

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Wills/Trusts

QUESTION

Ted, a widower, had a child, Deb. He had three brothers, Abe, Bob, and Carl.

In 1998, Abe died, survived by a child, Ann. Ted then received a letter from a woman with whom he had once had a relationship. The letter stated that Sam, a child she had borne in 1997, was Ted's son. Ted, until then unaware of Sam's existence, wrote back in 1998 stating he doubted he was Sam's father.

In 1999, Ted executed a will. With the exception of the signature of a witness at the bottom, the will was entirely in Ted's own handwriting and signed by Ted. The will provided that half of Ted's estate was to be held in trust by Trustee, Inc. for ten years with the income to be paid annually "to my brothers," with the principal at the end of ten years to go "to my child, Deb." The other half of the estate was to go to Deb outright. One month after Ted signed the will, Ted's second brother, Bob, died, survived by a child, Beth.

In 2000, Ted died. After Ted's death, DNA testing confirmed Ted was Sam's father.

What interests, if any, do Deb, Sam, Ann, Beth, and Carl have in Ted's estate and/or the trust? Discuss. Answer according to California law.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Wills/Trusts

ANSWER A

In re: Estate of Ted (T)

I will first discuss the validity of the will, and then discuss the terms of the will, which includes the trust. Then I will discuss how the estate should be distributed, according to those terms, and then how that distribution would be altered by Sam's claims.

I. Validity of Will

Under California law, a valid will must be signed by the testator, signed or attested before two witnesses at the same time, who know the items in a will, and who then sign the will. Further, the testator must have the intent that this document be his will.

Here, while the will was signed by T, it was not properly witnessed - it appears only one witness signed, and the law requires that two sign. Therefore, this will does not comply with will formalities.

However, this will is valid as a holographic will. Holographic wills are valid in California. A holographic will is one in which all of the material terms of the will - testamentary intent, property to be distributed, and intended beneficiaries - are all in the testator's handwriting (intent can be found as a commercially prepared will form, but that is not applicable here). Next, the holographic will must be signed by the testator.

Here, those requirements are met. The entire will was written by T (under the witness' signature), so the material portions are in T's handwriting (he expressed his intent, disposed of his property, and named his beneficiaries) and he signed the will.

II. Terms of the Will

Half of the estate goes to Deb (D). The other half goes to the trust.

A trust is a disposition of property which separates equitable title, held by the beneficiaries, from the legal title, held by the trustee. The trustee must manage the trust for the benefit of the beneficiaries.

A. Validity of Trust

For a trust to be valid, there must be: 1) a trustee; 2) funding of the trust; 3) ascertainable beneficiaries; and 4) no violation of public policy.

Here, a trustee has been named - Trustee, Inc. Even if Trustee, Inc. is not actually still in existence, the trust will not fail. Trusts do not fail for want of a trustee - the court will just name one.

Next, the trust has ascertainable beneficiaries. The trustee must be able to identify the recipients of the trust. Here, Deb may argue that the beneficiaries are not ascertainable because

JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS

Wills/Trusts

none are listed by name. However, here there is a class gift. T left the income of the trust for 10 years “to his brothers.” A trustee can identify his brothers.

D may argue this class gift violates the Rule against Perpetuities. Under the rule, an interest must vest if at all with 21 years of a life in being at execution. Here, D would argue that T could still have more brothers. However, at T’s death, the class closes due to the Rule of Convenience, so the interest vests.

Next, the trust is funded by the transfer from the will to the trust at death. This is called a testamentary trust and is valid.

Finally, there is no improper purpose for this trust. Therefore, the trust is valid.

III. Distribution

Here, I will discuss the distribution as if Sam’s claims are denied. I will discuss the impact of his claims on this distribution later.

A. Deb's 1/2 of Estate in the will

Deb takes this share outright.

B. Distribution of trust

As discussed above, the income of the trust is distributed to T’s brother for ten years. The issue is which brothers or their issue share in this class gift.

When T died, Carl was still alive, and Abe and Bob had already died. Carl will argue that he is the only surviving member of this class, so he takes the 1/2 interest outright. He would argue that Abe and Bob’s interests had lapsed, and so failed.

However, California has an anti-lapse statute. Under the statute, if: 1) the dead beneficiary was related to the testator, 2) the dead beneficiary was survived by issue, and 3) there is no contrary intent, then the dead beneficiary’s issue represent him and take his share. In California anti-lapse also applies to member of a class gift, unless a member of that class died before execution and the testator knew that.

Here, Bob died one month after T executed the will, so he qualifies for anti-lapse application under the statute. Further, Bob satisfies the statute - he is related to T (his brother), he is survived by issue (Beth) and there is no contrary intentions in the will, like a survivorship clause. Therefore, Beth joins Carl in the class.

However, Abe died before execution of the will, and provided T knew this, which he probably did because people usually know when their siblings die, Abe does not qualify for protection under the statute because he fails the class gift requirements. Therefore, even though Abe satisfied the statute, Ann cannot avail herself of the statute and so will not join the class.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Wills/Trusts

Therefore, Carl and Beth are entitled to the income from the trust for 10 years. Once the ten years are up, Deb gets the principal and therefore, the entire estate.

IV. Sam's Claims

Sam, if he can prove he is T's son, has several claims.

First, Sam must prove he is T's son. During life, Sam could prove paternity by admission of T, being listed on a birth certificate with T as father, or by being born in marriage between his mom and T. Here, during T's life paternity was never established. T wrote back to Sam's mom saying he doubted he was Sam's father, and T was unaware Sam existed, so they never held out a relationship.

