

February 2003
QUESTION 2

Olga, a widow, owned Blackacre, a lakeside lot and cottage. On her seventieth birthday she had a pleasant reunion with her niece, Nan, and decided to give Blackacre to Nan. Olga had a valid will leaving "to my three children in equal shares all the property I own at my death." She did not want her children to know of the gift to Nan while she was alive, nor did she want to change her will. Olga asked Bruce, a friend, for help in the matter.

Bruce furnished Olga with a deed form that by its terms would effect a present conveyance. Olga completed the form, naming herself as grantor and Nan as grantee, designating Blackacre as the property conveyed, and including an accurate description of Blackacre. Olga signed the deed and Bruce, a notary, acknowledged her signature. Olga then handed the deed to Bruce, and told him, "Hold this deed and record it if Nan survives me." Nan knew nothing of this transaction.

As time passed Olga saw little of Nan and lost interest in her. One day she called Bruce on the telephone and told him to destroy the deed. However, Bruce did not destroy the deed. A week later Olga died.

Nan learned of the transaction when Bruce sent her the deed, which he had by then recorded. Nan was delighted with the gift and is planning to move to Blackacre.

Olga never changed her will and it was in effect on the day of her death.

Who owns Blackacre? Discuss.

Answer A to Question 2

Olga owned Blackacre and had a valid will leaving to her three children "in equal shares all the property I own at death." If the terms of the will were to take effect while Olga owned Blackacre, her three children would share in Blackacre equally. However, she had a reunion with her niece Nan, and had decided to make a present conveyance of Blackacre. She drew up a deed with the help of her friend Bruce, gave the deed to Bruce, and, without Nan's knowledge, instructed Bruce to "record it if Nan survives me." Later, Olga attempted to revoke her alleged gift to Nan by destruction of the deed, however, Bruce did not destroy the deed. When Olga died, Bruce conveyed the deed to Nan. In order to determine who owns Blackacre, the central question to answer is whether Olga made a valid conveyance to Nan. A second question is whether Olga appropriately revoke[d] the conveyance to Nan. If Olga is found to have appropriately conveyed Blackacre [to] Nan, the three children would not take any share of Blackacre under the terms of the will. On the other hand, if Olga did not appropriately convey Blackacre to Nan, the three children would take Blackacre in equal shares, and Nan would not get anything. A final consideration is whether there was any reliance on Nan's part that would allow Nan to take Blackacre.

Did Olga make a valid conveyance of Blackacre to Nan?

In order to find that Olga validly conveyed Blackacre by deed to Nan, three elements must be present. First, there must be an intent by the grantor, Olga, to convey Blackacre to the grantee Nan. Secondly, there must be a valid delivery of the deed to Nan. And thirdly, Nan must validly accept the deed and Olga's conveyance.

Did Olga have an intent to convey Blackacre to Nan?

In order to possess valid intent, Olga must have intended to convey Blackacre to Nan at the moment she made delivery. It is not enough that Olga possess the requisite intent to convey Blackacre to Nan years before delivery is made. The intent must match the moment of delivery.

Here, the facts indicate that Olga intended to "effect a present conveyance." This wording implies that her intent was to convey Blackacre at that precise moment. Olga therefore had Bruce draw up a deed which complied with deed formalities of description of property, names involved, and Olga's signature. Olga then handed the deed to Bruce, stating, "Hold this deed and record it if Nan survives me." When Olga handed the deed to Bruce, the facts state that she intended to transfer Blackacre to Nan at that precise moment. However, her conduct does not match the wording of "present conveyance." Instead, Olga wanted Bruce to "hold this deed, and record it if Nan survives me." This language is indicative that Olga did not want to make a precisely present conveyance of Blackacre. Instead, Olga wanted Nan to receive Blackacre upon the happening of a condition, that Nan survive Olga. Olga manifested the intent that should Nan not survive Olga, Nan should not get Blackacre. Olga intended that at that moment, Nan was to receive a contingent remainder in Blackacre, and was not intended to be a present conveyance. Instead, Olga intended to remain holder of the deed to Blackacre, and leave open whether her children should take under her will.

This contingent remainder should be distinguished from a fee simple determinable. A fee simple determinable transfers an interest in land; however, should a condition occur,

then the land will revert back to the grantor through possibility of reverter. Here, a court will most likely find that Olga did not intend to convey any type of defeasible fee, but instead wanted to convey a contingent remainder.

Nan would disagree with the characterization that Olga intended to convey a contingent remainder. Instead, Nan would argue that Olga intended to make a present possessory conveyance of Blackacre to Nan when she handed the deed to Bruce. However, the language which Olga used, indicating that there was a condition before the deed should be recorded, indicates that there was also a condition before the deed was to become possessory in Nan. This characterization will also depend on whether Bruce is an agent for Nan, or an agent for Olga as shall be discussed later.

