Simpson v. Commissioner, 64 T. C. 974 (1975)

An individual's status as an independent contractor for self-employment tax purposes depends on the degree of control, investment in facilities, opportunity for profit or loss, and the nature of the relationship with the principal.

Summary

Kelbern Simpson, an insurance agent for Farmers Insurance Group, contested the IRS's determination that he was liable for self-employment tax as an independent contractor rather than an employee. The Tax Court analyzed the common law factors to determine Simpson's status, focusing on the control exerted by Farmers over Simpson's work, his investment in facilities, and the contractual terms. The court found that Simpson was not an employee due to the lack of control by Farmers, his personal investment in his business, and the independent contractor language in his contract, resulting in a decision for the Commissioner.

Facts

Kelbern Simpson worked as an insurance agent for Farmers Insurance Group from 1958 to 1974 under a contract that designated him as an independent contractor. In 1970, he sold insurance for Farmers and 19 other companies. The contract allowed Simpson to set his own work hours, methods, and sales areas within California. He maintained his own office, paid for equipment and supplies, and employed his own secretary. Farmers did not provide leads, required no regular reports except for remittance advices, and did not control Simpson's day-to-day activities. Simpson's compensation was solely commission-based, with the exception of certain life insurance policy bonuses.

Procedural History

The IRS determined a deficiency in Simpson's 1970 self-employment tax, classifying him as an independent contractor. Simpson petitioned the U. S. Tax Court, arguing he was an employee of Farmers and thus exempt from self-employment tax. The Tax Court reviewed the case and issued its decision on August 28, 1975, holding that Simpson was not an employee of Farmers during 1970.

Issue(s)

1. Whether Kelbern Simpson was an employee of Farmers Insurance Group for purposes of exclusion from self-employment tax under section 1402(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code?

Holding

1. No, because the common law factors indicated that Simpson was an independent contractor, not an employee, based on the degree of control, investment in facilities,

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

opportunity for profit or loss, and the terms of the contract.

Court’s Reasoning

The court applied common law rules to determine Simpson’s employment status, focusing on several factors. Firstly, it found that Farmers exerted little control over the details of Simpson’s work, as he had autonomy over his schedule, sales methods, and geographical area. Secondly, Simpson, not Farmers, invested in the facilities used for his work, including office equipment and personnel. Thirdly, Simpson’s compensation structure, primarily commission-based, indicated an opportunity for profit or loss based on his own efforts. Fourthly, the contract’s termination provisions, requiring three months’ notice absent specific breaches, did not reflect typical employer-employee rights. Finally, the contract’s designation of Simpson as an independent contractor was considered evidence of the parties’ intent. The court distinguished cases cited by Simpson, noting the higher degree of control present in those cases, and concluded that the totality of circumstances supported the IRS’s determination.

Practical Implications

This decision clarifies that for self-employment tax purposes, the IRS and courts will look beyond contractual labels to the substance of the working relationship. Legal practitioners should advise clients to assess the common law factors, particularly the degree of control, investment in facilities, and compensation structure, when determining employment status. Businesses may need to carefully structure their agreements with independent contractors to ensure compliance with tax laws. This ruling has influenced subsequent cases in distinguishing between employees and independent contractors, emphasizing the importance of the right to control over the details of the work.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.