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SUMMARY OF WORK OF COMMISSION

Recommendations to the 1992 Legislative Session
Most of the recommendations the Commission plans to submit to the 1992 legislative session concern probate law and procedure:
– Litigation Involving Decedents
– Recognition of Agent’s Authority Under Statutory Form Power of Attorney
– Recognition of Trustees’ Powers
– Relocation of Powers of Appointment Statute
– Notice of Trustees’ Fees
– Nonprobate Transfers of Community Property
– Special Needs Trust
– Preliminary Distribution Without Court Supervision
– Transfer of Conservatorship Property to Trust
– Nonprobate Transfer to Trustee Named in Will
– Compensation in Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings
The Commission also plans to recommend legislation to make any needed technical or corrective revisions in the new Probate Code.

The Commission plans to recommend legislation concerning several creditors’ remedies matters.

Recommendations Enacted in the 1991 Legislative Session
In 1991, all five bills introduced to effectuate the Commission’s recommendations were enacted. These bills amended 61 sections, added 79 sections, and repealed 31 sections of California statutes. Commission-recommended legislation enacted in 1991 related to:
– Debts That Are Contingent, Disputed, or Not Due
– Remedies of Creditor Where Personal Representative Fails to Give Notice
– Repeal of Civil Code Section 704 (Passage of Ownership of US Bonds on Death)
– Disposition of Small Estate Without Probate
– Right of Surviving Spouse to Dispose of Community Property
– Elimination of Seven-Year Limit for Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care
– Access to Decedent’s Safe Deposit Box
– Gifts in View of Impending Death
– TOD Registration of Vehicles and Certain Other State-Registered Property
– Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities
– Application of Marketable Title Statute to Executory Interests
– Remedies for Breach of Assignment or Sublease Covenant
– Use Restrictions

**Commission Plans for 1992**

During 1992, the Commission will work primarily on two major projects—administrative law and drafting the Family Code. The Commission will also consider some probate law matters and will review experience under the new Probate Code to determine whether any corrective legislation is necessary. The Commission may also consider other matters if time permits.
To: The Honorable Pete Wilson  
   Governor of California, and  
   The Legislature of California

   November 1, 1991

In conformity with Government Code Section 8293, the California Law Revision Commission herewith submits this report of its activities during 1991.

All five bills introduced in 1991 to effectuate the Commission’s recommendations were enacted. A concurrent resolution recommended by the Commission was adopted.

The Commission is grateful to the members of the Legislature who carried Commission-recommended bills:

– Senator Beverly (bill relating to commercial real property leases).
– Senator Kopp (general probate bill)
– Senator Mello (urgency probate bill)
– Assembly Member Polanco (bill repealing the seven-year limit on durable powers of attorney for health care)
– Assembly Member Sher (bill relating to the Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities)
– Senator Lockyer (concurrent resolution continuing the Commission’s authority to study previously authorized topics)
The Commission held five two-day meetings and a one-day meeting during 1991. Meetings were held in Los Angeles, Sacramento, and San Jose.

As of the date this report goes to print, the Commission has one vacancy, and the terms of four Commissioners have expired. The Commission respectfully brings to the Governor’s attention the need to make the appointments necessary to keep the Commission up to full strength.

Respectfully submitted,

Edwin K. Marzec  
*Chairperson*
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Introduction

The California Law Revision Commission was created in 1953 as the permanent successor to the Code Commission and given responsibility for the continuing substantive review of California statutory and decisional law. The Commission studies California law to discover defects and anachronisms and recommends legislation to make needed reforms.

The Commission assists the Legislature in keeping the law up to date by:

– Intensively studying complex and sometimes controversial subjects
– Identifying major policy questions for legislative attention
– Gathering the views of interested persons and organizations
– Drafting recommended legislation for legislative consideration

The efforts of the Commission permit the Legislature to determine significant policy questions rather than to concern itself with the technical problems in preparing background studies, working out intricate legal problems, and drafting implementing legislation. The Commission thus enables the Legislature to accomplish needed reforms that otherwise might not be made because of the heavy demands on legislative time. In some cases, the Commission’s report demonstrates that no new legislation on a particular topic is needed, thus relieving the Legislature of the need to study the topic.

The Commission consists of:

– A Member of the Senate appointed by the Committee on Rules
– A Member of the Assembly appointed by the Speaker
– Seven members appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate
– The Legislative Counsel, who is an ex officio member

The Commission may study only topics that the Legislature by concurrent resolution authorizes it to study. The Commission now has a calendar of 26 topics.

---

3. See list of topics under “Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study” set out in Appendix 1 infra.
Commission recommendations have resulted in the enactment of legislation affecting 15,288 sections of the California statutes: 7,028 sections have been added, 2,571 sections amended, and 5,689 sections repealed. The Commission has submitted more than 250 recommendations to the Legislature. Approximately 95% of these recommendations have been enacted in whole or in substantial part.4

The Commission’s recommendations are published in softcover and later are collected in hardcover volumes. A list of past publications and information on obtaining copies is at the end of this Report.

1992 Legislative Program

In 1992 the Commission plans to submit recommendations to the Legislature concerning the following subjects:

Probate Law

The Commission plans to submit the following recommendations concerning probate law and procedure:

– Litigation Involving Decedents5
– Recognition of Agent’s Authority Under Statutory Form Power of Attorney6
– Recognition of Trustees’ Powers7
– Relocation of Powers of Appointment Statute8
– Notice of Trustees’ Fees9
– Nonprobate Transfers of Community Property10
– Special Needs Trust11
– Preliminary Distribution Without Court Supervision12

4. See list of recommendations and legislative action in Appendix 2 infra.
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– Transfer of Conservatorship Property to Trust\textsuperscript{13}
– Nonprobate Transfer to Trustee Named in Will\textsuperscript{14}
– Compensation in Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings\textsuperscript{15}

The Commission also plans to recommend additional technical and minor substantive revisions in the new Probate Code that come to the Commission’s attention in time to be included in 1992 legislation.

**Creditors’ Remedies**

The Commission plans to submit a recommendation concerning several creditors’ remedies matters, including wage garnishment and interrogatories to judgment debtors\textsuperscript{16}.

**Major Studies in Progress**

During 1992, the Commission plans to work on three major topics: administrative law, the Family Code, and probate law. The Commission will consider other matters to the extent time permits.

**Administrative Law**

The Commission is giving priority to the study of administrative law. The Commission has divided the study into four phases: (1) administrative adjudication, (2) judicial review, (3) administrative rulemaking, and (4) nonjudicial oversight.

The Commission retained a consultant, Professor Michael Asimow of UCLA Law School, to prepare a background study of administrative adjudication. Professor Asimow has delivered the study in four installments: “Structural Issues,” “Appeals Within the Agency: The Relationship Between Agency Heads and ALJs,” “Impartial Adjudicators: Bias, Ex Parte Contacts and Separation of Functions,” and “The Adjudication Process.”

The Commission’s objective is to prepare a new Administrative Procedure Act to govern constitutionally and statutorily required administrative hearings of all state agencies, with the exception of the

\textsuperscript{13} See *Transfer of Conservatorship Property to Trust*, to be published in 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports (1991).

\textsuperscript{14} See *Nonprobate Transfer to Trustee Named in Will*, to be published in 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports (1991).


Legislature, the courts and judicial branch, the Governor and Governor’s office, and the University of California.

The Commission has devoted substantial resources to studying the concept of expansion of the Office of Administrative Hearings to provide administrative law judge services for all state agencies, but has initially concluded this should only be done on a case-by-case basis.

During 1992 the Commission will continue to give consideration to these and other administrative adjudication issues on a priority basis, with the intent to prepare a tentative recommendation on the matter.

**Family Code**

In 1990, the Commission began work on the new Family Code.\(^{17}\) The Commission does not plan to propose any major changes in existing law in the new code. Instead, the new code will reorganize and collect into one code the various scattered provisions of existing family law. Lengthy sections found in existing law will be divided into short, manageable sections. In some cases, provisions duplicated in several existing statutes will be consolidated into one general statute. Statutory language will be improved and simplified.

In August 1991, the Commission’s staff prepared a “Revised Staff Working Draft” of the new Family Code.\(^{18}\) This draft included substantially all of the new code, except the portion relating to minors. The draft did not include any conforming amendments or repeals of existing code provisions. The staff draft was made

\(^{17}\) The 1989 Legislature directed the Commission to review the statutes relating to the adjudication of child and family civil proceedings and to make recommendations to the Legislature regarding the establishment of a Family Relations Code. 1989 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 70. The Legislature directed that this topic be given equal priority with the administrative law study.

The Commission distributed a questionnaire to approximately 4,000 individuals in 1990. The questionnaire was designed to obtain the views of interested persons whether there should be a new Family Code or separate act in which the family law statutory provisions would be compiled and, if so, what should be contained in the new code or act. The great majority of those who responded to the questionnaire favored a new code or act. See *Annual Report for 1990*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2201, 2212 (1990). The Commission decided to commence the preparation of a Family Code.

In August 1991, the Commission appointed John H. DeMoully, the Commission’s former Executive Secretary and primary draftsman for the Family Code project, as a special consultant on the project.

\(^{18}\) The Revised Draft replaced an earlier draft of a portion of the new Family Code that was made available in April 1991.
available so that interested persons would be advised of how work on
the new code was progressing and could submit comments and
suggestions.

The Commission plans to have a draft of the new Family Code
available for introduction as a preprint bill early in 1992. Interested
persons and organizations will be requested to review the preprint bill
and to provide their comments and suggestions to the Commission.
The Commission will prepare a Comment to each section of the
preprint bill. The Comments will show the source of each section and
note any changes the new sections would make in existing law. These
Comments will assist interested persons and organizations in their
review of the preprint bill.

During 1992, the Commission will review the comments it receives
on the preprint bill and will make any necessary revisions and
corrections in its draft of the new code.

The Commission tentatively plans to submit a recommendation
proposing a new Family Code to the Legislature and the Governor in
December 1992 and has set as its goal the enactment of the new code
in 1993.

Probate Law

During the last few years, the Commission has been devoting its
time and resources almost exclusively to the study of probate law and
procedure. A new Probate Code was enacted in 1990 upon
recommendation of the Commission and became operative on July
1, 1991.

