

EQUITY AND THE LAW OF SUCCESSION SUMMARY



LAWSKOOL.CO.NZ

LAWSKOOL NEW ZEALAND

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CASES	7
1. INTRODUCTION	13
<i>What is equity?</i>	13
<i>Development</i>	13
<i>Main fields of application</i>	15
<i>Equitable Remedies</i>	15
<i>Injunctions</i>	15
<i>Rectification</i>	17
<i>Equitable Lien</i>	17
<i>Account of Profits</i>	17
<i>Equitable Compensation and Equitable Damages</i>	18
<i>Damages for Equitable Wrongs Generally</i>	18
<i>Exemplary Damages</i>	18
<i>Damages for Emotional Stress</i>	19
<i>Maxims of Equity</i>	19
<i>The Fusion of Law and Equity</i>	20
2. EQUITY AND CONTRACTS	22
<i>The Requirement for Consideration</i>	22
<i>The Nature of Specific Performance</i>	23
3. EQUITABLE ESTATES IN LAND	24
<i>What is an Equitable Estate</i>	24
<i>Equitable Estoppels</i>	25
<i>Oral Contracts and the Doctrine of part performance</i>	27
<i>Equitable Estates and Indefeasibility of Title</i>	27

4. ORIGINS OF THE TRUST	30
<i>Uses</i>	30
<i>From Uses to Trusts</i>	30
5. FORMAL REQUIREMENTS FOR A TRUST	32
<i>Definitions</i>	32
<i>Trusts over Estates in Land</i>	33
<i>The Three Certainties</i>	33
<i>Certainty of Intention</i>	33
<i>Certainty of Subject-Matter</i>	35
<i>Certainty of Object</i>	37
<i>Trusts and Mere Powers</i>	39
<i>Certainty of Administration</i>	40
<i>Supervisory Power of the Court</i>	40
<i>Successive Trustees</i>	41
<i>Early Termination of a Trust</i>	43
6. THE BENEFICIARY PRINCIPLE	44
<i>Exceptions to the Beneficiary Principle</i>	44
<i>Miscellaneous Exceptions</i>	45
7. CHARITABLE TRUSTS	47
<i>What is a Charitable Purpose?</i>	47
<i>Relief of Poverty</i>	50
<i>Advancement of Education</i>	51
<i>Advancement of Religion</i>	52
<i>Other Purposes Beneficial to the Community</i>	52
<i>Administration Schemes</i>	54
8. RESULTING TRUSTS	57

<i>Resulting Trusts</i>	57
<i>Quistclose Trusts</i>	59
9. CONSTRUCTIVE TRUSTS	61
<i>Property Acquired by Dishonesty</i>	62
<i>Knowing Abetting the Breach of an Existing Trust</i>	63
<i>Property acquired subject to an Existing Trust</i>	63
<i>Institutional and Remedial Constructive Trusts</i>	65
10. DOMESTIC PROPERTY	67
<i>The Bundle o Rights Doctrine</i>	69
11. BREACHES OF TRUST	71
<i>Duties of Trustees</i>	74
<i>Tracing</i>	76
12. DEFENCE TRUSTS	80
<i>Imperfect Gifts</i>	80
<i>After Ego and Sham Trusts</i>	81
<i>The Rule against Perpetuities</i>	84
13. WILLS	85
<i>What is a Will?</i>	85
<i>Testators, Beneficiaries, Estates, Executors, Trustees and Administrators</i>	86
<i>Who can make a Will?</i>	87
<i>Formal Requirements</i>	88
<i>Witnesses</i>	91
<i>Other Requirements</i>	92
<i>Mutual Wills</i>	93
<i>Wills and Marriage</i>	93
14. THE CONSTRUCTION OF WILLS	95
<i>General Principles</i>	95