Olga's children will argue alternatively that the intent does not match the delivery at all, that Olga's intent was to make a present possessory transfer of Blackacre, that her actions do not match, and therefore, the whole transaction should be invalidated. However, courts are unwilling to invalidate a transaction simply on technicalities. Instead, courts will try to look at the transferor's intent in giving effect to a transaction, use that for guidance, but still rely on legal principles, justice, and fairness in coming to a decision. Therefore, most likely, a court will not invalidate Olga's attempt to convey Blackacre to Nan, solely because her words do not match her actions. Instead, a court will construe her intent reasonably.

Did Olga make a valid delivery of the deed to Nan?

Conveyance of a deed also requires valid delivery of the deed from the grantor to the grantee. Such conveyance does not have to be a precise handing of the deed from the grantor to the grantee. Instead, there can be a constructive conveyance. The grantor could hand the deed to a third party, who could in turn hold the deed for the grantee. A finding of whether there was a valid delivery in such a situation rests upon which party

the third party is an agent for.

In the present case, Olga handed the deed to Bruce, with precise instructions to record the deed should Nan survive Olga. It is clear that there was a valid delivery from Olga to Bruce. But the question is whether Bruce is an agent for Nan, or Olga.

The facts support the conclusion that Bruce is an agent for Olga. The facts describe Bruce as a "friend" of Olga, and a person whom Olga could turn to for help in drafting a deed. Furthermore, Bruce helped Olga draft the deed with a form, and for all purposes, seems to be on Olga's side. The facts also indicate that Bruce was to act on behalf of Olga. Bruce was to convey the deed to Nan, and record the deed, should Nan survive Olga. T[he]se actions on behalf of Olga and other aid to Olga are indicative of an agency relationship. A court will most likely find that Bruce is an agent for Olga.

The facts do not support a finding that Bruce is an agent for Nan. The facts do not show that Nan even knew Bruce, and for all purposes, seems to have first heard from Bruce when Bruce sent her the deed. Because Bruce is not acting on behalf of Nan, but rather on behalf of Olga, a court will most likely find that Bruce is Olga's agent, and not Nan's.

A finding of this sort is significant. If Bruce is an agent for Olga, then when Olga gave the

deed to Bruce, delivery was not yet made. Delivery would happen upon the occurrence of the specified condition, and Bruce would transfer the deed to Nan, using the power which Olga granted to Bruce to act on Olga's behalf. On the other hand, if Bruce is an agent for Nan, then delivery was complete upon Olga's delivery to Bruce. All that would remain is for the deed to be accepted.

Because a court will most likely find that Bruce is an agent for Olga, a court will also most likely not find that there was a valid delivery made to Nan at the moment Olga gave the deed to Bruce. Instead, a court may find that a valid delivery was made when Bruce, acting as agent for Olga, transferred the deed to Nan, because Olga empowered Bruce to act in her interest.

Was there a valid acceptance by Nan?

In addition to an intent to deliver by the grantor and a valid delivery by grantor to grantee, there must also be a valid acceptance by the grantee in order for a valid conveyance of a deed to take place. As indicated above, Bruce will most likely be found to be an agent for Olga. Thus Bruce cannot accept on behalf of Nan. If Bruce had been an agent for Nan, Bruce could accept the deed on behalf of Nan. Instead, the facts indicate that Nan did not even know of anything of the transaction. Nan could not accept until Bruce sent the letter to Nan.

When Bruce did send the letter to Nan, Nan accepted the transfer. This is indicative as Nan "was delighted" and intended to move to Blackacre. Thus, if there was not an effective revocation of Bruce's power to transfer the deed to Nan, then the deed should be effective in favor of Nan.

significance of Olga's revocation

These findings are significant because of the revocation which Olga made. A revocation is valid anytime up to the moment of acceptance. In the present case, there was not even a valid delivery, let alone a valid acceptance at the moment Olga handed the deed to Bruce. A court MAY find that there was a valid delivery and acceptance when Bruce transferred the deed to Nan, but only if Bruce was st[ill] empowered to transfer the deed to Nan. Nan would argue that Bruce remained empowered to transfer the deed because Bruce did not use substantially the same instrument and means to revoke her gift as she did to make it. Generally, such transfers are terminable by any reasonable means. Olga's children would argue that even if there was not a valid delivery or acceptance, the revocation was effective upon the phone call, that is, was reasonable to revoke her offer by telephone rather than in writing because Olga and Bruce were friends.

A court will probably hold that the revocation was not effective. Although this is a scenario for the transfer of land thus subject to the statute of frauds, a finding that a person can revoke or reinstate a transfer simply on a whimsical phone call would invite the danger of too much fraud. If Olga could effectively terminate her transfer by a phone call, then she could just as easily reinstate her offer. Such ease in a transfer of something as substantial as a transfer of land would invite too much danger of abuse and fraud. Hence, a court will probably hold that Olga's revocation was invalid.