Despite the enactment of the new Probate Code, the Commission
will continue to devote a substantial amount of its time and resources
to work in this field:

(1) The Commission will monitor the experience under the new
code and make recommendations needed to correct any technical or
substantive defects that come to its attention. Interested persons
should draw the Commission’s attention to any defect believed to
exist in the new code so that the Commission can study the matter and
present any necessary corrections for legislative consideration.

(2) The Commission will prepare recommendations on major
problem areas in the law, including development of a comprehensive

Cal. Stat. ch. 79, § 37). See also Recommendation Proposing New Probate Code, 20
Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1001 (1990); Revised and Supplemental Comments
powers of attorney statute, procedures for creditors to reach nonprobate assets, and treatment of community property held in joint tenancy form.

**Calendar of Topics for Study**

The Commission’s calendar of topics is set out in Appendix 1 to this Report. Each of these topics has been authorized for Commission study by the Legislature. Because of the number and scope of the topics already on its calendar, the Commission does not at this time recommend any additional topics for Commission study.

**Function and Procedure of Commission**

The principal duties of the Commission are to:

1. Examine the common law and statutes for the purpose of discovering defects and anachronisms.
2. Receive and consider suggestions and proposed changes in the law from the American Law Institute, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, bar associations, and other learned bodies, and from judges, public officials, lawyers, and the public generally.
3. Recommend such changes in the law as it deems necessary to bring California law into harmony with modern conditions.

The Commission is required to file a report at each regular session of the Legislature containing a calendar of topics selected by it for study, listing both studies in progress and topics intended for future consideration. As a rule, the Commission may study only topics that the Legislature, by concurrent resolution, authorizes it to study. However, the Commission may study and recommend revisions to

---

20. Section 8293 of the Government Code provides that the Commission shall study, in addition to those topics which it recommends and which are approved by the Legislature, any topics which the Legislature by concurrent resolution refers to it for study.
22. The Legislative Counsel, an ex officio member of the Law Revision Commission, serves as a Commissioner of the Commission on Uniform State Laws. See Gov’t Code § 8261. The Commission’s Executive Secretary serves as an Associate Member of the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws.
23. See Gov’t Code § 8288. The Commission is also directed to recommend the express repeal of all statutes repealed by implication or held unconstitutional by the California Supreme Court or the United States Supreme Court. Gov’t Code § 8290.
24. See Gov’t Code § 8293.
correct technical or minor substantive defects in state statutes without a prior concurrent resolution. 25

The Commission’s work on a recommendation is commenced after a background study has been prepared. The background study may be prepared by a member of the Commission’s staff or by a specialist in the field of law involved who is retained as a consultant. Using expert consultants provides the Commission with invaluable assistance and is economical because the attorneys and law professors who serve as consultants have already acquired the considerable background necessary to understand the specific problems under consideration. Expert consultants are also retained to advise the Commission at meetings.

After making its preliminary decisions on a subject, the Commission ordinarily distributes a tentative recommendation to the State Bar, other bar associations, and to numerous other interested persons. Comments on the tentative recommendation are considered by the Commission in determining what recommendation, if any, the Commission will make to the Legislature. When the Commission has reached a conclusion on the matter, its recommendation to the Legislature (including a draft of any legislation necessary to effectuate its recommendation) is published. 26 The background study is sometimes published with the recommendation published by the Commission or in a law review. 27

25. See Gov’t Code § 8298. In addition, Code of Civil Procedure Section 703.120 requires the Commission to review statutes providing for exemptions from enforcement of money judgments each 10 years and to recommend any needed revisions. See also 1990 Cal. Stat. ch. 943, § 3, which provides: “The California Law Revision Commission shall study the impacts of the changes in Sections 483.010 and 483.015 of the Code of Civil Procedure made by Sections 1 and 2 of this act during the period from January 1, 1991, to and including December 31, 1993, and shall report the results of its study, together with recommendations concerning continuance or modification of these changes, to the Legislature on or before December 31, 1994.”

26. Occasionally one or more members of the Commission may not join in all or part of a recommendation submitted to the Legislature by the Commission.

The Commission ordinarily prepares an official Comment explaining each section it recommends. These Comments are included in the Commission’s recommendations and are frequently revised by the Commission in later reports to reflect amendments made in the legislative process. The reports provide background with respect to the Commission intent in proposing the enactment, such intent being reflected in the Comments to the various sections of the bill contained in the Commission’s recommendation except to the extent that new or revised Comments are set out in the report on the bill as amended.

Comments indicate the derivation of a section and often explain its purpose, its relation to other sections, and potential problems as to its meaning or application. The Comments are legislative history and are entitled to substantial weight in construing the statutory provisions. However, while the Commission endeavors in Comments to explain any changes in the law made by a section, the Commission does not claim that every inconsistent case is noted in the Comments, nor can it anticipate judicial conclusions as to the significance of existing case authorities. Hence, failure to note a change in prior law or to refer to an inconsistent judicial decision is not intended to, and should not, influence the construction of a clearly stated statutory provision.

28. Many amendments are made on recommendation of the Commission to deal with matters brought to the Commission’s attention after its recommendation was printed. In some cases, however, an amendment may be made that the Commission believes is not desirable and does not recommend.

29. For examples of such reports, see Appendices 4-7 to this Report. Reports containing new or revised comments are printed in the Commission’s Annual Report for the year in which the recommendation was proposed. For a description of legislative committee reports adopted in connection with the bill that became the Evidence Code, see Arellano v. Moreno, 33 Cal. App. 3d 877, 884, 109 Cal. Rptr. 421, 426 (1973).


Commission publications are distributed to the Governor, legislative leadership, and, on request, to heads of state departments and a substantial number of judges, district attorneys, lawyers, law professors, and law libraries throughout the state. 33 Thus, a large and representative number of interested persons is given an opportunity to study and comment on the Commission’s work before it is considered for enactment by the Legislature. 34

The reports, recommendations, and studies of the Commission are republished in a set of hardcover volumes that is both a permanent record of the Commission’s work and, it is believed, a valuable contribution to the legal literature of the state. These volumes are available at most county law libraries and at some other libraries. Some hardcover volumes are out of print, but others are available for purchase. 35

Personnel of Commission

As of November 1, 1991, the membership of the Law Revision Commission is:

Members Appointed by Governor36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Term Expires</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edwin K. Marzec, Santa Monica, Chairperson</td>
<td>October 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur K. Marshall, Los Angeles, Vice Chairperson</td>
<td>October 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger Arnebergh, Van Nuys</td>
<td>October 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forrest A. Plant, Sacramento</td>
<td>October 1, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford M. Skaggs, Walnut Creek</td>
<td>October 1, 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann E. Stodden, Los Angeles</td>
<td>October 1, 1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Vacancy)</td>
<td>October 1, 1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note for next year - reappointment time frame is 60 days - submission to Senate is 90 days.

33. See Gov’t Code § 8291. In the past, Commission publications have generally been distributed free of charge. Due to budget constraints, the Commission in 1991 began implementing a charge for Commission publications.


35. See “Commission Publications” infra.

36. Seven Commission members are appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. Gov’t Code § 8281. These Commissioners serve staggered four-year terms. Id. The provision in Government Code Section 8281 to the effect that Commission members appointed by the Governor hold office until the appointment and qualification of their successors has been superseded by the rule in Government Code Section 1774 declaring a vacancy if there is no reappointment 90 days following
**Legislative Members**

Assembly Member Terry Friedman, Sherman Oaks
Senator Bill Lockyer, Hayward

**Legislative Counsel**

Bion M. Gregory, Sacramento

In January 1991, Elihu M. Harris left the Assembly (and the position of Assembly Member of the Commission) to serve as Mayor of the City of Oakland. Terry Friedman was appointed to replace Mayor Harris as the Assembly Member of the Commission.

In March 1991, Brad R. Hill resigned from the Commission to accept an appointment as a Municipal Court Judge in Fresno. As of the date of this report, no replacement for Judge Hill has been appointed.

In late May 1991, Eugenia Ayala left the Commission’s clerical staff to accept a position with the Employment Development Department in San Mateo.

Effective August 1, 1991, Nathaniel Sterling, the Commission’s Assistant Executive Secretary, was elevated to the position of Executive Secretary. Stan Ulrich, Commission Staff Counsel, assumed the position of Assistant Executive Secretary.

In August 1991, Pamela K. Mishey, research attorney with the Sonoma County Superior Court, was appointed to the Commission’s legal staff.


During 1991, Michael Cavanaugh, a student at Santa Clara University Law School, was employed as a student legal assistant.

In July 1991, John H. DeMoully retired from his position as the Commission’s Executive Secretary, a position in which he had served for 32 years. The Commission adopted the following resolution in honor of Mr. DeMoully:

---

37. The Senate and Assembly members of the Commission serve at the pleasure of the appointing power, the Senate Committee on Rules and the Speaker of the Assembly, respectively. Gov’t Code § 8281.
38. The Legislative Counsel serves on the Commission by virtue of office. Gov’t Code § 8281.
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RESOLUTION IN HONOR OF

John H. DeMouldy

The California Law Revision Commission takes the occasion of the retirement of John H. DeMouldy as its Executive Secretary to honor his career in public service to the Commission and the State of California.

John H. DeMouldy became Executive Secretary of the Commission in August 1959, and directed its activities for the following 32 years. During that time he prepared or supervised the preparation of over 200 recommendations to the California Legislature, enjoying an unparalleled enactment rate in excess of 95%. His tenure is marked by nearly 15,000 statute sections added, amended, or repealed on recommendation of the Commission.

The Commission’s remarkable legislative accomplishments under John H. DeMouldy’s direction include:

• Evidence Code • Probate Code • Tort Claims Act
• Eminent Domain Law • Enforcement of Judgments Law
• Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care • Marketable Record Title Act • Family Code, in progress at the time of retirement • Comprehensive statutes governing arbitration, real property leases, counterclaims, cross-complaints, and joinder of causes of action, additur and remittitur, survival of actions, suit by or against unincorporated associations, rescission of contracts, powers of appointment, rule against perpetuities, liquidated damages, powers of attorney, community property, and other matters

The singular record of John H. DeMouldy’s achievements reflects the energy, intellect, creativity, wisdom, political acuity, public spirit, long hours, perseverance, and plain hard work he has devoted to the Commission. The members and staff of the California Law Revision Commission take pride in the high standards and outstanding reputation he has helped create and maintain for the Commission, and are pleased to honor his long and distinguished professional career.

