



## The *InterConnect* FLASH!

Practical Bursts of Information Regarding Critical Independent Contractor Relationships

Best Lawyers  
LAW FIRM  
OF THE YEAR

& WORLD REPORT  
U.S. News

TRANSPORTATION LAW  
2017

Benesch has been named  
**Law Firm of the Year**  
in **Transportation Law**  
in the 2017 Edition of  
U.S. News & World  
Report/Best Lawyers®  
“Best Law Firms” ranking.

Only one law firm per practice area in the U.S. is receiving this recognition, making this award a particularly significant achievement. This honor would not have been possible without the support of our clients, who both enable and challenge us every day, and the fine attorneys of our Transportation & Logistics Practice Group.

*The U.S. News & World Report/Best Lawyers® “Best Law Firms” rankings are based on an evaluation process that includes the collection of client and lawyer evaluations, peer review from leading attorneys in their field and review of additional information provided by law firms as part of the formal submission process. For more information on Best Lawyers, please visit [www.bestlawyers.com](http://www.bestlawyers.com).*

## FLASH NO. 59 MASSACHUSETTS “ABC” TEST COURT DECISION: FRESH APPLICATION ON OLD SPIN

Over the last two years, the Benesch Transportation & Logistics Team has written in various installments of the *FLASH* about the Massachusetts Independent Contractor Law, Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 149, §148B (the “Massachusetts ‘ABC’ Test”). The Massachusetts “ABC” Test provides that a worker is properly classified as an independent contractor if the employer can show that: (A) the individual is free from control and direction in connection with the performance of the service, both under his contract for the performance of service and in fact; and (B) the service is performed outside the usual course of the business of the employer, and (C) the individual is customarily engaged in an independently established trade, occupation, profession or business of the same nature as that involved in the service performed. As we reported in *FLASH Nos. 53 and 54*,<sup>1</sup> the First Circuit Court of Appeals held that Prong B of the Massachusetts “ABC” Test was preempted for motor carriers under the Federal Aviation and Administration Authorization Act of 1994 (“FAAAA”).<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, Prongs A and C of the Massachusetts “ABC” Test remain in play. The preemption of Prong B does not equal a free pass.

Late last month, the Massachusetts Supreme Court considered the relationship between drivers and a provider of “last mile” delivery services for retail furniture companies in *Chambers v. RDI Logistics, Inc.* In its opinion, the court reversed the trial court’s judgment in favor of RDI on the grounds that Prongs A and C of the Massachusetts “ABC” Test were not preempted under FAAAA, and that issues of material fact existed as to whether plaintiffs had standing as individuals to assert their misclassification claims. While there is certainly nothing overwhelmingly earth-shattering about the court’s decision, the facts of the case (which were construed in a light most favorable to the plaintiffs) reemphasize the importance of treating your independent contractors like any other vendor with which you do business. In addition, the opinion highlights the potential minefield when you are too clever by half.

According to the court’s decision, RDI only did business with corporate entities (*i.e.*, not individuals), and that policy extended to RDI’s independent contractor drivers. The service agreements entered into between RDI and its ICs contained a nonsolicitation provision (which is not unusual) and also an onerous noncompete agreement with a three-year tail. RDI, through its managers, allegedly told drivers they would be terminated if they performed services for any company other than RDI. Moreover, the court noted that RDI regulated how its drivers loaded furniture onto their trucks, required drivers to follow prescribed routes, and mandated the use of GPS devices to make certain drivers followed the prescribed routes.

As we begin a new year, audit the relationships between your businesses and your independent contractor fleets and/or drivers, particularly your service agreements. Recognize the importance of treating independent contractors like customers or

vendors. They are not employees. If you have a noncompete provision in a service agreement with an independent contractor, like RDI, ask your attorney to help you revise that agreement. Employers can restrict the ability of an employee to perform work for another employer, but independent contractors are free to perform services for others while performing services for you.

If you control the manner and means of your independent contractors' performance of services to your business, through the service agreement or through your managers or operations, like RDI did, ask your attorney to help you revise that agreement and audit your operations to make certain your operational conduct mirrors the terms and provisions of your service agreement. Employers dictate employees' routines and hours worked. Employers direct the means and methods by which tasks and assignments are performed by their employees. Employers generally control the way an employee's tasks are performed. Independent contractors, on the other hand, determine their own routines and when to work, they determine the way accepted tasks and assignments will be performed, and they are responsible only for the results or final product.

The other important takeaway from the *RDI Logistics* decision is to avoid the temptation in your business to act overconfidently or cutely based upon a misguided understanding or interpretation of the legal landscape. The court does not say, but the opinion suggests, that RDI was so insistent that its independent contractors be

business entities as opposed to individuals because RDI, or perhaps its attorneys, mistakenly believed that corporate entities were barred from asserting misclassification claims under the Massachusetts Independent Contractor Law, which refers only to individuals. Applicable case law cited by the court demonstrates that the statute's reference to individuals does not preclude individuals providing services through a corporate entity from asserting a misclassification claim if the worker was forced to incorporate so the "employer" could misclassify the worker as an independent contractor. The court precluded summary judgment on this point because "the allegations raise the question whether the plaintiffs incorporated for their own benefit, as the defendants suggest, or whether RDI required them to incorporate in order to misclassify them as independent contractors."

---

#### For more information, contact:

**J. Allen Jones** at [ajones@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ajones@beneschlaw.com) or (614) 223-9323

Allen is a partner with Benesch's Transportation & Logistics Practice Group. He focuses his practice on the representation of companies located throughout the country in virtually all segments of the transportation industry, including, among others, truckload carriers, overweight/over-dimensional carriers, bulk and tank carriers, dray carriers, and third-party logistics providers in matters involving, among other things, independent contractor/owneroperator issues, lost, damaged or stolen freight, freight charge collection, and transportation related service agreements.

