

**AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

**PETITIONER:**

Employer Account No. - 2816747  
LAW OFFICE OF JAMIE ALLEN PA  
837 NE 17TH WAY  
FT LAUDERDALE FL 33304-4407

**RESPONDENT:**

State of Florida  
Agency for Workforce Innovation  
c/o Department of Revenue

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-83594L**

**ORDER**

This matter comes before me for final Agency 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 30, 2010, is AFFIRMED.

DONE and ORDERED at Tallahassee, Florida, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of **November, 2010**.



---

TOM CLENDENNING  
Assistant Director  
AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION

**AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION  
Unemployment Compensation Appeals**

MSC 345 CALDWELL BUILDING  
107 EAST MADISON STREET  
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143

**PETITIONER:**

Employer Account No. - 2816747  
LAW OFFICE OF JAMIE ALLEN PA  
BRIAN LEE ALLEN  
837 NE 17TH WAY  
FT LAUDERDALE FL 33304-4407



**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-83594L**

**RESPONDENT:**

State of Florida  
Agency for Workforce Innovation  
c/o Department of Revenue

**RECOMMENDED ORDER OF SPECIAL DEPUTY**

TO: Assistant Director  
Agency for Workforce Innovation

This matter comes before the undersigned Special Deputy pursuant to the Petitioner's protest of the Respondent's determination dated April 30, 2010.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on August 18, 2010. The Petitioner's president appeared and provided testimony at the hearing. The Joined Party appeared and testified on her own behalf. A tax specialist II appeared and testified on behalf of the Respondent.

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 by the Joined Party constitute insured employment, and if so, the effective date of liability, pursuant to Section 443.036(19), 443.036(21); 443.1216, Florida Statutes.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Petitioner is a subchapter S corporation, incorporated March 27, 2006, for the purpose of running a law firm.
2. The Joined Party performed services for the Petitioner as a paralegal from July 3, 2008, through September 9, 2009.
3. The Joined Party responded to an advertisement placed by the Petitioner. The Joined Party was interviewed and subsequently hired as a part time paralegal.

4. The Joined Party was initially expected to work Monday, Wednesday, and Friday from 9 to 5. The Petitioner offered the Joined Party an additional day of work per week in which the Joined Party could work from home. The Joined Party was allowed flexibility with her schedule.
5. The Joined Party had weekly meetings with the Petitioner. The Petitioner would inform the Joined Party what the work priority was for the week.
6. The Petitioner paid the Joined Party \$150 per day. The Petitioner paid bonuses to the Joined Party on occasion.
7. The Petitioner would email the Joined Party to instruct the Joined Party on what files were to be worked on for that day.
8. Either party had the right to end the relationship at anytime, without liability.
9. The Petitioner provided the workspace and all necessary equipment for performing the work.

### Conclusions of Law:

10. The issue in this case, whether services performed for the Petitioner constitute employment subject to the Florida Unemployment Compensation 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.
11. 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." United States v. W.M. Webb, Inc., 397 U.S. 179 (1970).
12. 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).
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. Comments in the Restatement 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. In Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services v. Department of Labor & Employment Security, 472 So.2d 1284 (Fla. 1<sup>st</sup> 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. 1<sup>st</sup> DCA 1983), the court acknowledged that the question of whether a person is properly classified an employee or an independent contractor often cannot be answered by reference to “hard and fast” rules, but rather must be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
16. The evidence presented in this case reveals that the Petitioner controlled the order in which the work was performed. The Petitioner gave direction as to what files were to be worked with at any given time. The Petitioner had control over the location and timing of the work.
17. The Joined Party was paid a daily wage. This method of payment is more indicative of an employer-employee relationship.
18. The Petitioner provided the tools, equipment, and location necessary to perform the work. The Joined Party had no expenses for supplies, materials, or equipment. The Joined Party was given office space in which to perform the work.
19. The relationship was terminable at will. Either party had the right to end the relationship at anytime and without liability. In Cantor v. Cochran, 184 So.2d 173 (Fla. 1966), the court in quoting 1 Larson, Workmens' Compensation Law, Section 44.35 stated: "The power to fire is the power to control. The absolute right to terminate the relationship without liability is not consistent with the concept of independent contractor, under which the contractor should have the legal right to complete the project contracted for and to treat any attempt to prevent completion as a breach of contract."
20. A preponderance of the evidence in this case reveals that the Petitioner established sufficient control over the Joined Party as to create an employer-employee relationship between the Petitioner and the Joined Party.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the determination dated April 30, 2010, be AFFIRMED.

Respectfully submitted on September 14, 2010.



---

KRIS LONKANI, Special Deputy  
Office of Appeals