As of November 1, 1991, the staff of the Commission is:

**Legal**

Nathaniel Sterling  
*Executive Secretary*

Robert J. Murphy III  
*Staff Counsel*

Stan Ulrich  
*Assistant Executive Secretary*

Pamela K. Mishey  
*Staff Attorney*

**Administrative-Secretarial**

Stephen F. Zimmerman  
*Administrative Assistant*

Victoria V. Matias  
*Composing Technician*

**Legislative History of Recommendations Submitted to 1991 Legislative Session**

The Commission recommended five bills and one concurrent resolution for enactment at the 1991 legislative session. All five bills were enacted and the concurrent resolution was adopted.

**Omnibus Probate Bill**

Senate Bill 271, which became Chapter 1055 of the Statutes of 1991, was introduced by Senator Kopp to effectuate eight Commission recommendations relating to probate law and procedure and to make a number of technical and minor substantive revisions.\(^{39}\) See *Recommendation Relating to Debts That Are Contingent, Disputed, or Not Due*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2707 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Remedies of Creditor Where Personal Representative Fails to Give Notice*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2719 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Repeal of Civil Code Section 704 (Passage of Ownership of U.S. Bonds on Death)*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2729 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Disposition of Small Estate Without Probate*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2737 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Right of Surviving Spouse to Dispose of Community Property*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2769 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Access to Decedent’s Safe Deposit Box*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2859 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to Gifts in View of Impending Death*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2869 (1990); *Recommendation Relating to TOD Beneficiary*

\(^{39}\) Senate Bill 271 also contains legislation sponsored by the California State Bar. Only sections in the bill for which there is an official Commission Comment effectuate Commission recommendations.

Senate Bill 271 was enacted after several amendments were made to the bill. For new and revised Comments reflecting amendments made in the legislative process, see Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 1055 of the Statutes of 1991 (Senate Bill 271) (Omnibus Probate Bill), 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 71 (1991), which is printed as Appendix 7 to this Report.

Urgency Probate Bill

Senate Bill 896, which became Chapter 82 of the Statutes of 1991, was introduced by Senator Mello to make a number of technical corrections in the new Probate Code (1990 Cal. Stat. ch. 79) and restore some legislation that was chaptered out in the 1990 session before the new code’s July 1, 1991, operative date. See Comments to 1991 Probate Urgency Clean-up Bill, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2909 (1990).

Senate Bill 896 was enacted after several amendments were made to the bill. For new and revised Comments reflecting amendments made in the legislative process, see Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 82 of the Statutes of 1991 (Senate Bill 896) (Urgency Probate Bill), 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 67 (1991), which is printed as Appendix 5 to this Report.

Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities

Assembly Bill 1577, which became Chapter 156 of the Statutes of 1991, was introduced by Assembly Member Sher to effectuate the Commission’s Recommendation Relating to Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2501 (1990), and Application of Marketable Title Statute to Executory Interests, 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 53 (1991), which is printed as Appendix 3 to this Report.

Assembly Bill 1577 was enacted after the bill was amended. For a revised Comment reflecting the amendment made in the legislative process, see Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 156 of the Statutes of 1991 (Assembly Bill 1577) (Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities), 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 69 (1991), which is printed as Appendix 6 to this Report.
Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care

Assembly Bill 793, which became Chapter 896 of the Statutes of 1991, was introduced by Assembly Member Polanco to effectuate the Commission’s Recommendation Relating to Elimination of Seven-Year Limit for Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2601 (1990). The bill was enacted as introduced.

Commercial Real Property Leases

Senate Bill 256, which became Chapter 67 of the Statutes of 1991, was introduced by Senator Beverly to effectuate the Commission’s Recommendation Relating to Remedies for Breach of Assignment or Sublease Covenant, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2405 (1990), and Recommendation Relating to Use Restrictions, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2421 (1990).

Senate Bill 256 was enacted after an amendment was made to the bill. For new and revised Comments reflecting the amendment made in the legislative process, see Report of the California Law Revision Commission on Chapter 67 of the Statutes of 1991 (Senate Bill 256) (Commercial Real Property Leases), 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 65 (1991), which is printed as Appendix 4 to this Report.

Resolution Regarding Topics for Study

Senate Concurrent Resolution 4, introduced by Senator Lockyer and adopted as Resolution Chapter 33 of the Statutes of 1991, continues the Commission’s authority to study 26 topics previously authorized for study.

Report on Statutes Repealed by Implication or Held Unconstitutional

Section 8290 of the Government Code provides:

The commission shall recommend the express repeal of all statutes repealed by implication, or held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of the state or the Supreme Court of the United States.

Pursuant to this directive, the Commission has reviewed the decisions of the United States Supreme Court and the California Supreme Court published since the Commission’s last Annual Report was prepared and has the following to report:

40. This study has been carried through 53 Cal. 3d 1360 (Advance Sheet No. 22, August 15, 1991) and 111 S. Ct. 2923 (Advance Sheet No. 18, July 15, 1991).
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(1) No decision of the United States Supreme Court holding a state statute repealed by implication has been found.

(2) No decision of the United States Supreme Court holding a state statute unconstitutional has been found.

(3) No decision of the California Supreme Court holding a state statute repealed by implication has been found.\(^{41}\)

(4) One decision of the California Supreme Court held a state statute unconstitutional.\(^{42}\)

In *Raven v. Deukmejian*\(^{43}\) the court found that Section 3 of Proposition 115 (approved June 5, 1990) providing that certain enumerated criminal defendants’ rights would be construed to provide no greater protection to the defendant than is set out in the United States Constitution, amounted to a qualitative revision of the California Constitution and thus could not be accomplished by the initiative process. The court found that Section 3 violated California Constitution, Article XVIII, Sections 1 and 2, which establish the exclusive methods by which the state constitution may be amended.

**Recommendations**

The Law Revision Commission respectfully recommends that the Legislature authorize the Commission to complete its study of the topics previously authorized for study (see “Calendar of Topics Authorized for Study” set out as Appendix 1 to this Report).

---

41. One decision of the California Supreme Court found a state statute to contain an implied exception. In *People v. Pieters*, 52 Cal. 3d 894, 802 P.2d 420, 276 Cal. Rptr. 918 (1991), the court held that a prior version of Penal Code Section 1170.2(g) impliedly included an exception for violations of Health and Safety Code Section 11370.4. This implied exception has been expressly included in the current, revised version of Penal Code Section 1170.2(g).

42. One decision of the California Supreme Court imposed constitutional limitations upon the application of a state statute. In *Tapia v. Superior Court of Tulare County*, 53 Cal. 3d 282, 807 P.2d 434, 279 Cal. Rptr. 592 (1990), the court held that retroactive application of those provisions of Proposition 115 that changed the legal consequences of behavior would be unconstitutional under Article 1, Section 10, of the U.S. Constitution and Article 1, Section 9, of the California Constitution.

One decision of the California Supreme Court held that a state statute was preempted by federal law. In *Carpenters S. Cal. Admin. Corp. v. El Capitan Dev. Co.*, 53 Cal. 3d 1041, 811 P.2d 296, 282 Cal. Rptr. 277 (1991), the court held that Civil Code Section 3111 was preempted by the Employment Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) (29 U.S.C. § 1001 et seq.), which provides a comprehensive federal statutory scheme with an expressly and broadly stated preemption provision (29 U.S.C. § 1144(a)).

Pursuant to the mandate imposed by Government Code Section 8290, the Commission recommends the repeal of the provision referred to under “Report on Statutes Repealed by Implication or Held Unconstitutional,” supra, to the extent it has been held unconstitutional and has not been amended or repealed.
APPENDIX 1

CALENDAR OF TOPICS AUTHORIZED FOR STUDY

The Commission has on its calendar of topics the topics listed below. Each of these topics has been authorized for Commission study by the Legislature.


2. Probate Code. Whether the California Probate Code should be revised, including but not limited to, whether California should adopt, in whole or in part, the Uniform Probate Code. (Authorized by 1980 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 37.)

3. Real and personal property. Whether the law relating to real and personal property (including, but not limited to, a Marketable Title Act, covenants, servitudes, conditions, and restrictions on land use or relating to land, possibilities of reverter, powers of termination, Section 1464 of the Civil Code, escheat of property and the disposition of unclaimed or abandoned property, eminent domain, quiet title actions, abandonment or vacation of public streets and highways, partition, rights and duties attendant upon assignment, subletting, termination, or abandonment of a lease, powers of appointment, and related matters) should be revised. (Authorized by 1983 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 40, consolidating various previously authorized aspects of real and personal property law into one comprehensive topic. Expanded in 1988 Cal Stat. res. ch. 81.)

4. Family law. Whether the law relating to family law (including, but not limited to, community property) should be revised. (Authorized by 1983

44. For additional matters authorized for Commission study, see note 25 supra.
5. **Prejudgment interest.** Whether the law relating to the award of prejudgment interest in civil actions and related matters should be revised. (Authorized by 1971 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 75.)

6. **Class actions.** Whether the law relating to class actions should be revised. (Authorized by 1975 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 15. See also 12 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 524 (1974).)

7. **Offers of compromise.** Whether the law relating to offers of compromise should be revised. (Authorized by 1975 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 15. See also 12 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 525 (1974).)

8. **Discovery in civil cases.** Whether the law relating to discovery in civil cases should be revised. (Authorized by 1975 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 15. See also 12 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 526 (1974).)

9. **Procedure for removal of invalid liens.** Whether a summary procedure should be provided by which property owners can remove doubtful or invalid liens from their property, including a provision for payment of attorney’s fees to the prevailing party. (Authorized by 1980 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 37.)

10. **Special assessment liens for public improvements.** Whether acts governing special assessments for public improvements should be simplified and unified. (Authorized by 1980 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 37.)

11. **Injunctions.** Whether the law on injunctions and related matters should be revised. (Authorized by 1984 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 42.)

12. **Involuntary dismissal for lack of prosecution.** Whether the law relating to involuntary dismissal for lack of prosecution should be revised. (Authorized by 1978 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 65. See also 14 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 23 (1978).)

13. **Statutes of limitation for felonies.** Whether the law relating to statutes of limitations applicable to felonies should be revised. (Authorized by 1981 Cal. Stat. ch. 909, § 3.)