**Richard A. Plewacki** at [rplewacki@beneschlaw.com](mailto:rplewacki@beneschlaw.com) or (216) 363-4159

Richard is a partner with the firm's Litigation and Transportation & Logistics Practice Groups. He has been in the transportation and logistics industry, both as a businessman and an attorney, for over 40 years during which he has been heavily involved with the IC model within the trucking industry. His practice also includes advising and representing motor carriers, leasing companies, third party logistics providers, national shippers, large private fleets and water carriers in the domestic, non-contiguous trade lanes.

The treatment of independent contractors/owner-operators in your business is important to profitability, sustainability, and the mitigation of potentially costly misclassification litigation. It is mission-critical that your service agreements and business operations are consistent. The Benesch Transportation & Logistics Team is happy to help your business review its independent contractor program at the operational level, through an audit of your service agreements, or both. Happy New Year!

---

<sup>1</sup> Previous issues of the *FLASH* can be found [here](#).

<sup>2</sup> See *Massachusetts Delivery Association v. Healy*, 821 F.3d 187 (1st Cir. 2016) and *Schwann, et al. v. FedEx Ground Package System, Inc.*, 813 F.3d 429 (1st Cir. 2016).

### Additional Information

For additional information, please contact:

#### Transportation & Logistics Practice Group

**Michael J. Barrie** at (302) 442-7068 or [mbarrie@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mbarrie@beneschlaw.com)  
**Marc S. Blubaugh** at (614) 223-9382 or [mblubaugh@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mblubaugh@beneschlaw.com)  
**Kevin M. Capuzzi** at (302) 442-7063 or [kcapuzzi@beneschlaw.com](mailto:kcapuzzi@beneschlaw.com)  
**Matthew D. Gurbach** at (216) 363-4413 or [mgurbach@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mgurbach@beneschlaw.com)  
**Jennifer R. Hoover** at (302) 442-7006 or [jhoover@beneschlaw.com](mailto:jhoover@beneschlaw.com)  
**J. Allen Jones III** at (614) 223-9323 or [ajones@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ajones@beneschlaw.com)  
**Thomas B. Kern** at (614) 223-9369 or [tkern@beneschlaw.com](mailto:tkern@beneschlaw.com)  
**Peter N. Kirsanow** at (216) 363-4481 or [pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com](mailto:pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com)  
**David M. Krueger** at (216) 363-4683 or [dkrueger@beneschlaw.com](mailto:dkrueger@beneschlaw.com)  
**Christopher J. Lalak** at (216) 363-4557 or [clalak@beneschlaw.com](mailto:clalak@beneschlaw.com)  
**Stephanie V. McGowan** at (317) 685-6161 or [smcgowan@beneschlaw.com](mailto:smcgowan@beneschlaw.com)  
**Andi M. Metzel** at (317) 685-6159 or [ametzel@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ametzel@beneschlaw.com)  
**Michael J. Mozes** at (614) 223-9376 or [mmoz@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mmoz@beneschlaw.com)  
**Kelly E. Mulrane** at (614) 223-9318 or [kmulrane@beneschlaw.com](mailto:kmulrane@beneschlaw.com)  
**Lianzhong Pan** at (86 21) 3222-0388 or [lp@beneschlaw.com](mailto:lp@beneschlaw.com)  
**Martha J. Payne** at (541) 764-2859 or [mpayne@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mpayne@beneschlaw.com)  
**Stephanie S. Penninger** at (317) 685-6188 or [spenninger@beneschlaw.com](mailto:spenninger@beneschlaw.com)  
**Joel R. Pentz** at (216) 363-4618 or [jpentz@beneschlaw.com](mailto:jpentz@beneschlaw.com)  
**Richard A. Plewacki** at (216) 363-4159 or [rplewacki@beneschlaw.com](mailto:rplewacki@beneschlaw.com)  
**Matthew J. Selby** at (216) 363-4458 or [mselby@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mselby@beneschlaw.com)  
**Brittany L. Shaw** at (317) 685-6118 or [bshaw@beneschlaw.com](mailto:bshaw@beneschlaw.com)  
**Peter K. Shelton** at (216) 363-4169 or [pshelton@beneschlaw.com](mailto:pshelton@beneschlaw.com)  
**Clare R. Taft** at (216) 363-4435 or [ctaft@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ctaft@beneschlaw.com)  
**Jonathan Todd** at (216) 363-4658 or [jtodd@beneschlaw.com](mailto:jtodd@beneschlaw.com)  
**Eric L. Zalud** at (216) 363-4178 or [ezalud@beneschlaw.com](mailto:ezalud@beneschlaw.com)

#### Labor & Employment Practice Group

**Maynard Buck** at (216) 363-4694 or [mbuck@beneschlaw.com](mailto:mbuck@beneschlaw.com)  
**Joseph Gross** at (216) 363-4163 or [jgross@beneschlaw.com](mailto:jgross@beneschlaw.com)  
**Rick Hepp** at (216) 363-4657 or [rhepp@beneschlaw.com](mailto:rhepp@beneschlaw.com)  
**Christopher J. Lalak** at (216) 363-4557 or [clalak@beneschlaw.com](mailto:clalak@beneschlaw.com)  
**Peter Kirsanow** at (216) 363-4481 or [pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com](mailto:pkirsanow@beneschlaw.com)

[www.beneschlaw.com](http://www.beneschlaw.com)