Conclusion

A court will most likely hold that Olga had an intent to deliver land to Nan. Although her intent may not coincide precisely with her actions, a court will construe a reasonable intent to deliver. Olga conveyed the property to Bruce as her agent who in turn was empowered to deliver the deed to Nan. Olga's revocation was ineffective because it did not comply with the statute of frauds. Hence, when Nan accepted the deed, a court will probably find an effective conveyance.

Should the court not find an effective conveyance, Nan could also pursue a theory of reliance. However, the facts do not support too much of a finding of reliance, as Nan did not take any substantial action, and instead, "planned" to move to Blackacre. A plan is not sufficient to justify a finding of reliance. There must be also a significant manifestation of intent to possess.

Answer B to Question 2

The issue is whether the deed form was sufficient to pass title to Nan and make her the owner of Blackacre, or whether the deed was invalid, which would mean that Olga was owner of Blackacre upon her death and the property would pass through her will to her three children in equal shares.

1. Deed

In order for a deed to be valid there must be: (1) a writing that satisfies the statute of frauds; (2) delivery, and (3) acceptance.

A. Statute of Frauds

When conveying an interest in land, the conveyance must be contained in a writing that satisfies the statute of frauds. A deed is sufficient to satisfy the statute of frauds if it: (1) identifies the parties to the conveyance; (2) sufficiently describes the property to be conveyed; (3) and is signed by the grantor. In this case, Blackacre is a piece of real property that consists of a lakeside lot and cottage, and a sufficient writing must exist in order for the conveyance to be enforceable.

Here, the deed form is a written memorandum which identifies the parties to the conveyance. The deed names herself as grantor and Nan as grantee. The deed also sufficiently identifies the property to be conveyed. The deed designates that Blackacre is the property being conveyed and the deed includes "an accurate description" of Blackacre. Also, Olga, as grantor, signed the deed. In general, the signature of a deed does not have to be notarized; however, in this case the deed was notarized by Bruce after Olga acknowledged her signature. Therefore, it appears that the deed form was a written memorandum that is sufficient to satisfy the statute of frauds requirement for conveying an interest in land.

B. Delivery

To determine whether a grantor has sufficiently delivered a deed so as to affect a conveyance of real property, the focus of the inquiry turns on the grantor's intent. If the grantor intends to pass a present interest in the property, then delivery is complete. Actual physical delivery of the deed is not required, nor is knowledge of the delivery by the grantee, so long as the grantor possessed the requisite intent.

Here, Nan would argue that at the time Olga executed the deed form she had the present intent to convey Blackacre to her. Olga and Nan were family members and had just had a "pleasant reunion" for Olga's seventieth birthday. In addition, Olga did not want her children to know that she was leaving Nan Blackacre while she was alive. Thus, this shows that Olga has the present intent to pass title to Nan while she was alive. Moreover, the deed form by its terms would effect a present conveyance of the property.

On the other hand, Olga's children may argue that Bruce merely provided Olga with the deed form, and Olga did not know that it would effect a present conveyance. Even though the terms were sufficient, Olga's children would argue that she lacked the requisite present intent as evidenced by Olga handing the deed to Bruce and telling him to hold the deed and only record it if Nan survived her. Olga's children would argue that this demonstrates that Olga did not intend for the deed form to pass to present title and therefore Olga never 'delivered the deed' to Nan. Olga's children would also note that Olga's intent not to pass present title to Nan is shown by Olga's telephone call to Bruce in which she instructed Bruce to "destroy the deed".

On balance, because at the time of the conveyance Olga executed the deed sufficient to convey title and she wanted to make a gift of the property to Nan at that point, even though she didn't want her children to know about it, a court would likely find the deed

was sufficient to convey title to Nan at the point it was executed by Olga. Olga did not state that she only intended the deed to be effective upon the occurrence of an event, rather Olga merely stated that she wanted Bruce to record the deed if Nan survived her. A deed does not have to be recorded in order to be valid. Therefore, Olga likely delivered the deed.

C. Acceptance

A grantee must accept the deed of conveyance. In general, acceptance is presumed unless the grantee has specifically indicated an intent not to accept the conveyance. Instead, it is immaterial whether Nan knew about the conveyance or not when Olga "delivered" the deed. Therefore, Nan's lack of knowledge would not prohibit a finding that she "accepted" the deed. In fact, as further evidence of her acceptance, Nan "was delighted" with the gift and planned on moving to Blackacre. Thus, there was sufficient acceptance.