14. **Rights and disabilities of minors and incompetent persons.** Whether the law relating to the rights and disabilities of minors and incompetent
persons should be revised. (Authorized by 1979 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 19. See also 14 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 217 (1978).)


17. Arbitration. Whether the law relating to arbitration should be revised. (Authorized by 1968 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 110. See also 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1325 (1967).)


20. Inverse condemnation. Whether the decisional, statutory, and constitutional rules governing the liability of public entities for inverse condemnation should be revised (including, but not limited to, liability for damages resulting from flood control projects) and whether the law relating to the liability of private persons under similar circumstances should be revised. (Authorized by 1971 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 74. See also 1970 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 46; 1965 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 130.)


22. Parol evidence rule. Whether the parol evidence rule should be revised. (Authorized by 1971 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 75. See also 10 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1031 (1971).)
23. **Pleadings in civil actions.** Whether the law relating to pleadings in civil actions and proceedings should be revised. (Authorized by 1980 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 37.)

24. **Administrative law.** Whether there should be changes to administrative law. (Authorized by 1987 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 47.)

25. **Attorney’s fees.** Whether there should be changes in the law relating to the payment and the shifting of attorney’s fees between litigants. (Authorized by 1988 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 20.)

26. **Family Relations Code.** Conduct a careful review of all statutes relating to the adjudication of child and family civil proceedings, with specified exceptions, and make recommendations to the Legislature regarding the establishment of a Family Relations Code. (Authorized by 1989 Cal. Stat. res. ch. 70.)
## APPENDIX 2

### LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

(Cumulative)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report for 1954 at 12 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>646,** 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports, Annual Report for 1954 at 50 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957 at 13 (1957); 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports, Annual Report for 1956 at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm’n Reports at A-1 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions,** 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports at B-1 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1 (1957)</td>
<td>§ 612.5, enacting substance of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. The Dead Man Statute,</strong> 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports at D-1 (1957)</td>
<td>recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**8. Rights of Surviving Spouse in Property Acquired by Decedent While</td>
<td>Not enacted. But recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domiciled Elsewhere,** 1 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports at E-1 (1957)</td>
<td>accomplished in enactment of Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revision Comm’n Reports at F-1 (1957)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Enacted. 1955 Cal. Stat. ch. 799, 877
Enacted. 1955 Cal. Stat. ch. 1183
Enacted. 1957 Cal. Stat. ch. 456
Enacted. 1957 Cal. Stat. ch. 139
Enacted. 1957 Cal. Stat. ch. 540
Enacted. 1957 Cal. Stat. ch. 490
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Presentation of Claims Against Public Officers and Employees, 3 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports at H-1 (1961)</td>
<td>Not enacted 1961. See recommendation to 1963 session (item 39 <em>infra</em>) which was enacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Liability of Public Entities for Ownership and Operation of Motor Vehicles, 4 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1401 (1963); 7 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 401 (1965)</td>
<td>Enacted. 1965 Cal. Stat. ch. 1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>50.</strong> Whether Damage for Personal Injury to a Married Person Should be Separate or Community Property, 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 401 (1967); 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1385 (1967)</td>
<td>Enacted. 1968 Cal. Stat. chs. 457, 458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>54.</strong> Good Faith Improver of Land Owned by Another, 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 801 (1967); 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1373 (1967)</td>
<td>Enacted. 1968 Cal. Stat. ch. 150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation | Action by Legislature
--- | ---
55. Suit By or Against an Unincorporated Association, 8 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 901 (1967) | Enacted. 1967 Cal. Stat. ch. 1324
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation | Action by Legislature
--- | ---
97. **Undertakings for Costs**, 13 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 901 (1976) | Not enacted 1976. But see recommendation to 1979 session (item 118 infra) which was enacted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152. Disclaimer of Testamentary and Other Interests, 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 207 (1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153. Wills and Intestate Succession, 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2301 (1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156. Conforming Changes to the Bond and Undertaking Law, 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2239 (1982)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action by Legislature</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 842</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1984 Cal. Stat. ch. 1671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 1204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted. 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEGISLATIVE ACTION

#### Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEGISLATIVE ACTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>199. <strong>Civil Code Sections 4800.1 and 4800.2</strong>, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 383 (1986)</td>
<td>One of two recommended measures enacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Application of Civil Code Sections 4800.1 and 4800.2), 1986 Cal. Stat. ch. 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendation | Action by Legislature
--- | ---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action by Legislature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Recommendation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action by Legislature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATION

Application of Marketable Title Statute to Executory Interests

January 1991

California Law Revision Commission
4000 Middlefield Road, Suite D-2
Palo Alto, CA 94303-4739
NOTE
This recommendation includes an explanatory Comment to each section of the recommended legislation. The Comments are written as if the legislation were enacted since their primary purpose is to explain the law as it would exist (if enacted) to those who will have occasion to use it after it is in effect.

Cite this recommendation as *Application of Marketable Title Statute to Executory Interests*, 21 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 53 (1991).
January 10, 1991

To: The Honorable Pete Wilson  
   Governor of California, and  
   The Legislature of California

This recommendation proposes revising the marketable title statute to treat executory interests affecting the use of real property in the same manner as powers of termination. This would have the effect of terminating executory interests of record if a notice of intent to preserve the interest is not recorded for a 30-year period.

This recommendation was prepared pursuant to Resolution Chapter 81 of the Statutes of 1988, continued in Resolution Chapter 53 of the Statutes of 1990.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Arnebergh  
Chairperson
APPLICATION OF MARKETABLE TITLE
STATUTETOEXECUTORYINTERESTS

In a separate recommendation, the Commission proposed enactment of the Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities. The Uniform Statutory Rule adopts a 90-year wait-and-see period in place of the common law period of lives in being plus 21 years. During the wait-and-see period, property dispositions that violate the common law rule are generally not invalidated or subjected to reformation. One type of future interest in real property that, in theory, could be greatly affected by the new perpetuities statute is the executory interest preceded by a fee simple determinable or the executory limitation on a fee simple. For example, consider the situation where the owner of a home devises the property to A so long as the property is used for residential purposes, then to B. Under the common law rule


2. A variety of phrases has been used to describe this class of interests, such as executory interest subject to an unfulfilled condition precedent and executory interest preceded by a fee simple determinable. See Restatement (Second) of Property: Donative Transfers § 1.4 comment m (1983); H. Miller & M. Sturr, Current Law of California Real Estate § 11.15, at 23-24 (2d ed. 1989); L. Simes & A. Smith, The Law of Future Interests §§ 191-92, 221 (2d ed. 1956); Waggoner, Future Interests in a Nutshell § 2.1 (1981). At common law, the fee simple interest in this situation was known as a fee simple determinable or a fee simple subject to a condition subsequent. The fee simple determinable terminated automatically on occurrence of the stated condition, whereas the fee simple subject to a condition subsequent terminated only by divestment by a person entitled to take advantage of breach of the condition. See 4 B. Witkin, Summary of California Law Real Property § 238, at 442-43 (9th ed. 1987). The fee simple determinable was abolished in the 1982 marketable title legislation; such an interest is now deemed to be a “fee simple subject to a restriction in the form of a condition subsequent.” See Civ. Code § 885.020 & Comment.

3. See Restatement (Second) of Property: Donative Transfers § 1.4 comment m, illus. 19 (1983). Another example would be a devise of land to a religious organization so long as its present religious beliefs are maintained, then to B. See Fellows, Testing Perpetuity Reforms: A Study of Perpetuity Cases 1984-1989, Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. (forthcoming).
against perpetuities, the interest of B is void because it is not certain to vest (or fail) within lives in being plus 21 years.\(^4\) However, under the proposed Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities, an executory limitation invalid under the common law rule could last for 90 years.

Although the Commission is not aware that such executory interests are encountered with any frequency in practice, their potential existence for 90 years could act as an undesirable cloud on title. The law would be improved if certain executory interests were to be treated the same as powers of termination under the marketable title statute.\(^5\) A power of termination is a reversionary interest retained by the testator or transferor rather than an interest created in a devisee or transferee. A power of termination may accomplish the same purpose as the executory interest in the example given above: O devises the property to A so long as the property is used for residential purposes, but if the property ceases to be so used, O has the power to terminate the estate devised to A. The interest of O in this example may be transferred,\(^6\) and so could be held by the same person (B) who held the executory interest in the first example.

A power of termination under existing law is not subject to the rule against perpetuities,\(^7\) but the marketable title statute causes a power of termination of record to expire if a notice of intent to

\(^4\) The result in California is not certain, in view of the cy pres rule in Civil Code Section 715.5. A court might reform the disposition to permit the executory interest to last for 21 years or lives in being plus 21 years.


\(^6\) See Civ. Code § 885.010(a) (last sentence).

\(^7\) See 4 B. Witkin, Summary of California Law Real Property § 397, at 586 (9th ed. 1987); Restatement (Second) of Property: Donative Transfers § 1.4 comment c (1983).
preserve the interest is not recorded within the preceding 30 years.\textsuperscript{8} As defined in the marketable title statute, a power of termination is

the power to terminate a fee simple estate in real property to enforce a restriction in the form of a condition subsequent to which the fee simple estate is subject, whether the power is characterized in the instrument that creates or evidences it as a power of termination, right of entry or reentry, right of possession or repossession, reserved power of revocation, or otherwise, and includes a possibility of reverter that is deemed to be and is enforceable as a power of termination pursuant to Section 885.020.\textsuperscript{9}

In traditional terms a power of termination is an interest retained by the transferor of real property, although the statutory definition is not specifically so limited.\textsuperscript{10}

The power of termination and the executory interest restricting the use of real property are functionally equivalent. These interests operate in the same fashion on the preceding fee simple, the distinguishing characteristic being the person in whom the interest is originally created. But since both types of interest are transferable, the nature of the interest’s origin does not restrict the class of persons who may ultimately hold the interest. One important difference does remain: An executory interest (but not a power of termination) is subject to the rule against perpetuities.\textsuperscript{11}

\textsuperscript{8} Civ. Code § 885.030. A power of termination may also be extinguished if it becomes obsolete. See Civ. Code § 885.040.

\textsuperscript{9} Civ. Code § 885.010(a).