<i>Specific Rules of Construction</i>	95
<i>Contradictions</i>	97
<i>Admission of Extrinsic Evidence</i>	98
<i>Time of Construction</i>	99
<i>Doctrine of Incorporation by Reference</i>	101
15. ADMINISTRATION OF DECEASED ESTATES	102
<i>Probate and Letters of Administration</i>	102
<i>Effect of Grant of Administration</i>	103
<i>Failure of Gifts</i>	104
<i>Distribution of Intestate Estates</i>	106
16. FAMILY PROTECTION ACT 1955	109
<i>Grounds for Making a Claim</i>	110
<i>Proper Maintenance and Support</i>	111
17. LAW REFORM (TESTAMENTARY PROMISES) ACT 1949	113
<i>Conflicting Claims</i>	115
18. TE TURE WHENUA MAORI ACT 1993/MAORI LAND ACT 1993	116
<i>Trusts</i>	116
<i>Administration of Deceased Estates in Maori Freehold Land</i>	118
<i>Restrictions on Operation of Statutes</i>	119
<i>Restrictions on Disposition by Will</i>	119
<i>Succession on Intestacy</i>	120

TABLE OF CASES

<i>Adams v Kensington Vestry</i> (1884) 27 Ch D 394	32
<i>Andrews v Partington</i> (1791) 3 Bro CC 401	97
<i>Aquaculture Corp v NZ Green Mussel Ltd</i> [1990] 3 NZLR 299	18
<i>Armitage v Nurse</i> [1998] Ch 241	38
<i>Assets Co Ltd v Mere Roihi</i> [1905] AC 275	27
Attorney-General for Hong Kong v Reid [1992] 2 NZLR 385	60
<i>Auckland Medical Aid Trust v CIR</i> [1979] 1 NZLR 382	49
<i>Bank of New Zealand v New Zealand Guardian Trust Company Ltd</i> [1999] 1 NZLR 664	71
<i>Banks v Goodfellow</i> (1870) LR 5 QB 549	89
<i>Barclays Bank Ltd v Quistclose Investments Ltd</i> [1963] 3 All ER 651	57
<i>Boardman v Phipps</i> [1967] 2 AC 46	64, 72
<i>Boyce v Boyce</i> (1849) 16 Sim 476	34
<i>Boyce v Cook</i> (1880) 14 Ch Div 53	95
<i>Cadell v Palmer</i> (1833) 6 ER 956 (HL)	81
<i>Carreras Rothmans Ltd v Freeman Mathews Treasure Ltd</i> [1985] 1 All ER 155	58
<i>Carrigan v Redwood</i> (1910) 30 NZLR 244	43
<i>Casson v Dade</i> (1781) 28 ER 1010	87
<i>Centrepoint Community Growth Trust v CIR</i> [1985] 1 NZLR 673	50
<i>CIR v Medical Council of New Zealand</i> [1997] 2 NZLR 297	51
<i>Cunnack v Edwards</i> [1896] 2 Ch 679	56
<i>Dilicar v West</i> [1921] NZLR 617	27

<i>Elders Pastoral Ltd v BNZ</i> [1989] 2 NZLR 180	20, 59, 61
<i>Foreman v Kingstone</i> [2004] 1 NZLR 841	76
<i>Fortex Group (in receivership and liquidation) v MacIntosh</i> [1998] 3 NZLR 171	63
<i>Fox v Harvey</i> [1968] NZLR 394	78
<i>Frith v Cartland</i> (1865) 2 H & M 417	74
<i>General Communications Ltd v DFC New Zealand Ltd</i> [1990] 3 NZLR 406	58
<i>Gillies v Keogh</i> [1989] 2 NZLR 327	65, 66
<i>Hall v Hall</i> (1868) LR 1 P&D 481	89
<i>Harrison v Harrison</i> [2009] NZFLR 687	68
<i>Hawkins v Public Trustee</i> [1960] NZLR 305	114
<i>Hayward v Giordani</i> [1983] NZLR 140	91
<i>Hunter v Hunter</i> [1938] NZLR 520	73
<i>In bonis Truro</i> (1866) LR 1 P&D 201	83, 97
<i>Incorporated Council of Law Reporting v Attorney-General</i> [1972] Ch 73	49
<i>IRC v Pemsel</i> [1891] AC 531	46
<i>Jones v Lock</i> (1865) 1 Ch App 25	32
<i>Kain v Hutton</i> [2008] 3 NZLR 589	80
<i>Keelan v Peach</i> [2003] 1 NZLR 589	108
<i>Lankow v Rose</i> [1995] 1 NZLR 277	66, 78
<i>Latimer v CIR</i> [2004] 3 NZLR 157	52
<i>Letterstedt v Broers</i> [1881-5] All ER Rep 882	73
<i>Lewis v Cotton</i> [2001] 2 NZLR 21	89
<i>Little v Angus</i> [1981] 1 NZLR 126	109
<i>Matarangi Beach Estates Ltd v Dawson & Dawson</i> (2008) 6 NZ ConvC 194	79

