

Circuit Court Rules Insurance Agents Are Not “Employees” Under ERISA

April 04, 2019

The identity crisis appears to be over for one insurer using independent contractors. In *Jammal v. American Family Insurance Co.*, the Sixth Circuit reversed the district court and held that a putative class of insurance agents for American Family Insurance Co. were properly classified as independent contractors under ERISA and, therefore, not entitled to ERISA benefits. The ruling helped to quell insurance industry uproar resulting from the district court’s decision in 2017, much to the dismay of the several thousand current and former American Family agents who had argued the insurer misclassified them as independent contractors to avoid paying them ERISA-required benefits.

The Sixth Circuit’s decision turned on its analysis of the *Darden* factors for determining who qualifies as an employee under ERISA, as set forth in the Supreme Court’s *Nationwide Mutual Insurance Co. v. Darden* opinion, and the court’s review of those factors as conclusions of law rather than fact. The court found that the district court incorrectly applied the standards relating to:

1. the skill required of an agent; and
2. the hiring and paying of assistants.

According to the court, the correct application of the *Darden* standards weighed in favor of independent-contractor status. The Sixth Circuit also found that the district court failed to give sufficient weight to the parties’ written agreement, which expressly stated the parties’ intent to establish an independent-contractor relationship, and the factors relating to the “financial structure of the company-agent relationship,” including the source of the instrumentalities and tools, method of payment, provision of employee benefits, and agents’ tax treatment. The Sixth Circuit explained that, had the district court “properly weighed those factors in accordance with their

significance, it would have determined that the entire mix of *Darden* factors favored independent-contractor status.”

Authored By



Todd M. Fuller

Related Practices

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Litigation](#)

[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

[Labor & Employment](#)

Related Industries

[Securities & Investment Companies](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.