\textsuperscript{10} It should be noted that the 1872 Civil Code does not make the traditional distinctions between reversionary and executory interests, although California courts have adopted the general usage. See 4 B. Witkin, Summary of California Law Real Property § 335, at 534 (9th ed. 1987).

and, conversely, a power of termination (but not an executory interest) is subject to the 30-year marketable title recording limitations.

The Commission recommends that functionally equivalent reversionary powers of termination and executory interests be treated in the same manner under the marketable title statute by applying the 30-year recording rule to executory interests. Under this rule, an executory interest restricting the use of real property would terminate if the instrument creating the interest or a notice of intent to preserve the interest is not recorded within a 30-year period. Executory interests should not be preserved for a different period than similar interests retained by a testator or grantor which may be preserved for additional 30-year periods. Treating powers of termination and executory interests in the same fashion under the marketable title statute would also apply the rules concerning expiration of an obsolete power of termination, the procedure for exercising a power of termination, and the effect of expiration of a power of termination. The proposed law would apply to existing executory interests, but provides a five-year grace period for holders of existing executory interests to record a notice of intent to preserve the interest.

12. The traditional rule that includes executory interests within the coverage of the rule against perpetuities while excluding powers of termination retained by a transferor would not be changed. It would not be appropriate to extend the rule against perpetuities to reversionary interests at this late stage. Consistency of treatment would not justify removing the perpetuities limitations from executory interests.

16. The grace period is the same as that provided by the 1982 legislation applicable to powers of termination. See Civ. Code § 885.070; Recommendation Relating to Marketable Title of Real Property, 16 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 401, 421-22 (1982).
RECOMMENDED LEGISLATION

Civ. Code § 885.010 (amended). “Power of termination” defined

885.010 (a) As used in this chapter, “power:

(I) “Power of termination” means the power to terminate a fee simple estate in real property to enforce a restriction in the form of a condition subsequent to which the fee simple estate is subject, whether the power is characterized in the instrument that creates or evidences it as a power of termination, right of entry or reentry, right of possession or repossession, reserved power of revocation, or otherwise, and includes a possibility of reverter that is deemed to be and is enforceable as a power of termination pursuant to Section 885.020.

(2) “Power of termination” includes the power created in a transferee to terminate a fee simple estate in real property to enforce a restriction on the use of the real property in the form of a limitation or condition subsequent to which the fee simple estate is subject, whether the power is characterized in the instrument that creates or evidences it as an executory interest, executory limitation, or otherwise, and includes the interest known at common law as an executory interest preceded by a fee simple determinable.

(b) A power of termination is an interest in the real property.

(+) (c) For the purpose of applying this chapter to other statutes relating to powers of termination, the terms “right of reentry,” “right of repossession for breach of condition subsequent,” and comparable terms used in the other statutes mean “power of termination” as defined in this section.

Comment. Section 885.010 is amended to include an executory limitation on a fee simple within the scope of this chapter. The language of subdivision (a)(2) extends the definition of “power of termination” to include an executory interest created in a transferee of real property. For the purpose
of this chapter, the inclusion of such executory interests extends the
traditional use of the term “power of termination” beyond rights of entry and
related interests that were retained by the grantor. The traditional description
of an executory interest preceded by a fee simple determinable in subdivision
(a)(2) makes the coverage of this provision complete. The fee simple
determinable is abolished in Section 885.020. See Comment to Section
885.020.

Executory interests are also subject to the limitations provided in the
statutory rule against perpetuities. See Prob. Code §§ 21202 (application of
statutory rule), 21205 (90-year wait-and-see period). Thus, an executory
interest that becomes invalid under the statutory rule against perpetuities
may not be renewed under this chapter. Similarly, if an executory interest
terminates under this chapter, it is fully terminated and does not continue for
purposes of the statutory rule against perpetuities. See Section 885.060
(effect of expiration of power of termination).

**Civ. Code § 885.015 (amended). Application of chapter**

885.015. This chapter does not apply to any of the following:

(a) A reversionary interest *power of termination* conditioned
upon the continued production or removal of oil or gas or other
minerals.

(b) A reversionary interest in *power of termination as to*
separately owned improvements or fixtures conditioned upon
the continued leasehold or possessory interest in the underlying
land.

**Comment.** Section 885.015 is amended to refer to powers of termination,
for consistency with the broadened scope of this chapter. See Section
885.010(b) ("power of termination" includes executory interest). This
revision makes the exception provided in this section coextensive with the
interests covered by this chapter.

**Civ. Code § 885.070 (amended). Application of chapter**

885.070. (a) Subject to Section 880.370 (grace period for
recording notice) and except as otherwise provided in this
section, this chapter applies on the operative date to all powers
of termination, whether executed or recorded before, on, or after
the operative date.
(b) If breach of the restriction to which the fee simple estate is subject occurred before the operative date of this chapter and the power of termination is not exercised before the operative date of this chapter, the power of termination shall be exercised, or in the case of a power of termination of record, exercised of record, within the earlier of the following times:

(1) The time that would be applicable pursuant to the law in effect immediately prior to the operative date of this chapter.

(2) Five years after the operative date of this chapter.

(c) As used in this section, “operative date” means the operative date of this chapter as enacted or, with respect to any amendment of a section of this chapter, the operative date of the amendment.

Comment. Subdivision (c) is added to Section 885.070 to clarify the application of this section to executory interests included within the scope of this chapter by the amendment of Section 885.010. The effect is the same as the effect on powers of termination when this chapter was enacted. See 1982 Cal. Stat. ch. 1268, § 1.

REVISED COMMENT

In order to reflect the expansion of the scope of this chapter resulting from the amendment of Section 885.010, the Comment to Section 885.030 should be revised to read as follows:

Civ. Code § 885.030. Expiration of power of termination

Comment. Section 885.030 provides for expiration of a power of termination after 30 years, notwithstanding a longer or indefinite period provided in the instrument reserving the power. The expiration period supplements the rule against perpetuities. The rule against perpetuities does not apply to reversionary powers of termination. See Strong v. Shatto, 45 Cal. App. 29, 187 P. 159 (1919); Prob. Code § 21225(g) (exclusion from statutory rule against perpetuities). Executory interests remain subject to the limitations provided in the statutory rule against perpetuities. See Comment to Section 885.010; Prob. Code §§ 21202 (application of statutory rule), 21205 (90-year wait-and-see period).
The expiration period runs from the date of recording rather than the date of creation of the power of termination because the primary purpose of Section 885.030 is to clear record title. The expiration period can be extended for up to 30 years at a time by recordation of a notice of intent to preserve the power of termination. See Section 880.310 (notice of intent to preserve interest). Recordation of a notice of intent to preserve the power of termination does not enable enforcement of a power that has expired because it has become obsolete due to changed conditions or otherwise. See Sections 880.310 (notice of intent to preserve interest), 885.040 (obsolete power of termination), & Comments.

For the effect of expiration of a power of termination pursuant to this section, see Section 885.060 (effect of expiration). This section does not affect conservation easements pursuant to Sections 815-816. See Section 880.240 (interests excepted from title) & Comment. See also Section 885.015 (exceptions from chapter) & Comment.
APPENDIX 4

REPORT OF THE
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
ON CHAPTER 67 OF THE STATUTES OF 1991
(SENATE BILL 256)

Chapter 67 of the Statutes of 1991 was introduced as Senate Bill 256 by Senator Robert G. Beverly on recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission. Comments to the sections in Chapter 67 are set out in the Commission’s Recommendations Relating to Commercial Real Property Leases, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2401 (1990). These Comments remain applicable to Chapter 67, except to the extent they are replaced or supplemented by the revised and new Comments set out below which reflect an amendment to the bill made during the legislative process.

Civ. Code § 1995.300. Remedies subject to express provision in lease and applicable defenses

Comment. Subdivision (a) of Section 1995.300 codifies the general rule that the parties to a contract may negotiate the remedies to be applied in case of a breach of the contract. This rule is of course subject to general principles limiting freedom of contract. See, e.g., 1 B. Witkin, Summary of California Law Contracts §§ 23-36 (9th ed. 1987) (adhesion and unconscionable contract doctrines).

Subdivision (b) codifies the general rule that a party may waive the party’s remedies for breach either expressly or by conduct.

Civ. Code § 1995.320. Landlord’s remedies for tenant’s breach

Comment. Section 1995.320 treats a restriction on transfer as a covenant, violation of which is a breach of the lease. A transfer in violation of the restriction is voidable, not void, and the landlord may waive the landlord’s remedies for breach either expressly or by conduct. Section 1995.300 (remedies subject to express provisions in lease and applicable defenses). This principle applies to a sublease as well as an assignment. Section 1995.020(e) (“transfer” defined).

Section 1995.320 makes clear the landlord may seek contract damages caused by the wrongful transfer in addition to termination of the lease. This is a specific application of Section 1951.2 (damages in connection with lease termination).
Section 1995.320 also permits the landlord to waive the termination remedy and still collect contract damages for wrongful transfer. This resolves a matter that was unclear under prior law, consistent with the general principle that a landlord may leave a lease in effect and recover damages for breach of a covenant. See Coskran, Assignment and Sublease Restrictions: The Tribulations of Leasehold Transfers, 22 Loy. L.A.L. Rev. 405, 495-98 (1989).

Other remedies available to the landlord for the tenant’s breach include unlawful detainer, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief. For remedies against the assignee or subtenant under a wrongful transfer, see Section 1995.330 (application of remedies to assignee or subtenant).
APPENDIX 5

REPORT OF THE
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
ON CHAPTER 82 OF THE STATUTES OF 1991
(SENATE BILL 896)

Chapter 82 of the Statutes of 1991 was introduced as Senate Bill 896 by Senator Henry Mello on recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission. Comments to the sections in Chapter 82 are set out in the Commission’s Recommendations Relating to Probate Law, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2701, 2909-14 (1990). These Comments remain applicable to Chapter 82, except to the extent they are replaced or supplemented by the revised and new Comments set out below which reflect amendments to the bill made during the legislative process.

Prob. Code § 1203 (technical amendment). Order shortening time
Comment. Subdivision (a) of Section 1203 is amended to make clear that the general rule permitting shortening of time applies unless the general rule is made inapplicable by a provision to that effect in a particular statute. This is a technical, nonsubstantive change.

Prob. Code § 2629 (technical amendment). Compelling filing of account
Comment. Subdivision (c) of Section 2629 is amended to correct a drafting error by changing “personal representative” to “guardian or conservator.”