<i>McLaren v McLaren</i> [1919] GLR 287	87
<i>McPhail v Doulton</i> [1971] AC 424	35, 36, 38
<i>Milroy v Lord</i> (1862) 4 De G F & J 264	77, 78
<i>Morice v Bishop of Durham</i> (1804) 9 Ves Jr 399	42, 45
<i>National Anti-Vivisection Society v IRC</i> [1948] AC 31	48
<i>Neagle v Rimmington</i> [2002] 3 NZLR 826	71
<i>Neste Oy v Lloyds Bank PLC</i> [1983] 2 Lloyd's Rep 658	60
<i>New Zealand Dairy Board v New Zealand Co-operative Dairy Co Ltd</i> [1999] 2 NZLR 355	38
<i>New Zealand Society of Accountants v CIR</i> [1986] 1 NZLR 147	51
<i>Official Assignee v Wilson</i> [2008] 3 NZLR 841	79
<i>Parker v Felgate</i> (1883) 8 PD 171	89
<i>Paul v Constance</i> [1977] 1 WLR 527	33
<i>Perrin v Morgan</i> [1943] AC 399	91
<i>Prime v Hardie</i> [2003] NZFLR 481	78, 80
<i>R v District Auditor, ex parte West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council</i> [1986] RVP 24	39
<i>Ramsden v Dyson</i> (1865) LR 1 HL 129	25
<i>Re Amelia Bullock-Webster</i> [1936] NZLR 814	53
<i>Re Baden's Trust Deed (No 2)</i> [1973] Ch 9	36
<i>Re Beckbessinger</i> [1993] 2 NZLR 362	36
<i>Re Bravda</i> [1968] 2 All ER 217	88
<i>Re Burke</i> [1991] 2 NZLR 312	98
<i>Re Centrepont Community Trust</i> [2000] 2 NZLR 325	54

<i>Re Cook</i> [1948] Ch 212	92
<i>Re Cook's Estate</i> [1960] 1 All ER 689	86
<i>Re Daniels</i> (1918) 87 LJ Ch 661	96
<i>Re Denley's Trust Deed</i> [1969] 1 Ch 373	43
<i>Re Diplock</i> [1948] 2 All ER 138	74
<i>Re Dupree's Will Trust</i> [1944] 2 All ER 443	49
<i>Re Endacott</i> [1959] 3 All ER 562	42
<i>Re Everett</i> (1944) 14 Ch 176	92
<i>Re Gibson</i> (1866) LJ Ch 661	96
<i>Re Gillingham Bus Disaster Fund</i> [1958] Ch 300	55
<i>Re Golay's Will Trusts</i> [1965] 1 WLR 969	35
<i>Re Gook</i> [1957] 1 WLR 383	94
<i>Re Gulbenkian's Settlement Trusts</i> [1970] AC 508	37
<i>Re Hayward</i> [1989] NZLR 759	114
<i>Re Helliwell</i> [1916] 2 Ch. 580	92
<i>Re Horrocks</i> [1939] P 198	91
<i>Re Karsten</i> [1950] NZLR 1022	83
<i>Re Kayford</i> [1975] 1 WLR 279	33
<i>Re Leonard</i> [1985] 2 NZLR 88	110
<i>Re McAnnalley</i> [1935] NZLR 106	95
<i>Re McIntosh</i> [1976] 1 NZLR 308	46
<i>Re Mitchell</i> [1963] NZLR 934	48
<i>Re Mulligan (deceased)</i> [1998] 1 NZLR 481	70
<i>Re Nottage</i> [1895] 2 Ch 649	50

