

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

PETITIONER:

Employer Account No. - 2546334
T W MOODY PAINTING
ATTN DIANNE BRIERY
12627 SAN JOSE BLVD STE 601
JACKSONVILLE FL 32223-8642

RESPONDENT:

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

**PROTEST OF LIABILITY
DOCKET NO. 2012-86266L**

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 June 6, 2012, 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 _____ 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:

T W MOODY PAINTING
ATTN DIANNE BRIERY
12627 SAN JOSE BLVD STE 601
JACKSONVILLE FL 32223-8642

D K BRIERY CPA PLC
ATTN DIANNE BRIERY
12627 SAN JOSE BLVD SUITE 601
JACKSONVILLE FL 32223-8642

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

BLAKE HARTLAND
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
921 NORTH DAVIS STREET
SUITE A-215
JACKSONVILLE FLORIDA 32209-6829

CHERYL REWIS, TA IV
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
921 NORTH DAVIS STREET
SUITE A-215
JACKSONVILLE FLORIDA 32209-6829

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. - 2546334

T W MOODY PAINTING

ATTN DIANNE BRIERY

12627 SAN JOSE BLVD STE 601

JACKSONVILLE FL 32223-8642

PROTEST OF LIABILITY

DOCKET NO. 2012-86266L

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 June 6, 2012.

After due notice to the parties, a telephone hearing was held on October 29, 2012. The Petitioner, represented by its Certified Public Accountant, appeared and testified. The Respondent was represented by a Department of Revenue Senior Tax Audit Administrator. A Tax Auditor testified 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 received from the Petitioner.

Issue:

Whether services performed for the Petitioner constitute insured employment, and if so, the effective date of the Petitioner's liability, pursuant to Sections 443.036(19), (21); 443.1216, Florida Statutes.

Whether the Petitioner's corporate officers received remuneration for employment which constitutes wages, pursuant to Sections 443.036(21), (44), Florida Statutes; Rule 73B-10.025, Florida Administrative Code.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Petitioner is a subchapter S corporation which operates a business as a residential and commercial painting contractor. The Petitioner's owner and president is Thomas W. Moody who is active in the operation of the business.

2. The Department of Revenue randomly selected the Petitioner for an audit of the Petitioner's books and records for the 2011 tax year to ensure compliance with the Florida Reemployment Assistance Law.
3. The audit was performed at the location of the Petitioner's Certified Public Accountant. The Tax Auditor examined the Petitioner's general ledger, the 1099 forms, Form 940, the 941 forms, Form W-3, the W-2 forms, the UCT-6 forms, and the 1120S.
4. Three 1099 forms were issued by the Petitioner. The 1099s issued by the Petitioner included one for \$11,685 issued to James Moody and one for \$19,452 issued to Vance Moody. The other 1099 form was issued to the Certified Public Accountant for performing bookkeeping and tax services.
5. The Certified Public Accountant performs the bookkeeping services for the Petitioner by entering the information from the check register. The coding concerning the categories of the expenses is determined by the Petitioner, not by the Certified Public Accountant. The monies paid to James Moody and to Vance Moody were coded as "Part-Time or Casual Labor."
6. The Tax Auditor asked the Certified Public Accountant for information concerning the nature of the services provided by James Moody and Vance Moody. The Certified Public Accountant was not able to provide additional information.
7. The only wages reported by the Petitioner was the salary paid to the officer, Thomas W. Moody, in the amount of \$5,000. The Tax Auditor discovered that Thomas W. Moody had taken distributions in the amount of \$4,229.77 during the year and that those distributions had not been reported as wages.
8. The Tax Auditor concluded that the distributions received by Thomas W. Moody were wages and that the remuneration paid to James Moody and Vance Moody was also wages.
9. On June 12, 2012, the Tax Auditor issued a *Notice of Proposed Assessment* detailing the results of the audit resulting in additional gross wages of \$35,366.77, excess wages of \$19,366.77, and taxable wages of \$16,000. The Petitioner's Certified Public Accountant filed a protest after speaking to the Petitioner's president.

Conclusions of Law:

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), Florida Statutes, provides that employment subject to the chapter includes a service performed by a corporate officer and services performed by other 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. In Spicer Accounting, Inc. v. United States, 918 F.2d 90 (9th Cir. 1990), the court determined that dividends paid by an S corporation to an officer of the corporation who performed services for the business, were wages subject to federal employment taxes, including federal unemployment compensation taxes. The court relied upon federal regulations which provide that the “form of payment is immaterial, the only relevant factor being whether the payments were actually received as compensation for employment.”
18. The Petitioner does not dispute that the distributions received by the Petitioner's active officer, Thomas W. Moody, should have been included as wages in addition to the salary received by the officer. However, the Petitioner does dispute the reclassification of remuneration paid to James Moody and Vance Moody as wages.
19. No evidence was presented to show that the services performed by James and Vance Moody were separate and distinct from the Petitioner's business. No competent evidence was presented to show who provided the tools, equipment, and supplies, the method of pay, the length of the employment, or the belief of the parties.
20. The Petitioner's witness, the Certified Public Accountant, testified that she does not have personal knowledge of the terms and conditions under which James and Vance Moody performed services. She testified that the only knowledge which she has is what she has been told by Thomas W. Moody.

21. 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.
22. 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.
23. The testimony of the Certified Public Accountant regarding the nature of the services provided by James and Vance Moody is hearsay and, as such, is legally insufficient to establish that the determination of the Department of Revenue is in error.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the determination dated June 6, 2012, be AFFIRMED.

Respectfully submitted on November 19, 2012.



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.

Shanendra Y. Barnes

SHANEDRA Y. BARNES, Special Deputy Clerk

**Date Mailed:
November 19, 2012**

Copies mailed to:

Petitioner
Respondent
Joined Party

BLAKE HARTLAND
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
921 NORTH DAVIS STREET
SUITE A-215
JACKSONVILLE FLORIDA 32209-6829

D K BRIERY CPA PLC
ATTN DIANNE BRIERY
12627 SAN JOSE BLVD SUITE 601
JACKSONVILLE FL 32223-8642

CHERYL REWIS, TA IV
FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
921 NORTH DAVIS STREET
SUITE A-215
JACKSONVILLE FLORIDA 32209-6829

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