

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

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. - 3001690
ELMER TRUCK SERVICES INC
C/O ALLEN S STRANGE
11 SW 109TH AVE APT C8
MIAMI FL 33174-1416

PROTEST OF LIABILITY
DOCKET NO. 0020 9339 66-02

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 good cause is found for the Petitioner's nonappearance for the March 11, 2014, hearing. It is further ORDERED that the determination dated October 16, 2013, is AFFIRMED.

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 15th day of **October, 2014**.



[Handwritten signature]

Magnus Hines,
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.

Shanendra Y. Barnes

DEPUTY CLERK

10.22.14

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 22nd day of October, 2014.

Shanendra Y. Barnes

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

By U.S. Mail:

ELMER TRUCK SERVICES INC
C/O ALLEN S STRANGE
11 SW 109TH AVE APT C8
MIAMI FL 33174-1416

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

MIAMI TAX OFFICE
ATTN: MERCEDES FAJARDO
8175 NW 12TH STREET SUITE 119
MIAMI FL 33126

ELMER TRUCK SERVICES INC
C/O ALLEN S STRANGE
1325 SW 87TH AVENUE
MIAMI FL 33174-3308

ISMARY MARTINEZ
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF
REVENUE
8175 NW 12TH
SUITE 119
MIAMI 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. - 3001690
ELMER TRUCK SERVICES INC
C/O ALLEN S STRANGE
1325 SW 87TH AVENUE
MIAMI FL 33174-3308

PROTEST OF LIABILITY
DOCKET NO. 0020 9339 66-02

RESPONDENT:

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

RECOMMENDED ORDER OF SPECIAL DEPUTY

TO: Magnus Hines
RA 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 October 16, 2013.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on July 8, 2014. The Petitioner, represented by its accountant, 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.

NON-APPEARANCE: Whether there is good cause for proceeding with an additional hearing, pursuant to Florida Administrative Code Rule 73B-10.035(18).

Findings of Fact:

1. The Petitioner, Elmer Truck Services Inc., was selected by the Department of Revenue for an audit of the Petitioner's books and records for the 2011 tax year to ensure compliance with the Florida Unemployment Compensation Law, now known as the Florida Reemployment Assistance Program Law.
2. The Petitioner operates a local delivery service. The Petitioner owns the trucks which are used to make the deliveries and is responsible for the cost of operating the vehicles. During 2011 the Petitioner used workers which the Petitioner assigned to drive the Petitioner's trucks to make the deliveries. The Petitioner classified the drivers as independent contractors. The Petitioner also used a mechanic to maintain and repair the Petitioner's trucks. The Petitioner classified the mechanic as an independent contractor.

3. The Petitioner did not withhold payroll taxes from the workers' pay during 2011 and at the end of the year the Petitioner reported each worker's earnings on Form 1099-MISC as nonemployee compensation.
4. The Tax Auditor examined the twelve 1099 forms filed by the Petitioner for 2011. Based on the Petitioner's books and records, and based on the lack of evidence that the workers were bona fide independent contractors, the Tax Auditor concluded that the workers were misclassified as independent contractors.
5. On October 16, 2013, the Department of Revenue issued a *Notice of Proposed Assessment* listing the additional tax that was due as a result of the audit. The Petitioner filed a timely protest on November 4, 2013.
6. After due notice to the parties, a special deputy in the Reemployment Assistance Appeals Office scheduled a telephone hearing to be held on March 11, 2014. All parties were notified to contact the deputy clerk to provide the name and telephone number of the person to be contacted for the telephone hearing. The Petitioner's accountant intended to represent the Petitioner in the hearing, however, due to an oversight, the Petitioner's representative did not provide the contact information to the deputy clerk.
7. As a result of the Petitioner's failure to participate in the telephone hearing a *Recommended Order of Dismissal* was mailed to the parties on March 11, 2014. On March 19, 2014, the Petitioner's accountant requested that the hearing be rescheduled.

