

**AGENCY FOR WORKFORCE INNOVATION  
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

**PETITIONER:**

Employer Account No. - 2381490  
FAST WRAP INC  
7834 NW 194TH TER  
MIAMI FL 33015-6397

**RESPONDENT:**

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

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-10114L**

**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 November 18, 2009, is REVERSED.

DONE and ORDERED at Tallahassee, Florida, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of **May, 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. - 2381490  
FAST WRAP INC  
IVAN PORTES  
7834 NW 194TH TER  
MIAMI FL 33015-6397



**PROTEST OF LIABILITY  
DOCKET NO. 2010-10114L**

**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 November 18, 2009.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on February 1, 2011. The Petitioner’s owner appeared and testified at the hearing. The Joined Party appeared and testified on his own behalf. A service center manager appeared on behalf of the Respondent and called a tax specialist I as 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 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 corporation, incorporated in 2002 for the purpose of running a commercial cleaning business.
2. The Joined Party provided services for the Petitioner as a cleaner from July 2008, through October 2008.

3. The Petitioner offered buildings that needed cleaning to the Joined Party. The Joined Party would choose a building and receive a set fee each month for continuing cleaning of the building.
4. The Joined Party initially selected a school. The Joined Party would report to work after the school had closed and perform whatever cleaning needed to be done. The Joined Party was paid \$200 per month for cleaning the school.
5. The Joined Party took advantage of the opportunity to move to a different building. The new building paid between \$1300 and \$1500 per month.
6. The Petitioner provided an orientation for each building when the Joined Party first started working at the building.
7. The Petitioner provided all tools, equipment, and materials needed to perform the work.
8. The Joined Party was free to determine the order in which the work was to be performed.

### Conclusions of Law:

9. 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.
10. 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).
11. 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).
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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.
15. The evidence presented in this hearing reflects that the Petitioner did not exercise control over the work performed by the Joined Party. While there were limits to the time periods in which the Joined Party could perform the work, such limits are not inconsistent with an independent contractor relationship. The limits were not so narrow as to create a defacto schedule.
16. The Petitioner did not supervise the Joined Party’s work. The Joined Party was free to determine the order in which tasks would be performed as well as what specific means could be used to accomplish the tasks performed.
17. The Joined Party was free to select a work site from available worksites. The Joined Party did change work sites based upon the Joined Party’s assessment of which work site was better suited to his own financial needs.
18. A preponderance of the evidence presented in this hearing reveals that the Petitioner did not establish sufficient control over the Joined Party as to create an employer-employee relationship between the parties.

**Recommendation:** It is recommended that the determination dated November 18, 2009, be REVERSED.

Respectfully submitted on March 21, 2011.



---

KRIS LONKANI, Special Deputy  
Office of Appeals