Prob. Code § 7622 (amended). Manner of administration; compensation of public administrator
Comment. Section 7622 is amended to add the second sentence to subdivision (b). This restores the substance of a portion of the first sentence of subdivision (b) of former Section 7622 of the repealed Probate Code.

The reference in subdivision (b) to the “same compensation” as is granted by this division to personal representatives generally, and attorneys for personal representatives generally, includes allowances of compensation. See Part 7 (commencing with Section 10800) (compensation of personal representative and estate attorney), particularly Chapter 2 (commencing with Section 10830) (allowance of compensation by court).
Prob. Code § 8547 (unchanged). Compensation of special administrator and attorney for special administrator

**Comment.** Section 8547 (enacted as a part of the new Probate Code by 1990 Cal. Stat. ch. 79, § 14) was amended by 1990 Cal. Stat. ch. 710, § 22. The section as amended continues Section 8547 of the repealed Probate Code without substantive change.

Under subdivision (d), compensation of an attorney for extraordinary services to a special administrator is made on the same basis as compensation for extraordinary services to a general personal representative. This includes services by a paralegal performing the extraordinary services under the direction and supervision of an attorney. See Section 10811 (additional compensation for extraordinary services).

Prob. Code § 10811 (added). Additional compensation for extraordinary services

**Comment.** Section 10811 is new. It continues the substance of the last portion of the first sentence, and all of the second and third sentences, of former Section 910 of the repealed Probate Code.

Prob. Code § 11623 (amended). Distribution under Independent Administration of Estates Act

**Comment.** Section 11623 is amended to replace the former language “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter” with the language “[n]otwithstanding Section 11601.” This makes clear that the provisions of Section 11623 allowing reduced notice (notice under Section 1220 instead of Section 11601) control over the notice provisions of Section 11601. Other provisions of this chapter do apply to proceedings under this section, including those relating to opposing the petition (Section 11602), contents of court order (Section 11603), requirements for distribution to a person other than an estate beneficiary (Section 11604), binding effect of order (Section 11605), time for petition (Section 11620), requirement of bond (Section 11622), and payment of costs (Section 11624).
Chapter 156 of the Statutes of 1991 was introduced as Assembly Bill 1577 by Assembly Member Byron Sher on recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission. Comments to the sections in Chapter 156 are set out in the Commission’s *Recommendation Relating to Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2501 (1990). These Comments remain applicable to Chapter 156, except for the revised Comment set out below which reflects an amendment to the bill made in the Assembly.

**Prob. Code § 21209 (added). Construction of “later of” language in perpetuity saving clause**

**Comment.** Subdivision (a) of Section 21209 is the same in substance as Section 1(e) of the Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities. This section is intended to invalidate a two-pronged perpetuity saving clause to the extent that it attempts to employ a period of time extending beyond the traditional perpetuities period of lives in being plus 21 years. The effect of this rule is that there is no advantage to be gained by inserting such a “later of” clause in an instrument. A standard perpetuity saving clause in use before enactment of USRAP continues to be appropriate. Consequently, instruments should not be redrafted in an attempt to apply a “later of” 90 years or lives-in-being-plus-21-years test. This section also prevents the loss of grandfathered status under the federal generation-skipping transfer tax involving exercise of a nongeneral power of appointment under a pre-1986 irrevocable trust. See Temp. Treas. Reg. § 26.2601-1(b)(1)(v)(B)(2) (1988) (as agreed to be amended); see also Appendix to *Recommendation Relating to Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities*, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2501, 2577-79 (1990); Unif. Prob. Code § 2–901(e) comment (9th ed. 1990).

Subdivision (b) makes clear that subdivision (a) applies only prospectively.
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REPORT OF THE
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION
ON CHAPTER 1055 OF THE STATUTES OF 1991
(SENATE BILL 271)

Chapter 1055 of the Statutes of 1991 was introduced as Senate Bill 271 by Senator Quentin L. Kopp on recommendation of the California Law Revision Commission. Comments to the sections in Chapter 1055 are set out in the following portions of the Commission’s Recommendations Relating to Probate Law, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 2701 (1990):

• Debts That Are Contingent, Disputed, or Not Due (pp. 2707-18)
• Remedies of Creditor Where Personal Representative Fails to Give Notice (pp. 2719-27)
• Repeal of Civil Code Section 704 (Passage of Ownership of U. S. Bonds on Death) (pp. 2729-35)
• Disposition of Small Estate Without Probate (pp. 2737-67)
• Right of Surviving Spouse to Dispose of Community Property (pp. 2769-84)
• Access to Decedent’s Safe Deposit Box (pp. 2859-67)
• Gifts in View of Impending Death (pp. 2869-82)
• TOD Beneficiary Designation for Vehicles and Certain Other State-Registered Property (pp. 2883-2906)
• Comments to Other Provisions of 1991 General Probate Bill (pp. 2907-08)

These Comments remain applicable to Chapter 1055, except to the extent they are replaced by the revised comments set out below which reflect amendments to the bill made during the legislative process.

Health & Safety Code § 18080.2 (added). Ownership of manufactured home, mobilehome, commercial coach, truck camper, or floating home in beneficiary form

Comment. Section 18080.2 is new. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp. 1991). The language of Section 18080.2 is conformed to the usage in this article. See, e.g., Health & Safety Code § 18080. See also Health & Safety Code § 18102.2; Veh. Code §§ 4150.7, 5910.5, 9852.7, 9916.5.
Health & Safety Code § 18102.2 (added). Transfer of manufactured home, mobilehome, commercial coach, truck camper, or floating home owned in beneficiary form

Comment. Section 18102.2 is new. Subdivisions (a) through (d) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp. 1991). Subdivision (e) is drawn from Health and Safety Code Section 18102(b) and Vehicle Code Sections 5910(b) and 9916(b). Subdivision (f) is drawn from Health and Safety Code Section 18100.5(a)(4). Subdivision (g) is drawn from Probate Code Section 5304. Subdivision (h) is comparable to Probate Code Section 5705 (gift in view of impending death) and Vehicle Code Sections 5910.5(h) and 9916.5(h). Subdivision (j) is drawn from Vehicle Code Section 5910(c). See also Health & Safety Code § 18080.2; Veh. Code §§ 4150.7, 5910.5, 9852.7, 9916.5.

Prob. Code § 331 (added). Access to decedent’s safe deposit box

Comment. Section 331 is new. It permits a person who has a key to a decedent’s safe deposit box to gain immediate access in order to remove the decedent’s wills, trust instruments, and instructions for disposition of the decedent’s remains, and to inventory the contents of the box. If no other directions have been given by the decedent, the right to control the disposition of the decedent’s remains devolves, in order, on the surviving spouse, children, parents, other kindred, and the public administrator. Health & Safety Code § 7100.

If the person seeking access does not have a key to the safe deposit box and is not the public administrator, the person must obtain letters from the court to gain access to the box. Concerning the authority of the public administrator, see Section 7603.

Subdivision (e) requires the person given access to deliver the wills to the clerk of the superior court and mail or deliver a copy to the person named in the will as executor or beneficiary “as provided in Section 8200.” Section 8200 requires the custodian to deliver the will to the clerk of the superior court in the county in which the estate of the decedent may be administered, and to mail a copy of the will to the person named in the will as executor, if the person’s whereabouts is known to the custodian, or if not, to a person named in the will as beneficiary, if the person’s whereabouts is known to the custodian. For the county in which the estate of the decedent may be administered, see Sections 7051 (for California domiciliary, county of domicile), 7052 (nondomiciliary). See also Sections 40 (“financial
institution” defined), 52 (“letters” defined), 58 (“personal representative” defined), 88 (“will” includes a codicil).

Prob. Code § 9653 (technical amendment). Duty to recover property transferred in fraud of creditors
Comment. Paragraph (2) of subdivision (a) of Section 9653 is amended to refer to a gift in view of “impending” death, consistent with Sections 5701-5705.

Paragraph (3) is added to subdivision (a) to provide for recovery of property transferred by TOD beneficiary designation.

Prob. Code § 13101 (amended). Furnishing affidavit or declaration
Comment. Subdivision (a)(4) of Section 13101 is revised and subdivision (e) is added to reflect the new authorization for the decedent’s personal representative to consent to use of the affidavit procedure, notwithstanding that an estate proceeding is pending or has been conducted in this state. See Section 13108(a)(2).

Subdivision (a)(9) is amended to change “a right” to “a superior right.” This conforms Section 13101 to Section 13200(a)(9) (affidavit procedure for real property of small value), and is nonsubstantive.

Prob. Code § 13207 (amended). Limitation on liability under Sections 13204 and 13205
Comment. Subdivision (a) of Section 13207 is amended to reflect the new authorization for the decedent’s personal representative to consent to use of the procedure provided by this chapter, notwithstanding that an estate proceeding is pending or has been conducted in this state. See Section 13210.

Subdivision (b) is amended to make a technical, nonsubstantive clarification.

Veh. Code § 4150.7 (added). Ownership of vehicle in beneficiary form
Comment. Section 4150.7 is new. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp. 1991). See also Health & Safety Code §§ 18080.2, 18102.2; Veh. Code §§ 5910.5, 9852.7, 9916.5.

Veh. Code § 5910.5 (added). Transfer of vehicle owned in beneficiary form
Comment. Section 5910.5 is new. Subdivisions (a) through (d) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp.
1991). Subdivision (e) is drawn from Health and Safety Code Section 18102(b) and Vehicle Code Sections 5910(b) and 9916(b). Subdivision (g) is drawn from Probate Code Section 5304. Subdivision (h) is comparable to Health and Safety Code Section 18102.2(h), Probate Code Section 5705 (gift in view of impending death), and Vehicle Code Section 9916.5(h). Subdivision (j) is drawn from Vehicle Code Section 5910(c). See also Health & Safety Code §§ 18080.2, 18102.2; Veh. Code §§ 4150.7, 9852.7, 9916.5.

Veh. Code § 9852.7 (added). Ownership of vessel in beneficiary form

Comment. Section 9852.7 is new. Subdivisions (a), (b), and (c) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp. 1991). See also Health & Safety Code §§ 18080.2, 18102.2; Veh. Code §§ 4150.7, 5910.5, 9916.5.

