

## QUESTION 6: SELECTED ANSWER B

1. Zoo's Petition.

The Issue here is whether Tess created a valid will and trust that left Zoo any interest in T's property.

### **2011 - Will**

A valid will must be in writing. It must be signed by the testator in the presence of two disinterested witnesses at the same time who also sign the will.

The facts state that T created a valid will, so we can assume she met all elements of the will. Therefore, a valid will was created.

### **Trust**

T left all of her property in trust for her grandchildren. In order for a trust to be valid, there must be a testator, a beneficiary, trustee, trust purpose, and trust property.

#### *Testator*

Here, T is the testator.

#### *Beneficiaries*

T's grandchildren Greg and Susie are the income beneficiaries b/c they get the income from the trust. The Zoo is also a beneficiary and they hold a future interest in the property. The Zoo will get the remainder of the trust after the last grandchild dies.

#### *Trustee*

Although there isn't a named trustee, it doesn't defeat the trust. The court will appoint a trustee if there is no trustee to manage the trust.

### *Trust Purpose*

The purpose of the trust is to provide income to the grandchildren for their lives, then the remainder goes to the zoo.

### *Trust property*

T has left all of her property into the trust.

Therefore, a valid trust was created. Under the 2011 will, Zoo had an interest in T's trust.

### **2013 - New Will**

The issue is whether the new will is valid b/c it was created by a court appointed conservator.

### Will Formalities

See rules above.

Here, Greg as the conservator for T and under the court's authorization created a new will for Tess. The will was signed by two disinterested witnesses. However, T did not sign the will. But Greg will argue that as the conservator, he was permitted to sign on her behalf. So, technically, a will was properly created. However, I will discuss below why the will should be void.

### Greg as Conservator

A court can appoint a guardian or conservator to act on behalf of a person who lacks the mental capacity to act on their behalf. They have the authority to make legal decisions, such as drafting a new will. However, a conservator still owes the testator a fiduciary duty of care and loyalty. The conservator must act in the best interest of the testator and not make any decisions that are self-serving and are directly adverse to T's interest.

Here, Greg was appointed as a conservator for T b/c of her "failing mental abilities." Although he is authorized to create a new will for T, he must uphold his fiduciary duties. Greg violated his fiduciary duties when he created T's new will without first talking to her about the will and determining whether she was okay with changing the will so that it left the entire estate to Greg and Susie. Instead, Greg disregarded her previous will and left the entire estate himself and his sister Susie, cutting the Zoo completely out of the will. The act of leaving everything to himself and his sister shows self-dealing and he has violated his duty of loyalty. Even though he was legally permitted to create a new will for Tess, he violated his fiduciary duty to T. Any attempt Greg makes to argue that he was within his right to draft the new will will fail b/c he violated his fiduciary duties. T's estate could sue Greg for violating this duties and seek a request to void the 2013 will.

### Undue Influence

Additionally, the Zoo and T's estate will argue undue influence per se b/c there was a fiduciary relationship with the person who wrote the will and there was an unnatural devise.

Here, Greg is the conservator and in a fiduciary relationship with T. The devise was also unnatural b/c the original will never intended to leave the entire estate to Susie and Greg. Therefore, the Zoo and T's estate should be successful in voiding the will under undue influence per se.

### DRR

Alternatively, the Zoo and T's estate could attempt to revive the original will under DRR.

Under DRR, a previous will can be revived if a most recent will was created under fraud or misrepresentation. Meaning that the testator created the new will because they were misinformed about something (i.e., a beneficiary had died when they were really alive). If that is the case, then the new will can be voided and the old will can be revived.

Here, T's estate and the Zoo will argue that T would have never created the new will that Greg created. Greg fraudulently misrepresented T's wishes for her will and created an unnatural devise. As discussed above, T never intended to leave her entire estate to Greg and Susie. There is nothing in the facts that suggests she had changed her mind since 2011. Therefore, the 2013 will should be voided and the 2011 will should be revived.

2014 Will Drafted by Lawyer

After T discovered that Greg created the 2013 will, T created a new will. The issue here is whether a valid will was created for lack of capacity.

#### Will Formalities

See rule above. Here, the facts state that the new will was properly executed and witnessed. So, let's assume that will formalities have been met.

#### Lack of Capacity

Generally, a person lacks capacity if they are unable to understand the nature of their estate, the nature of their relationship with family and friends, and the nature of their act of creating the will.

Here, the biggest problem is that the court appointed a conservator for T b/c of her failing mental abilities. Other than that, we don't know much about her capacity to create a will. We don't know if "failing mental abilities" equates to lack of capacity. Let's look at the elements for capacity.

#### Nature of the act

This element means that the T must understand the nature of her acts and conduct of creating the will.

Here, T appears to understand the nature of her act of creating the will because she saw the will that Greg drafted and became furious and contacted her lawyer to draft a new will. It appears that T understood the nature of her act b/c she knew that Greg's 2013 will was not what she intended and she knew that she needed to call her lawyer to draft a new will. Therefore, this element is met.

#### *Nature of the estate*

This element means that the testator must understand the extent of and identify his property.

Here, T understands the nature of her estate and property b/c she revised her will describing her assets in detail and left her entire estate to Susie. Thus, this element is likely met.

#### *Nature of relationships with family and friends*

This element means that the testator must understand their relationship with family and friends - the people they are leaving their assets to.

Here, T seems to understand the nature of her relationships b/c she was so angry at Greg for what he did that she specifically excluded him from her new will. She left all of estate in trust to Susie with the remainder to the Zoo. Thus, this element is likely met.

Therefore, since T appears to have met all the elements for capacity at the time that she created the will, the 2014 will is probably the valid enforceable will. The 2014 will revokes all prior wills automatically. If the court agrees that T had capacity at the time that she created her will, then T's 2014 will is probably valid and Zoo has an interest in T's estate.

## Cy Pres

The next issue is Zoo's ability to use the assets b/c the trust assets were left for the care of its elephants but they have no elephants. Under the Cy Pres doctrine, the court can modify a charitable trust purpose if the trust purpose has been frustrated.

Here, T's trust left anything remaining in the trust to Zoo for the care of its elephants. The facts don't indicate that Susie has died yet, so the Zoo's interest is still a future one. Because the Zoo doesn't have any present interest in the trust, the Zoo will most likely fail in petitioning the court to modify the trust purpose. Although the Zoo doesn't have any elephants at this time, they might have elephants when Susie dies. If at the time that Susie dies, the Zoo doesn't have elephants, then the Zoo might have a better chance at succeeding in modifying the trust purpose. If they are successful in modifying the trust purpose, the new purpose must also be charitable and the court will probably want them to keep the charitable purpose as close as possible to what the original trustor intended the purpose to be. Therefore, Zoo's petition is premature. The court should dismiss it at this time b/c they do not have any present interest and the purpose of the trust is not currently frustrated.

## **2. Rights of Greg, Susie, and Zoo.**

See discussion above regarding the beneficiaries' rights.

## Disposition

### Greg

Based on the 2014 will, Greg has no interest in T's assets. Of course, if the court determines that T lacked capacity to create the 2014 will, then Greg might be able to income from the trust from the 2011 will. The 2011 will will only be valid, if the 2013 will that Greg fraudulently created is void and the 2011 will is revived.

### Susie

Susie has interest in the trust income for her life under the 2014 will. As discussed above, the 2013 will is likely invalid, so Susie won't get share T's entire estate with Greg. If the court determines that the 2014 will is invalid, then Susie gets trust income for life under the 2011 will.

### Zoo

Zoo has a future interest in the remainder of the trust for the care of its elephants under the 2014 will.