After death, paternity can be proven, but it must be by clear and convincing existence. Here, DNA confirmed T was S's father, which is convincing and clear evidence, so Sam can pursue the following claims.

1. Pretermitted Child

By statute, a child born after execution of a will can take an intestate share if he was not taken care of in the will, outside of the will, there is no contrary interest, and the parent did not leave most of the estate to the surviving spouse.

Here, S was born in 1997. T learned of this in 1998. T executed his will in 1999. Therefore, because T executed his will after S was born, S cannot avail himself of this statute.

2. Unknown Child

By statute; a child born before the will was executed, who was not provided for in the will or outside the will in other instruments, is entitled to an intestate share if the testator did not know of the child's existence, and did not provide for the child because of that belief, either by mistakenly believing the child was dead or never born.

Deb will argue that T knew of Sam's existence when he executed the will. T received a letter in 1998 telling him he was Sam's dad. Therefore, Sam cannot qualify under the statute.

Sam will argue that, although T knew Sam existed, he did not know Sam was his child. This proof did not come out until after T died, with the DNA testing. Sam will argue that had T known S was his child, T would not have omitted him.

However, that belief must be the but/for cause of the omission. Here, it appears that T was not interested in Sam - he made no attempt to determine paternity, or to establish a relationship with Sam, so Sam cannot qualify under this statute.

If he did, he would get an apportioned share of the entire estate.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Wills/Trusts

ANSWER B

Validity of Will: CA recognizes the validity of wills that are valid under CA law or the law of other states where a person executed the will. I will assume Ted died and executed his will in CA.

CA recognizes attested, statutory and holographic wills. A holographic will must be signed by the testator and the material provisions in the handwriting of the testator. Here, Ted signed the will and the entire will, which would include material provisions, was in his handwriting. Therefore, the will is valid.

Validity of Trust: A will may create a trust. Ted's Will created a trust. A trust must have: (1) settlor with capacity. Ted is a settlor and has capacity. (2) Present intent to create: Ted intended [that] his will create the trust. (3) Trust property existing and ascertained. Ted's estate meets this requirement. (4) Beneficiaries existing within the rule of perpetuities. All Ted's provisions require that beneficiaries take within 10 years. Therefore, all beneficiaries will be existing within the Rule Against Perpetuities, and (5) Valid Purpose: A trust for relatives is a valid purpose. Further, Ted already has a trustee. The trust is valid.

Ann, Beth and Carl:

Carl: Carl definitely takes a share of the trust income because he is a surviving member of a named class: "Ted's Brothers." The share he takes, however, depends on the claims of everyone else.

Beth: Any rights Beth have come from her father, Bob. Bob predeceased Ted. Therefore, Bob and his issue do not take under the instrument. However, Beth may take under CA Anti-lapse, which states: if a beneficiary predeceases the Testator (Note: Anti-lapse applies to all testamentary instruments including trusts), that person's issue takes his share unless a contrary intent. Class gifts are included in Anti-lapse. Therefore, Beth will take her father Bob's share. (See Ann for more Anti-lapse)

Ann: Same analysis except as Abe's daughter as Beth until Anti-lapse. Another exception to anti-lapse is that if a class gift is made and one member of the class is dead when made, anti-lapse does not apply to that person if testator knew he was dead.

Here, Ted likely knew his brother Abe was dead (Abe died in 1998) when he made his will in 1999. Plus, Abe is a member of a class gift. Therefore, Ann will not take unless Ted did not know of Abe's death; then she will take his share of anti-lapse.

Deb: Deb will take the shares described in the instrument because the trust and will are valid. However, her share may be altered by Sam's claims.

**JULY 2001 CALIFORNIA BAR EXAMINATION
ESSAY QUESTIONS AND SELECTED ANSWERS**

Wills/Trusts

Sam: Sam will not take under the instruments. Sam may take under CA's Omitted Child Provisions. Since Ted died in 2000, the omitted child provisions apply to all testamentary documents.

An omitted child is a child: born after execution of the instrument(s), thought dead, or not known by testator to be born.

Here, Ted knew of Sam, but did not know Sam was his child. However, after execution of the instrument(s) and in fact after Ted's death, DNA proved Sam was the child of Ted. Therefore, Sam may qualify as constructively being born after execution or that he was not known to be born. One of these arguments should work because as to Ted Sam was not known to be born.

Therefore, the omitted child provision should apply unless Ted provided for Sam outside the instrument, intended to exclude or gave most property to the surviving parent.

Deb will argue that Ted intended to exclude Sam because Ted knew of Sam and doubted that he was Sam's father. Deb's argument likely fails because Ted never knew Sam was his child and neither of the other exceptions even remotely qualifies.

Therefore, Sam will very likely take his omitted child's share, which is his intestate share.

Sam's Intestate Share: Since Ted had no surviving spouse, his issue are his intestate successors. Ted had two issue, Deb and Sam. The intestate share is 1/2 of Ted's estate each. However, since Deb takes under the will, she does not take under intestacy.

Sam's Share: 1/2 the estate prior to it going into the trust or to Deb if he is an omitted child. If not, he gets nothing.

Summary:

1. Beth and Carl likely split the trust income for 10 years unless Ted did not know of Abe's death. In that case, Ann, Beth and Carl split the income.
2. Deb takes the principal of the trust after 10 years and 1/2 the estate outright subject to Sam's interests.
3. Sam likely takes 1/2 the estate before any other dispositions are made. Or he takes nothing.