Veh. Code § 9916.5 (added). Transfer of vehicle owned in beneficiary form

Comment. Section 9916.5 is new. Subdivisions (a) through (d) are drawn from Missouri law. See Mo. Ann. Stat. § 301.681 (Vernon Supp. 1991). Subdivision (e) is drawn from Health and Safety Code Section 18102(b) and Vehicle Code Sections 5910(b) and 9916(b). Subdivision (g) is drawn from Probate Code Section 5304. Subdivision (h) is comparable to Health and Safety Code Section 18102.2(h), Probate Code Section 5705 (gift in view of impending death), and Vehicle Code Section 5910.5(h). Subdivision (j) is drawn from Vehicle Code Section 5910(c). See also Health & Safety Code §§ 18080.2, 18102.2; Veh. Code §§ 4150.7, 5910.5, 9852.7, 9916.5.
APPENDIX 8

REPORT OF THE
CALIFORNIA LAW REVISION COMMISSION ON
CORRECTED PROBATE CODE COMMENTS

The following Comments replace the corresponding Comments printed in the Commission’s Recommendation Proposing New Probate Code, 20 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 1001 (1990). This action is necessary to correct errors in the earlier Comments.

Prob. Code § 281. Disclaimer irrevocable and binding

Comment. Section 281 continues Section 281 of the repealed Probate Code without change. This section makes clear the effect of a disclaimer on creditors of the beneficiary. See also Section 283 (disclaimer not a fraudulent transfer). The binding effect of a disclaimer has no effect on the passing of the disclaimed interest pursuant to Section 282. As to interests created before January 1, 1984, see Section 287. After December 31, 1983, an interest that would otherwise be taken by a beneficiary may be disclaimed only as provided in this part. See Section 288. As to the application of any amendments made after that date, see Section 3. A disclaimer effective under federal law is effective as a disclaimer under this part. See Section 295.

Background on Section 281 of Repealed Code

Section 281 was added by 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 17 § 2. The section restated the first sentence of former Probate Code Section 190.5 (repealed by 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 17 § 1) without substantive change. For background on the provisions of this part, see the Comment to this part under the part heading.

Prob. Code § 282. Effect of disclaimer

Comment. Section 282 continues Section 282 of the repealed Probate Code without substantive change, except that subdivision (b)(1) is revised to refer to other instruments for conformity with Part 6 (commencing with Section 240). The introductory clause of subdivision (b) continues the substance of 1984 Cal. Stat. ch. 892, § 50.

The introductory clause of subdivision (a) makes clear that a condition of survival is not a contingency otherwise provided in the will, disapproving dictum in Estate of Murphy, 92 Cal. App. 3d 413, 426, 154 Cal. Rptr. 859 (1979).
Clause (2) of the first sentence of subdivision (a) makes clear that a disclaimer has the effect of accelerating the possession and enjoyment of subsequent interests. This provision is drawn from Section 3 of the Uniform Disclaimer of Transfers by Will, Intestacy or Appointment Act (1978) and Section 3 of the Uniform Disclaimer of Transfers Under Nontestamentary Instruments Act (1978). The pertinent portion of the Comment to Section 3 of the Uniform Disclaimer of Transfers by Will, Intestacy or Appointment Act explains the provision as follows:

“Acceleration of Future Interests: If a life estate or other future interest is disclaimer, the problem is raised of whether succeeding interests or estates accelerate in possession or enjoyment or whether the disclaimed interest must be marshalled to await the actual happening of the contingency. Section 3 provides that remainder interests are accelerated, the second clause specifically stating that any future interest which is to take effect in possession or enjoyment after the termination of the estate or interest disclaimer, takes effect as if the disclaimant had predeceased the event which determines that the taker has become finally ascertained and his interest indefeasibly vested. Thus, unless the decedent or donor of the power has otherwise provided, if T leaves his estate in trust to pay the income to his son S for life, remainder to his son’s children who survive him, and S disclaims with two children then living, the remainder in the children accelerates; the trust terminates and the children receive possession and enjoyment, even though the son may subsequently have other children or one or more of the living children may die during their father’s lifetime. The will or instrument of transfer may be drafted to avoid acceleration if desired.”

Paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) is designed to prevent an heir from disclaiming property for the purpose of increasing the share of his or her line at the expense of other lines of the decedent’s descendants. For example, suppose the decedent has two children: The disclaimant (C-1) is living and has two children (GC-1 and GC-2, the decedent’s grandchildren). The decedent’s other child (C-2) has predeceased the decedent leaving one child (GC-3). But for the disclaimer, C-1’s share is one-half and GC-3 takes the other half. See Sections 240, 245. See also Section 6402. If the disclaimant (C-1) is treated as having predeceased the decedent as provided in subdivision (a) of Section 282 and the rule of Sections 240 and 245 is applied, the estate would be divided at the grandchildren’s generation, with GC-1, GC-2, and GC-3 each taking one-third. Paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) precludes the
disclaimer from reducing the estate to which GC-3 would otherwise be entitled were the disclaimer not exercised. Paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) changes the rule concerning manner of distribution to children of the disclaimant as enunciated in Estate of Bryant, 149 Cal. App. 3d 323, 335, 196 Cal. Rptr. 856 (1983).

Paragraph (2) of subdivision (b) makes clear that the rule governing advancements and the rule governing charging a debt against an intestate share apply notwithstanding a disclaimer.

As to the construction of provisions drawn from uniform acts, see Section 2.

As to interests created before January 1, 1984, see Section 287. After December 31, 1983, an interest that would otherwise be taken by a beneficiary may be disclaimed only as provided in this part. See Section 288. As to the application of any amendments made after that date, see Section 3. A disclaimer effective under federal law is effective as a disclaimer under this part. See Section 295.

**Background on Section 282 of Repealed Code**

Section 282 was added by 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 17 § 2 and amended by 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 842 § 23, 1984 Cal. Stat. ch. 892 § 17, and 1987 Cal. Stat. ch. 923 § 25. The section superseded former Probate Code Section 190.6 (repealed by 1983 Cal. Stat. ch. 17 § 1). The 1983 amendment added subdivision (b). The 1984 amendment broadened paragraph (1) of subdivision (b) by deleting the former limitation in that paragraph to disclaimers of “an interest created by intestate succession” and by applying the paragraph to situations where the division is made under any “other provision of a will or trust.” See *Communication of Law Revision Commission Concerning Assembly Bill 2290*, 18 Cal. L. Revision Comm’n Reports 77, 84 (1986). The 1987 amendment revised the cross-reference in subdivision (b)(1). For background on the provisions of this part, see the Comment to this part under the part heading.

**Prob. Code § 20114.5. Excess retirement accumulations**

**Comment.** Section 20114.5 continues Section 20114.5 of the repealed Probate Code without substantive change. This section specifies the manner of proration of the 15 percent tax on excess retirement accumulations imposed by the Tax Reform Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-514, § 1133(a). This chapter does not apply to persons interested in the estate of a decedent who died before January 1, 1987. Prior law continues to apply where the decedent died before January 1, 1987. See Section 20101. As to the application of any amendments made after that date, see Section 3.

**Background on Section 20114.5 of Repealed Code**

Section 20114.5 was a new provision added by 1987 Cal. Stat. ch. 128 § 20 and amended by 1987 Cal. Stat. ch. 923 § 100.5. It was also amended by 1989 Cal. Stat. ch. 544 § 18 to correct references to the Internal Revenue Code. For background on Section 20114.5,
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- Attachment, Garnishment, and Exemptions From Execution: Discharge From Employment
- California Inverse Condemnation Law [out of print]
- Recommendation Relating to Attachment, Garnishment, and Exemptions From Execution: Employees’ Earnings Protection Law [out of print]

VOLUME 11 (1973)
[Out of Print]

Annual Report (December 1972)

Annual Report (December 1973) includes the following recommendations:
- Evidence Code Section 999 - The “Criminal Conduct” Exception to the Physician-Patient Privilege
- Erroneously Ordered Disclosure of Privileged Information

Recommendation and Study Relating to:
- Civil Arrest
- Inheritance Rights of Nonresident Aliens
- Liquidated Damages

Recommendation Relating to:
- Wage Garnishment and Related Matters
- The Claim and Delivery Statute
- Unclaimed Property
Enforcement of Sister State Money Judgments
Prejudgment Attachment
Landlord-Tenant Relations
Tentative Recommendation Relating to Prejudgment Attachment [out of print]

**VOLUME 12 (1974)**

Annual Report (December 1974) includes the following recommendations:
- Payment of Judgments Against Local Public Entities
- View by Trier of Fact in a Civil Case
- The Good Cause Exception to the Physician-Patient Privilege
- Escheat of Amounts Payable on Travelers Checks, Money Orders and Similar Instruments
- Recommendation Proposing the Eminent Domain Law [out of print]
- Recommendation Relating to Condemnation Law and Procedure: Conforming Changes in Improvement Acts
- Recommendation Relating to Wage Garnishment Exemptions
- Tentative Recommendations Relating to Condemnation Law and Procedure:
  - The Eminent Domain Law
  - Condemnation Authority of State Agencies
  - Conforming Changes in Special District Statutes

**VOLUME 13 (1976)**

Annual Report (December 1975) includes the following recommendations:
- Admissibility of Copies of Business Records in Evidence
- Turnover Orders Under the Claim and Delivery Law
- Relocation Assistance by Private Condemnors
- Condemnation for Byroads and Utility Easements
- Transfer of Out-of-State Trusts to California
- Admissibility of Duplicates in Evidence
- Oral Modification of Contracts
- Liquidated Damages

Annual Report (December 1976) includes the following recommendations:
- Service of Process on Unincorporated Associations
- Sister State Money Judgments
- Damages in Action for Breach of Lease
- Wage Garnishment
- Liquidated Damages
- Selected Legislation Relating to Creditors’ Remedies [out of print]
- Eminent Domain Law with Conforming Changes in Codified Sections and Official Comments [out of print]