As a result, because there is a sufficient writing to satisfy the statute of frauds, and Olga intended to make a present transfer of the Blackacre when she executed the deed and Nan's acceptance can be presumed, Nan owns Blackacre. Because the property is not part of Olga's estate at the time of her death because she did not own it anymore, her three children would not receive Blackacre in "equal shares" pursuant to Olga's will. A testator may not devise property which she does not own at her death.

However, if the court found that Olga did not possess the requisite intent to deliver Blackacre to Nan, Nan could still argue that Olga's deed form constituted a valid disposition by will and therefore she would still take the property.

2. WILL - Is the Deed Form a Valid Will?

In general, a will is valid if the testator is at least 18 years old and of sound mind, possesses the requisite testamentary intent, signs the will in the joint conscious presence of 2 witnesses that understand the document is the testator's will and who sign the will. Some jurisdictions recognize the validity of holographic wills. To be valid, a holographic will must be signed by the testator, the testator must possess testamentary intent, and the material provisions of the holographic will must be in the testator's handwriting. Material provisions of the will consist of identifying the beneficiaries and the property to be devised.

In this case, the deed form would not be a valid formal will because Olga executed the document in the presence of only 1 witness, Bruce. Thus, even though Olga was over 18 and appears to be of "sound mind", and she signed the deed, the deed form does not qualify as a valid formal will.

Nan could argue that the deed form constitutes a valid holographic will. The deed form was signed by Olga, and it appears that "Olga completed the form" by naming herself as grantor and Nan as grantee, and by including the property to be conveyed, Blackacre, and accurately described the property. Thus, the [the] "material terms" of the will appear to be in Olga's handwriting. It does not matter that the document was a "form" so long as

the material terms were in Olga's handwriting. Therefore, the court may conclude that Olga executed a valid holographic will if it concludes that at the time Olga possessed the necessary testamentary intent.

Nan would argue that Olga's statement to Bruce instructing him to hold the deed and record it if "Nan survives me" evidences a testimony intent that Nan only take the property upon Olga's death. Thus, Nan would not have an interest in the property until Olga dies, which is consistent with disposing of one's property by will. A court would likely conclude that the deed form constitutes a valid holographic will.

3. Revocation of Holographic Will

In general, wills are freely revocable during the testator's lifetime. A will may be revoked by a physical act or by execution of a subsequent instrument.

In order to revoke a will by physical act, the testator must (1) have the intent to revoke, and (2) do some physical act such as crossing out, destroying, obliterating which touches the language of the will. A testator may direct another person to destroy the will, however, the destruction must be at the testator's direction and in the testator's presence.

Here, Olga's children could argue that the deed form, which constitutes a holographic will, was revoked by Olga before her death. Olga intended to revoke the will when she called Bruce and told him to "destroy the deed". Olga's children may argue that even though Bruce did not actually destroy the deed, the court should still find that Olga possessed the intent to revoke. However, because Bruce was not in Olga's presence and did not do anything to the language of the holographic will, it is likely that Olga did not sufficiently revoke the holographic will before her death.

4. Revocation of Earlier Will

If the court found that Olga did not revoke the holographic will, then the issue becomes whether the holographic will is sufficient to revoke the earlier valid will leaving all of Olga's property to her three children equally. A testator may revoke a prior will by executing a subsequent instrument. In general, a subsequent written instrument that qualified as a will must be construed, to the extent possible, as consistent with the prior instrument. However, to the extent that a subsequent instrument is inconsistent with prior will, the prior will is revoked.

Here, the holographic will leaves Blackacre, which was part of Olga's "property" to Nan. Olga's original will left "all the property that I own at my death" to her three children. If the court finds that the deed form was insufficient to pass title to Nan during life because Olga lacked the necessary intent, she would "own" Blackacre at her death. If the deed form constitutes a valid holographic will, it disposes of Blackacre. Thus, this disposition would work a revocation of the original will to the extent that it is inconsistent. Therefore, Nan would take Blackacre under the holograph will, and Olga's children would take the rest of Olga's property since that would not be inconsistent with the original terms of the will.

Olga's children may argue that Olga never dated the holographic will, and therefore, when a testator is found to have a formal will and a holographic will that is undated, a

presumption exists that the holograph was executed before the holograph [sic]. Thus, the formal will would be inconsistent with the undated holograph, and the formal will would, to the degree of inconsistency, revoke the undated holograph. In that case, Olga's children would own Blackacre equally, and Nan would take nothing.

In sum, Nan likely own[s] Blackacre because the deed form was sufficient to pass present title to her, and therefore Olga did not own Blackacre at her death. As such, her original will would not pass Blackacre to her children since she did not "own" it at her death. In addition, even if the court finds that Olga lacked the requisite intent for a valid delivery, the deed form likely qualifies as a valid holographic will which Olga did not revoke in her lifetime.