Conclusions of Law:

8. Rule 73B-10.035, Florida Administrative Code, provides:
 - (18) Request to Re-Open Proceedings. Upon written request of the Petitioner or upon the special deputy's own motion, the special deputy will for good cause rescind a Recommended Order to dismiss the case and reopen the proceedings. Upon written request of the Respondent or Joined Party, or upon the special deputy's own motion, the special deputy may for good cause rescind a Recommended Order and reopen the proceedings if the party did not appear at the most recently scheduled hearing and the special deputy entered a recommendation adverse to the party. The special deputy will have the authority to reopen an appeal under this rule provided that the request is filed or motion entered within the time limit permitted to file exceptions to the Recommended Order. A threshold issue to be decided at any hearing held to consider allowing the entry of evidence on the merits of a case will be whether good cause exists for a party's failure to attend the previous hearing. If good cause is found, the special deputy will proceed on the merits of the case. If good cause is not found, the Recommended Order will be reinstated.
9. The Petitioner failed to provide contact information for the March 11, 2014, hearing due to human error. The Petitioner's representative promptly requested that the hearing be rescheduled. Thus, it is determined that good cause has been shown.
10. The issue in this case, whether services performed for the Petitioner 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.
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). 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.
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.
16. 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.
17. The "extent of control" referred to in Restatement Section 220(2)(a), has been recognized as the most important factor in determining whether a person is an independent contractor or an employee. Employees and independent contractors are both subject to some control by the person or entity hiring them. The extent of control exercised over the details of the work turns on whether the control is focused on the result to be obtained or extends to the means to be used. A control directed toward means is necessarily more extensive than a control directed towards results. Thus, the mere control of results points to an independent contractor relationship; the control of means points to an employment relationship. Furthermore, the relevant issue is "the extent of control which, by the agreement, the master may exercise over the details of the work." Thus, it is the right of control, not actual control or actual interference with the work, which is significant in distinguishing between

an independent contractor and an employee. Harper ex rel. Daley v. Toler, 884 So.2d 1124 (Fla. 2nd DCA 2004).

18. Rule 73B-10.035(7), Florida Administrative Code, provides that the burden of proof will be on the protesting party to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that the determination was in error.
19. The Petitioner's accountant was the Petitioner's sole witness. The accountant did not have any direct knowledge of the terms and conditions under which the workers provided services to the Petitioner. His testimony consisted of what he had been told by others and on supposition.
20. Section 90.604, Florida Statutes, sets out the general requirement that a witness must have personal knowledge regarding the subject matter of his or her testimony. Information or evidence received from other people and not witnessed firsthand is hearsay. Hearsay evidence may be used for the purpose of supplementing or explaining other evidence, but it is not sufficient, in and of itself, to support a finding unless it would be admissible over objection in civil actions. Section 120.57(1)(c), Florida Statutes.
21. Rule 73B-10.035(15), Florida Administrative Code, provides:
 - (c) Hearsay evidence, whether received in evidence over objection or not, may be used to supplement or explain other evidence but will not be sufficient in itself to support a finding unless the evidence falls within an exception to the hearsay rule as found in Chapter 90, Florida Statutes.
22. The evidence presented by the Petitioner does not show that the determination of the Department of Revenue is in error. Thus, the determination must be affirmed.

Recommendation: It is recommended that good cause be found for the Petitioner's failure to participate in the March 11, 2014, hearing. It is recommended that the determination dated October 16, 2013, be AFFIRMED.

Respectfully submitted on August 5, 2014.

R. O. Smith, 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 envío 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.

Shanetra Y. Barnes

SHANEDRA Y. BARNES, Special Deputy Clerk

Date Mailed:

August 5, 2014

Copies mailed to:

Petitioner

Respondent

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

ISMARY MARTINEZ
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
8175 NW 12TH STREET
SUITE 418
MIAMI FL 33126-1828

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