

Title

The financial advisor who sells a trustee an insurance contract that is inappropriate in light of the trust's purposes risks primary fiduciary liability in equity to non-contracting parties, namely the trust beneficiaries, for the imprudent investment.

Summary

It is an understatement that the Minnesota Court of Appeals in *In re: Amendment and Restatement of Revocable Living Trust of Alfred J. Berget dated February 15, 2005* [A13-2295, Dec. 8, 2014] afforded the trustee who had invested trust assets in annuity contracts the benefit of every doubt: "Although we have some concerns about the suitability of the variable annuities that...[the Trustee]...purchased in light of the purposes of the trust, we are reluctant to conclude that the district court erred by finding that a lay trustee did not breach her fiduciary duties by purchasing them after receiving and relying on professional advice from a financial advisor who previously served as a financial advisor to the grantor of the trust." The advisor had sold the annuity contracts to the trustee. In light of the agent-liability provisions of §9(b) of the Uniform Prudent Investor Act and the court's reasonable-reliance dicta, what about an action against the annuity salesman/financial advisor? The topic of third-party liability of a trustee's agents is taken up in §7.2.9 of *Loring and Rounds: A Trustee's Handbook* [pages 795-803 of the 2016 Edition]. The section is reproduced in its entirety below.

The Text

§7.2.9 Personal Liability of Third Parties, Including the Trustee's Agents, to the Beneficiary; Investment Managers; Directors and Officers of Trust Companies; Lawyers; Brokers [from *Loring and Rounds: A Trustee's Handbook* (2016)]

A third party may not knowingly participate in a breach of trust. The trust beneficiary has an equitable property right that is enforceable against "every person in the world" because "every person in the world" is obligated not to collude with the trustee in a breach of trust.⁶³¹ That would include a right of action against trust counsel, brokers, and other such agents of the trustee.⁶³² So also a beneficiary of a decanted trust (first trust) would have a right of action against the trustee of a recipient trust (second trust) who knowingly takes into the recipient trust improperly-decanted assets, or who unreasonably relies on incorrect assertions of the trustee of the decanted trust that the particular decanting was duly authorized at law and in equity.¹ Even a non-transferee-third-party who knowingly participates in a breach of trust may not escape liability to the beneficiary for any loss occasioned by the breach of trust.⁶³³ As to the

⁶³¹3 Scott & Ascher §13.1.

⁶³²As to the complicit broker, *see* Restatement (Third) of Restitution and Unjust Enrichment §17, illus. 12 (a securities broker having received trust funds in payment for securities that he knew had been purchased in violation of the terms of the trust, the successor trustee has a claim against the broker to rescind the sale and recover the original purchase price).

¹ *See, e.g.*, Uniform Trust Decanting Act § 6. Decanting is taken up generally in §3.5.3.2(a) of this handbook.

⁶³³Restatement (Second) of Trusts §326; 4 Scott on Trusts §326; 5 Scott & Ascher §§28.2, 30.6.5. One Missouri court, however, seems to have assumed that civil conspiracy doctrine, not general principles of equity, governs the liability of an agent of a trustee who knowingly participates in the trustee's breaches of trust. *See Brock v. McClure*, 404 S.W.3d 416 (Mo. App. 2013). Apparently, the law

liabilities, if any, of third-party transferees of trust property, the reader is referred to Section 8.15.63 of this handbook.⁶³⁴

A trustee's nonministerial agents generally owe fiduciary duties to the beneficiaries. An agent-fiduciary of a trustee who is knowingly involved in matters relating to the administration of a trust generally has fiduciary duties that run also to the beneficiaries.⁶³⁵ A broker retained by the trustee to find a buyer for a parcel of entrusted real estate, for example, may well have fiduciary duties that run to the beneficiaries as well as the trustee. The more discretionary the broker's authority, the more likely the broker is a fiduciary. As we discuss in Section 8.8 of this handbook, there may be a trust counsel exception in some jurisdictions. In some jurisdictions, trust counsel's fiduciary duties may run exclusively to the trustee. Still, as noted above, any lawyer who knowingly assists the trustee in committing a breach of trust may be held liable to the beneficiaries for the consequences.⁶³⁶ Under common law agency principles, for the lawyer's partner to be liable to the trust beneficiaries, however, the partner would have to have, at minimum, actual knowledge of the conspiracy.⁶³⁷

The Uniform Prudent Investor Act expressly provides that “[i]n performing a delegated function, an agent owes a duty to the trust to exercise care to comply with the terms of the delegation.”⁶³⁸ In England, however, there appears to be more deference to those who negligently assist trustees in breaching their trusts, the torts of conspiracy and unlawful interference having yet to intrude upon its law of trusts.⁶³⁹