<i>Re Oatway</i> [1903] 2 Ch 356	74
<i>Re Palmerston North Halls Trust Board</i> [1976] 2 NZLR 161	53
<i>Re Peacock</i> [1958] NZLR 374	93
<i>Re Rose, Rose v Inland Revenue Commissioners</i> [1952] 1 All ER 1217	77
<i>Re Shaw, Public Trustee v Day</i> [1957] 1 WLR 729	49
<i>Re Shaw's Will Trusts, National Provincial Bank Ltd v National City Bank Ltd</i> [1952] 1 Ch 163	49
<i>Re Slater</i> [1907] 1 Ch 665	102
<i>Re Smith</i> [1948] Ch 49	93
<i>Re Smith, Public Trustee v Smith</i> [1932] 1 Ch 153	51
<i>Re Taylor</i> [1927] NZLR 236	33
<i>Re Thurlow</i> [1972] Ch 379	91
<i>Re Whyte</i> [1969] NZLR 519	88
<i>Re Whorword</i> (1878) 34 Ch D 446	96
<i>Re Young</i> [1969] NZLR 454	85, 86
<i>Re Twigger</i> [1989] 3 NZLR 329	54
<i>Re Villar, Public Trustee v Villar</i> [1929] 1 Ch 24	81
<i>Re Welch</i> [1990] 3 NZLR 1	113
<i>Rochefoucauld v Bousted</i> [1897] 1 Ch 196	19
<i>Royal Brunei Airlines v Tan</i> [1995] 3 All ER 97	61, 63
<i>Saunders v Vautier</i> (1841) 49 ER 282	30, 41
<i>Shore v Wilson</i> (1842) 9 Cl & Fin 345	93
<i>Snook v London & West Riding Investments Ltd</i> [1967] 1 All ER 518	79
<i>Sprange v Barnard</i> (1789) 2 Bro CC 58	34

<i>Stern v McArthur</i> (1988) 165 CLR 489	23
<i>Stevens v King</i> [1904] 2 Ch 30	102
<i>Sutton v O’Kane</i> [1973] 2 NZLR 304	27
<i>Thexton v Thexton</i> [2001] 1 NZLR 237	33
<i>Thorn v Dickens</i> [1906] WN 54	95
<i>Twinsectra Ltd v Yardley</i> [2002] 2 All ER 377	58
<i>Waimihia Sawmilling Co Ltd v Waione Timber Co Ltd</i> [1926] AC 101	27
<i>Walker v Walker</i> [2007] NZFLR 772	67, 68
<i>West Sussex Constabulary’s Widows, Children and Benevolent (1930) Fund Trusts</i> [1971] 1 Ch 1	56
<i>Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale v Islington London Borough Council</i> [1996] 2 All ER 961	76
<i>Westpac Banking Corporation Ltd v Savin</i> [1985] 2 NZLR 41	62
<i>White v White</i> (1909) 28 NZLR 129	34
<i>Williams v Aucutt</i> [2000] 2 NZLR 479	110
<i>Williams v CIR</i> [1964] NZLR 395	30

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS EQUITY?

In ordinary language, the word carries ideas of fairness, equality and even-handedness. As a technical term of the law, it means the body of law developed by the English Court of Chancery before 1873. After the Judicature Acts of 1873 and 1875 the Court of Chancery was replaced by the Chancery Division of the new High Court and the same procedures were applied to actions at both equity and the common law. New Zealand has never had a separate court of equity, and actions for equitable relief are heard by the High Court following the same procedures as for common law actions.

DEVELOPMENT

Equity as a branch of the law developed from the medieval practice of petitioning the king for relief in cases where the common law provided no effective remedy or where the strict application of the law led to injustice. Kings increasingly delegated this jurisdiction to the Lord Chancellor (the head of the administration) whose office was the Chancery.

As clerics, the late medieval chancellors applied the moral principles that –

- In general, people would not be allowed to exercise their legal powers and rights against the principles of good conscience, and

- People claiming relief under that principle must themselves come to equity “with clean hands”.

