

**DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
THE CALDWELL BUILDING
107 EAST MADISON STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143**

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. - 2626226
THE HAIR TEAM, INC
C/O ELIGIO BONILLA
4801 S UNIVERSITY DRIVE
DAVIE FL 33328-3839

RESPONDENT:

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

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY
DOCKET NO. 2012-63977L**

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 May 15, 2012, 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, 2012.



Altemese Smith,
Assistant Director,
Reemployment Assistance Services
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.

Shanendra Y. Barnes

DEPUTY CLERK

DATE

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 _____ day of December, 2012.

Shanendra Y. Barnes

SHANEDRA Y. BARNES, Special Deputy Clerk
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC
OPPORTUNITY
Reemployment Assistance Appeals
107 EAST MADISON STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143

By U.S. Mail:

THE HAIR TEAM, INC
C/O ELIGIO BONILLA
4801 S UNIVERSITY DRIVE
DAVIE FL 33328-3839

THE HAIR TEAM INC
ATTN: RAFAEL ABREU
6568 NW 186TH STREET
MIAMI LAKES FL 33015

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: VANDA RAGANS - CCOC #1-4857
5050 WEST TENNESSEE STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: MERCEDES FAJARDO
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 119
MIAMI FLORIDA 33126-1831

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: HECTOR J. DETRES, TA
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 425
MIAMI FL 33126-1831

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

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Reemployment Assistance Appeals

MSC 347 CALDWELL BUILDING

107 EAST MADISON STREET

TALLAHASSEE FL 32399-4143

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. - 2626226

THE HAIR TEAM, INC

C/O ELIGIO BONILLA

4801 S UNIVERSITY DRIVE

DAVIE FL 33328-3839

PROTEST OF LIABILITY

DOCKET NO. 2012-63977L

RESPONDENT:

State of Florida

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

c/o Department of Revenue

RECOMMENDED ORDER OF SPECIAL DEPUTY

TO: Assistant Director,
Executive Director,
Reemployment Assistance Services
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

This matter comes before the undersigned Special Deputy pursuant to the Petitioner's protest of the Respondent's determination dated May 15, 2012.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on September 25, 2012. The Petitioner was represented by the Petitioner's accountant. The Petitioner's owner appeared at the hearing. The Respondent's representative called a sales tax auditor as a witness.

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 insured employment, and if so, the effective date of the petitioners liability, pursuant to Sections 443.036(19), (21); 443.1216, Florida Statutes.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Petitioner was selected for an audit due to an audit lead.
2. The audit was conducted by a sales tax auditor on May 2, 2012. The Petitioner's owner and accountant were present for the audit.
3. The audit found that the class of workers labeled as beauticians were misclassified as independent contractors and should be properly classified as employees.
4. The Petitioner is a subchapter C corporation, incorporated in 2007 for the purpose of running a hair salon.
5. The beauticians were hired as independent contractors by the Petitioner.

6. The beauticians were allowed to work for a competitor.
7. The beauticians were required to have either a beautician or nail tech license prior to working for the Petitioner. The Petitioner did not provide training.
8. The beauticians set their own schedule. The beauticians made agreements with their clients as to when appointments would be made.
9. The Petitioner's place of business was open from 9am through 9pm.
10. The Petitioner established a rotation of beauticians to handle walk in customers. The beauticians could refuse to see a walk in customer.
11. The beauticians set the price for their services. The beauticians paid the money to the Petitioner. The Petitioner kept 50% and paid out the remainder to the beautician at the end of each week.
12. The beauticians were required to provide their own combs, brushes, blow dryers, dye, and shampoo. The Petitioner provided the work space and towels. The Petitioner was responsible for cleaning the towels, cleaning the building, and building utilities.
13. The beauticians were not required to re-do defective work. Any problems with the work were between the client and the beautician.

Conclusions of Law:

14. 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.
15. 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).
16. 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).
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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. 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 cannot be answered by reference to “hard and fast” rules, but rather must be addressed on a case-by-case basis.
20. The record reflects that the Petitioner did not exercise control over when or how the work was performed. The workers were allowed to set their own schedule based upon an arrangement with the worker’s client. The work was performed at the Petitioner’s place of business but the workers could work for a competitor or from their own home.
21. While the Petitioner did establish a rotation for seeing walk in customers, the workers were allowed to opt out of the rotation without penalty.
22. The workers were licensed for their profession prior to working for the Petitioner. No training was provided.
23. The workers set their own prices, the Petitioner took half of the money paid to the worker. The pay is therefore by the job which tends to indicate an independent contractor relationship.
24. A preponderance of the evidence presented in this case reveals that the Petitioner did not exercise sufficient control over the workers as to create an employer-employee relationship between the parties.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the determination dated May 15, 2012, be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted on October 29, 2012.




KRIS LONKANI, Special Deputy
Office of Appeals

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.



SHANEDRA Y. BARNES, Special Deputy Clerk

Date Mailed:
October 29, 2012

Copies mailed to:

Petitioner
Respondent
Joined Party

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: DOUGLAS CAMPBELL
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 425
MIAMI FL 33126-1831

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: VANDA RAGANS - CCOC #1-4857
5050 WEST TENNESSEE STREET
TALLAHASSEE FL 32399

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: HECTOR J. DETRES, TA
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 425
MIAMI FL 33126-1831

THE HAIR TEAM INC
ATTN: RAFAEL ABREU
6568 NW 186TH STREET
MIAMI LAKES FL 33015

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
ATTN: MERCEDES FAJARDO
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 119
MIAMI FLORIDA 33126-1831