

**AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

**PETITIONER:**

Employer Account No. - 2507017  
RELOS CORPORATION  
2118 N MACDILL AVENUE  
TAMPA FL 33607-3226

**RESPONDENT:**

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

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-140050L**

**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 July 20, 2010, is AFFIRMED.

DONE and ORDERED at Tallahassee, Florida, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of **June, 2011**.



---

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. - 2507017  
RELOS CORPORATION  
EDUARDO SOLER  
2118 N MACDILL AVENUE  
TAMPA FL 33607-3226

**RESPONDENT:**

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

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-140050L**

**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 July 20, 2010.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on March 1, 2011. The Petitioner’s vice president appeared and testified at the hearing. The Joined Party appeared and testified on her own behalf. A tax auditor 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 and other individuals constitute insured employment pursuant to Sections 443.036(19), 443.036(21); 443.1216, Florida Statutes, and if so, the effective date of the liability.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The Petitioner is a subchapter S corporation, incorporated in approximately 2004, for the purpose of running a daycare center.
2. The Joined Party performed services for the Petitioner from February 26, 2009, through February 9, 2010, as a voluntary prekindergarten teacher. The Joined Party contacted the Petitioner in response to an advertisement placed by the Petitioner. The Petitioner interviewed and subsequently hired the Joined Party. The Joined Party was required by the Petitioner to sign an independent contractor agreement as a condition of hire.

3. The Joined Party had child care development training certification.
4. The Joined Party was expected to report to work at the Petitioner's place of business each day at 8 a.m. The Joined Party then had thirty minutes to prepare. The Joined Party was expected to assist with breakfast for the children and to help clean up after breakfast.
5. The Joined Party was expected to begin class at 9 a.m. The Petitioner provided the curriculum to the Joined Party. The Petitioner provided all materials needed for the work.
6. The Joined Party was supervised by the director. The Petitioner required the Joined Party to submit progress reports for the children as well as yearly evaluations.
7. The Joined Party was paid \$10 per hour. The Petitioner issued weekly paychecks.
8. The Joined Party was not allowed to work for a competitor of the Petitioner.
9. The Joined Party was required to perform the services personally.
10. The Joined Party was required to perform services at the Petitioner's place of business.

#### **Conclusions of Law:**

11. 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.
12. 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).
13. 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).
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. 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.
17. The evidence presented in this hearing reveals that the Petitioner exercised control over where, when, and how the work was performed. The Petitioner created a schedule and curriculum which the Joined Party was required to follow. The Petitioner supervised the Joined Party and required status reports and evaluations.
18. The Joined Party was not allowed to perform services for a competitor.
19. The Petitioner provided all of the materials needed to perform the work.
20. The work performed by the Joined Party as a voluntary prekindergarten teacher was a part of the normal course of business for the Petitioner’s day care center.
21. A preponderance of the evidence presented in this case reveals that the Petitioner established sufficient control over the Joined Party as to create an employer-employee relationship between the parties.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the determination dated July 20, 2010, be AFFIRMED.

Respectfully submitted on April 13, 2011.



---

KRIS LONKANI, Special Deputy  
Office of Appeals