The fundamental relationship that gives rise to remedies in equity is that of confidence and dependence. The relationship is classified as a **fiduciary** relationship, and the person on whom the burden of confidence and dependence rests is a fiduciary.

From 1474 onwards petitions for relief were addressed directly to the Lord Chancellor. From the 16th Century the chancellors were also lawyers, and a system of precedents and particular rules of law analogous to those of the common law were developed, as well as a Court of Chancery with its own judges, separate from the Chancellor's administrative functions.

One thing that remained was the principle, arising out of the original purpose of the jurisdiction, that equitable remedies could counteract the operation of common law rules in particular cases. The principal instrument by which this power was exercised was the injunction, an order preventing a party from exercising some right. The power was formalized in the Earl of Oxford's case (1615), in which the Lord Chancellor issued an injunction against enforcement of an order by the great common law judge, Sir Edward Coke CJ. The Attorney-General, Sir Francis Bacon, with the authority of King James I, ruled that that in the event of any conflict between the common law and equity, equity would prevail.

MAIN FIELDS OF APPLICATION

The Court of Chancery was concerned with:

- fraud (at common law this meant actual deceit. In equity it included innocent misrepresentation);
- accident (equity would not allow the enforcement of legal rights if it was gained by luck – it was against windfalls);
- things of confidence (mainly the laws governing trusts and wills where the settler or testator relies on the executor or trustee to carry out his or her wishes).

EQUITABLE REMEDIES

Remedies that were developed in the Court of Chancery were:

- injunctions (orders to refrain from doing something).
- orders for specific performance (that terms of a contract are to be complied with) and rectification, and
- orders for an account of profits.

INJUNCTIONS:

Injunctions are powerful weapons because failure to obey them is a contempt of court which is punishable by the courts as if it were a criminal offence.

They can be classified into

- **prohibitory injunctions** which require a person to refrain from doing something; and
- **mandatory injunctions** which require a person to do something – for example, remove trees on a boundary, or remove protesters from property.

Another classification is into

- **interim or interlocutory injunctions** which are usually issued as part of proceedings to maintain a status quo or safeguard property pending a full hearing.
- **permanent/ final/ perpetual injunctions** which are issued at the end of proceedings.

Two important types of interim injunction are

- **Mareva injunctions** issued where there is a danger that the defendant may dispose of his or her assets so as to frustrate any attempt to enforce a judgment against him or her. The court can grant an interlocutory judgment preventing the disposal (usually out of the jurisdiction) of assets of the defendant. The plaintiff has to show four things:
 1. a good arguable case against the defendant;
 2. that the defendant has assets within the jurisdiction;
 3. a real danger the assets may be removed; and
 4. that the overall justice of case requires the making of an order.
- **Anton Piller orders** (mandatory injunctions) usually issued *ex parte* (an urgent hearing without the defendant present) entitling a defendant to demand entry to a business/ residential premises to search and remove documents or items that may be used by a plaintiff in proceedings against him or her. They are commonly used in actions for fraud and actions for breaches of patents and copyright where the defendant's accounts, plans, technical data and items of manufacture can provide the plaintiff with a vital means of proving his or her case. Where questions of criminal liability arise (as in some fraud and copyright actions), the orders will usually contain exemptions for incriminatory material.

RECTIFICATION

Where there is an obvious mistake, the court can order for it to be corrected. The aim is to bring a faulty document into accord with a prior agreement. It is the document being rectified, not the agreement or matter. It usually applies to contract but can apply to leases, easements, insurance policies, and even wills.

EQUITABLE LIEN

Not really a remedy. At common law a lien describes a right to hold property belonging to another person as security for the performance of an obligation or payment of debt.

The holder of a lien (creditor) has the right to hold property belonging to debtor. In equity this is defined as right against property implied by equity to secure discharge of actual/ potential indebtedness. Although called a lien, it is a charge against property and is often based on a contract.



To order the complete version of the lawskool Equity and the Law of Succession summary please visit www.lawskool.co.nz