and QuickBooks software. Upon completion of the work David Durbin

- sent a copy of the client's file to the Petitioner and billed the Petitioner for the services performed at the rate of \$30 per hour.
- 4. The Petitioner did not withhold any payroll taxes from the pay and did not provide any fringe benefits such as paid holidays. At the end of 2012 the Petitioner reported the total amount paid to David Durbin during the year on a 1099 form. During 2012 the Petitioner paid David Durbin \$1,440.00.
- 5. The Department of Revenue selected the Petitioner for an audit of the Petitioner's books and records for 2012 to verify whether items such as bonuses, tips, sick leave, casual labor, sub-contractors, payment to corporate officers and staff, and excess wage computations were reported correctly.
- 6. On April 22, 2014, the Department of Revenue issued a *Notice of Proposed Assessment* reclassifying the \$1,440.00 paid to David Durbin as wages resulting in additional tax due in the amount of \$21.74. The Petitioner filed a timely protest by letter dated April 29, 2014.

Conclusions of Law:

- 7. The issue in this case, whether bookkeeping services performed for the Petitioner by David Durbin constitute employment subject to the Florida Reemployment Assistance Program Law, is governed by Chapter 443, Florida Statutes. Section 443.1216(1)(a)2., Florida Statutes, provides that employment subject to the chapter includes service performed by individuals under the usual common law rules applicable in determining an employer-employee relationship.
- 8. The Supreme Court of the United States held that the term "usual common law rules" is to be used in a generic sense to mean the "standards developed by the courts through the years of adjudication." <u>United States v. W.M. Webb, Inc.</u>, 397 U.S. 179 (1970).
- 9. The Supreme Court of Florida adopted and approved the tests in 1 Restatement of Law, Agency 2d Section 220 (1958), for use to determine if an employment relationship exists. See Cantor v. Cochran, 184 So.2d 173 (Fla. 1966); Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Kendall, 88 So.2d 276 (Fla. 1956); Magarian v. Southern Fruit Distributors, 1 So.2d 858 (Fla. 1941); see also Kane Furniture Corp. v. R. Miranda, 506 So.2d 1061 (Fla. 2d DCA 1987). In Brayshaw v. Agency for Workforce Innovation, et al; 58 So.3d 301 (Fla. 1st DCA 2011) the court stated that the statute does not refer to other rules or factors for determining the employment relationship and, therefore, the Department is limited to applying only Florida common law in determining the nature of an employment relationship.
- 10. Restatement of Law is a publication, prepared under the auspices of the American Law Institute, which explains the meaning of the law with regard to various court rulings. The Restatement sets forth a nonexclusive list of factors that are to be considered when judging whether a relationship is an employment relationship or an independent contractor relationship.
- 11. 1 Restatement of Law, Agency 2d Section 220 (1958) provides:
 - (1) A servant is a person employed to perform services for another and who, in the performance of the services, is subject to the other's control or right of control.
 - (2) The following matters of fact, among others, are to be considered:
 - (a) the extent of control which, by the agreement, the business may exercise over the details of the work;
 - (b) whether or not the one employed is engaged in a distinct occupation or business;
 - (c) the kind of occupation, with reference to whether, in the locality, the work is usually done under the direction of the employer or by a specialist without supervision;
 - (d) the skill required in the particular occupation;
 - (e) whether the employer or the worker supplies the instrumentalities, tools, and the place of work for the person doing the work;
 - (f) the length of time for which the person is employed;
 - (g) the method of payment, whether by the time or by the job;

- (h) whether or not the work is a part of the regular business of the employer;
- (i) whether or not the parties believe they are creating the relation of master and servant;
- (j) whether the principal is or is not in business.
- 12. Comments in the <u>Restatement</u> explain that the word "servant" does not exclusively connote manual labor, and the word "employee" has largely replaced "servant" in statutes dealing with various aspects of the working relationship between two parties.
- 13. In Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services v. Department of Labor & Employment Security, 472 So.2d 1284 (Fla. 1st DCA 1985) the court confirmed that the factors listed in the Restatement are the proper factors to be considered in determining whether an employer-employee relationship exists. However, in citing La Grande v. B&L Services, Inc., 432 So.2d 1364, 1366 (Fla. 1st DCA 1983), the court acknowledged that the question of whether a person is properly classified an employee or an independent contractor often can not be answered by reference to "hard and fast" rules, but rather must be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
- 14. In this case David Durbin performed the work from his own location using his own computer and computer software. The Petitioner did not supervise David Durbin nor require him to work specified hours. The evidence reveals that the Petitioner was not concerned with how the work was performed but was concerned only with the finished product.
- 15. Whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor is determined by measuring the control exercised by the employer over the worker. If the control exercised extends to the manner in which a task is to be performed, then the worker is an employee rather than an independent contractor. In <u>Cawthon v. Phillips Petroleum Co.</u>, 124 So 2d 517 (Fla. 2d DCA 1960) the court explained: Where the employee is merely subject to the control or direction of the employer as to the result to be procured, he is an independent contractor; if the employee is subject to the control of the employer as to the means to be used, then he is not an independent contractor.
- 16. It is determined that the bookkeeping services performed for the Petitioner by David Durbin do not constitute insured employment.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the determination dated April 22, 2014, be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted on October 13, 2014.





A party aggrieved by the *Recommended Order* may file written exceptions to the Director at the address shown above within fifteen days of the mailing date of the *Recommended Order*. Any opposing party may file counter exceptions within ten days of the mailing of the original exceptions. A brief in opposition to counter exceptions may be filed within ten days of the mailing of the counter exceptions. Any party initiating such correspondence must send a copy of the correspondence to each party of record and indicate that copies were sent.

Una parte que se vea perjudicada por la *Orden Recomendada* puede registrar excepciones por escrito al Director Designado en la dirección que aparece arriba dentro de quince días a partir de la fecha del envío por correo de la *Orden Recomendada*. Cualquier contraparte puede registrar contra-excepciones dentro de los diez días a partir de la fecha de envió por correo de las excepciones originales. Un sumario en oposición a contra-excepciones puede ser registrado dentro de los diez días a partir de la fecha de envío por correo de las contra-excepciones. Cualquier parte que dé inicio a tal correspondencia debe enviarle una copia de tal correspondencia a cada parte contenida en el registro y señalar que copias fueron remitidas.

Yon pati ke Lòd Rekòmande a afekte ka prezante de eksklizyon alekri bay Direktè Adjwen an lan adrès ki parèt anlè a lan yon peryòd kenz jou apati de dat ke Lòd Rekòmande a te poste a. Nenpòt pati ki fè opozisyon ka prezante objeksyon a eksklizyon yo lan yon peryòd dis jou apati de lè ke objeksyon a eksklizyon orijinal yo te poste. Yon dosye ki prezante ann opozisyon a objeksyon a eksklizyon yo, ka prezante lan yon peryòd dis jou apati de dat ke objeksyon a eksklizyon yo te poste. Nenpòt pati ki angaje yon korespondans konsa dwe voye yon kopi kourye a bay chak pati ki enplike lan dosye a e endike ke yo te voye kopi yo.

Shareba Y. Barnes, Special Deputy Clerk

Date Mailed: October 13, 2014

Copies mailed to: Petitioner Respondent

WILLA DENNARD FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE CCOC BLDG #1 SUITE 1400 2450 SHUMARD OAK BLVD TALLAHASSEE FL 32399

MERCEDES FAJARDO FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE 8175 NW 12TH STREET STE 119 DORAL FL 33126-1828

JOSE ROUCO FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE 8175 NW 12TH STREET STE 418 DORAL FL 33126-1828