Recommendation and Study Relating to Oral Modification of Written Contracts
Recommendation Relating to:
- Partition of Real and Personal Property
- Wage Garnishment Procedure
- Revision of the Attachment Law
- Undertakings for Costs
- Nonprofit Corporation Law [out of print]
VOLUME 14 (1978)
Annual Report (December 1977) includes the following recommendations:
Use of Keepers Pursuant to Writs of Execution
Attachment Law: Effect of Bankruptcy Proceedings; Effect of General Assignments for Benefit of Creditors
Review of Resolution of Necessity by Writ of Mandate
Use of Court Commissioners Under the Attachment Law
Evidence of Market Value of Property
Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege
Parol Evidence Rule
Annual Report (December 1978) includes the following recommendations:
Technical Revisions in the Attachment Law includes the following recommendations:
Unlawful Detainer Proceedings
Bond for Levy on Joint Deposit Account or Safe Deposit Box
Definition of “Chose in Action”
Ad Valorem Property Taxes in Eminent Domain Proceedings
Security for Costs
Recommendation Relating to Guardianship-Conservatorship Law

VOLUME 15 (1980)
Part I
Annual Report (December 1979) includes the following recommendations:
Effect of New Bankruptcy Law on the Attachment Law
Confessions of Judgment
Special Assessment Liens on Property Taken for Public Use
Assignments for the Benefit of Creditors
Vacation of Public Streets, Highways, and Service Easements
Quiet Title Actions
Agreements for Entry of Paternity and Support Judgments
Enforcement of Claims and Judgments Against Public Entities
Uniform Veterans Guardianship Act
Psychotherapist-Patient Privilege
Enforcement of Obligations After Death
Guardianship-Conservatorship Law with Official Comments
Recommendation Relating to:
Enforcement of Judgments includes the following recommendations:
Interest Rate on Judgments
Married Women as Sole Traders
State Tax Liens
Application of Evidence Code Property Valuation Rules in Noncondemnation Cases
Uniform Durable Power of Attorney Act
Probate Homestead
Part II
[Out of Print]

Annual Report (December 1980) includes the following recommendation:

Revision of the Guardianship-Conservatorship Law includes the following recommendations:
- Appointment of Successor Guardian or Conservator
- Support of Conservatee Spouse from Community Property
- Appealable Orders

Recommendations Relating to Probate and Estate Planning:
- Non-Probate Transfers
- Revision of the Powers of Appointment Statute

Tentative Recommendation Proposing the Enforcement of Judgments Law

VOLUME 16 (1982)
[Out of Print]

Annual Report (December 1981) includes the following recommendation:

Federal Military and Other Federal Pensions as Community Property

Annual Report (December 1982) includes the following recommendations:

- Division of Joint Tenancy and Tenancy in Common Property at Dissolution of Marriage
- Creditors’ Remedies includes the following recommendations:
  - Amount Secured by Attachment
  - Execution of Writs by Registered Process Servers
  - Technical Amendments
- Dismissal for Lack of Prosecution
- Conforming Changes to the Bond and Undertaking Law
- Notice of Rejection of Late Claim Against Public Entity

Recommendation Relating to:
- Holographic and Nuncupative Wills
- Marketable Title of Real Property
- Statutory Bonds and Undertakings
- Attachment

Probate Law and Procedure includes the following recommendations:
- Missing Persons
- Nonprobate Transfers
- Emancipated Minors
- Notice in Limited Conservatorship Proceedings
- Disclaimer of Testamentary and Other Interests

1982 Creditors’ Remedies Legislation [out of print]

Tentative Recommendation Relating to Wills and Intestate Succession

VOLUME 17 (1984)
[Out of Print]

Annual Report (December 1983)($25.00) includes the following recommendations:

- Effect of Death of Support Obligor
- Dismissal for Lack of Prosecution
- Severance of Joint Tenancy
- Effect of Quiet Title and Partition Judgments
Dormant Mineral Rights
Creditors' Remedies includes the following recommendations:
- Levy on Joint Deposit Accounts
- Issuance of Earnings Withholding Orders by Registered Process Servers
- Protection of Declared Homestead After Owner's Death
- Jurisdiction of Condominium Assessment Lien Enforcement
- Technical Amendments
- Rights Among Cotenants in Possession and Out of Possession of Real Property

Recommendation Relating to:
- Liability of Marital Property for Debts (January 1983) ($8.50)
- Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care Decisions (March 1983) ($8.50)
- Statutory Forms For Durable Powers of Attorney [out of print]

Family Law (November 1983) ($18.00) includes the following recommendations:
- Marital Property Presumptions and Transmutations
- Disposition of Community Property
- Reimbursement of Educational Expenses
- Special Appearance in Family Law Proceedings
- Liability of Stepparent for Child Support
- Awarding Temporary Use of Family Home

Probate Law (November 1983) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
- Independent Administration of Decedent's Estates
- Distribution of Estates Without Administration
- Execution of Witnessed Wills
- Simultaneous Deaths
- Notice of Will
- Garnishment of Amounts Payable to Trust Beneficiary
- Bonds for Personal Representatives
- Revision of Wills and Intestate Succession Law
- Recording Affidavit of Death
- Statutes of Limitation for Felonies (January 1984) ($8.50)

Uniform Transfers to Minors Act [out of print]

**VOLUME 18 (1986)**

[Out of Print]

Annual Report (March 1985) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
- Provision for Support if Support Obligor Dies
- Transfer Without Probate of Certain Property Registered by the State
- Dividing Jointly Owned Property Upon Marriage Dissolution

Annual Report (December 1985) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
- Protection of Mediation Communications
- Recording Severance of Joint Tenancy
- Abandoned Easements
- Distribution Under a Will or Trust
- Effect of Adoption or Out of Wedlock Birth on Rights at Death
- Durable Powers of Attorney
- Litigation Expenses in Family Law Proceedings
Civil Code Sections 4800.1 and 4800.2
Annual Report (December 1986) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Notice in Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings
  Preliminary Provisions and Definitions of the Probate Code
  Technical Revisions in the Trust Law
Recommendation Proposing the Trust Law [out of print]
Recommendations Relating to Probate Law (December 1985) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Disposition of Estates Without Administration
  Small Estate Set-Aside
  Proration of Estate Taxes
Selected 1986 Trust and Probate Legislation [out of print]

VOLUME 19 (1988)
Recommendations Relating to Probate Law (January 1987) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Supervised Administration of Decedent’s Estate
  Independent Administration of Estates Act
  Creditor Claims Against Decedent’s Estate
  Notice in Probate Proceedings
Annual Report (December 1987) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Marital Deduction Gifts
  Estates of Missing Persons
  The Uniform Dormant Mineral Interests Act
Recommendations Relating to Probate Law (December 1987) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Public Guardians and Administrators
  Inventory and Appraisal
  Opening Estate Administration
  Abatement
  Accounts
  Litigation Involving Decedents
  Rules of Procedure in Probate
  Distribution and Discharge
  Nondomiciliary Decedents
  Interest and Income During Administration
Annual Report (December 1988) ($25.00) includes the following recommendation:
  Creditors’ Remedies:
    Revival of Junior Liens Where Execution Sale Set Aside
    Time for Setting Sale Aside
    Enforcement of Judgment Lien on Transferred Property After Death of Transferor-Debtor

VOLUME 20 (1990)
Recommendations Relating to Probate Law (February 1989) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  No Contest Clauses
  120-Hour Survival Requirement
  Hiring and Paying Attorneys, Advisors and Others
  Compensation of Personal Representative
PUBLICATIONS

Multiple-Party Accounts in Financial Institutions
Notice to Creditors in Probate Proceedings
Annual Report (December 1989) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Commercial Lease Law: Assignment and Sublease
  Trustees’ Fees
Recommendation Relating to Powers of Attorney (December 1989) ($18.00)
  includes the following recommendations:
  Springing Powers of Attorney
Uniform Statutory Form Power of Attorney
Recommendations Relating to Probate Law (December 1989) ($25.00) includes
  the following recommendations:
  Notice to Creditors in Estate Administration
  Disposition of Small Estate by Public Administrator
  Court-Authorized Medical Treatment
  Survival Requirement for Beneficiary of Statutory Will
  Execution or Modification of Lease Without Court Order
  Limitation Period for Action Against Surety in Guardianship or Conservatorship Proceeding
  Repeal of Probate Code Section 6402.5 (In-Law Inheritance)
  Access to Decedent’s Safe Deposit Box
  Priority of Conservator or Guardian for Appointment as Administrator
Recommendation Proposing the New Probate Code (December 1989)
Revised and Supplemental Comments to the New Probate Code (September 1990)
[Note: The two publications listed above are available only as a set, at a cost of $35.00 per set. The individual pamphlets are not available separately.]
Annual Report (December 1990) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  Notice in Probate Where Address Unknown
  Jurisdiction of Superior Court in Trust Matters
  Uniform Management of Institutional Funds Act
  Discovery After Judicial Arbitration
Recommendations Relating to Commercial Real Property Leases (May 1990)
  ($8.50) includes the following recommendations:
  Remedies for Breach of Assignment or Sublease Covenant
  Use Restrictions
Recommendation Relating to Uniform Statutory Rule Against Perpetuities
  (September 1990) ($18.00)
Recommendation Relating to Powers of Attorney (November 1990) ($8.50) includes
  the following recommendations:
  Elimination of Seven-Year Limit for Durable Power of Attorney for Health Care
  Recognition of Agent’s Authority Under Statutory Form Power of Attorney
Recommendation Relating to Probate Law (November 1990) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
  1991 Probate Urgency Clean-Up Bill
  Debts That Are Contingent, Disputed, or Not Due
  Remedies of Creditor Where Personal Representative Fails to Give Notice
  Repeal of Civil Code Section 704 (Passage of Ownership of U.S. Bonds on Death)
  Disposition of Small Estate Without Probate
  Right of Surviving Spouse to Dispose of Community Property
Litigation Involving Decedents
Compensation in Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings
Recognition of Trustees’ Powers
Access to Decedent’s Safe Deposit Box
Gifts in View of Impending Death
TOD Registration of Vehicles and Certain Other State Registered Property

VOLUME 21
Annual Report for 1991 ($18.00) includes the following recommendation:
Application of Marketable Title Statute to Executory Interests
Recommendations (November 1991) ($25.00) includes the following recommendations:
Relocation of Powers of Appointment Statute
Miscellaneous Creditors’ Remedies Matters
Nonprobate Transfers of Community Property
Notice of Trustees’ Fees
Nonprobate Transfer to Trustee Named in Will
Preliminary Distribution Without Court Supervision
Transfer of Conservatorship Property to Trust
Compensation in Guardianship and Conservatorship Proceedings

VOLUME 22
Family Code (July 1992) ($35.00)