By federal statute, one who advises the trustees of a mutual fund on investment matters is expressly deemed to have a fiduciary duty to the investors, *i.e.*, the trust beneficiaries, not to take compensation that is unreasonable.⁶⁴⁰ Moreover, the advisor may not be exculpated from liability to the investors for acts of “willful misfeasance, bad faith, or gross negligence, in the performance of his duties, or by reason of his reckless disregard of his duties and obligations,” contractual and other-wise, under the investment management agency agreement.⁶⁴¹

Whether the directors of a trust company owe fiduciary duties to trust beneficiaries. A corporation that holds property in trust has fiduciary duties that run to the trust beneficiaries.⁶⁴² In the United States, so too do the directors and officers of the corporation.⁶⁴³ “[R]ecognition of a duty of a director to those for whom a corporation holds funds in trust may be viewed as another application of the general rule that a director's duty is that of an ordinary prudent person under the circumstances.”⁶⁴⁴ A

in Missouri has become unsettled as to whether civil conspiracy liability can attach to a conspirator who is not personally benefited by the conspiracy. *See Brock*, 404 S.W.3d 416 n.3. Civil conspiracy is a tort.

⁶³⁴See also §8.15.69 of this handbook (third party liability for trustee's misapplication of payments to trustee).

⁶³⁵*Lattuca v. Robsham*, 2004 WL 1636979 (Mass). *See also* Restatement (Second) of Trusts §326, cmt. a.

⁶³⁶See generally 4 Scott on Trusts §326.4; 5 Scott & Ascher §28.2.

⁶³⁷*Babb v. Bynum & Murphrey, PLLC*, 643 S.E.2d 55 (N.C. Ct. App. 2007).

⁶³⁸Uniform Prudent Investor Act §9(b).

⁶³⁹Lewin ¶40-48 through ¶40-49 (England).

⁶⁴⁰15 U.S.C.A. §80a-35(b) (Investment Company Act of 1940).

⁶⁴¹15 U.S.C.A. §80a-17(i) (Investment Company Act of 1940).

⁶⁴²*Francis v. United Jersey Bank*, 87 N.J. 15, 432 A.2d 814 (1981).

⁶⁴³See generally 3 Scott & Ascher §17.2.14.1 (the directors of an insolvent trust company may be held personally liable to the trust beneficiaries for trust cash that had been parked on its commercial side, at least to the extent that the cash cannot be traced and recovered for the trusts); 5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3 (Directors and Officers of Corporate Trustee).

⁶⁴⁴*Francis v. United Jersey Bank*, 87 N.J. 15, 432 A.2d 814 (1981). *See also* 5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3 (“A director or officer is under a duty to the beneficiaries to use reasonable care in the exercise of his or her powers and the performance of his or her duties as director or officer”).

corporate officer would have a similar duty.⁶⁴⁵ Thus, a director or officer of a trust company may be held liable to the trust beneficiaries for directly harming their equitable interests, either negligently or intentionally, in violation of his or her fiduciary duties to them, or for participating with the corporation in a breach of trust.⁶⁴⁶ “It is no defense that a director or officer did not personally profit from the breach of trust or that the conduct was not dishonest.”⁶⁴⁷ For liability to attach, however, the director or officer must be personally at fault.⁶⁴⁸ Just because the trust company is liable does not necessarily mean that its directors and officers are as well.⁶⁴⁹ Even a director who is passive or disengaged may be personally liable to the beneficiaries for the breaches of his codirectors.⁶⁵⁰ The same goes for the officers.⁶⁵¹

Here is another rationale for allowing the trust beneficiaries to seek redress from a trust company’s directors and officers, one that is not based on a duty that runs directly from the directors and officers to the beneficiaries: “Such directors and officers are personally liable to the corporation, and its claim against them is a corporate asset, which the beneficiaries can reach, as creditors of the corporation.”⁶⁵² One commentator has suggested that under this theory of liability, the claims of the trust beneficiaries ought to have priority over the claims of the corporation’s general creditors.⁶⁵³

In England, the director of a trust company owes no fiduciary duties or duties of care to the beneficiaries of the trusts of which the trust company is a trustee, unless he or she has dishonestly assisted the trust company in a breach of trust.⁶⁵⁴ Moreover, English case law does not support the proposition that a trust company’s claim against an honest but negligent director constitutes a corporate asset that is reachable in a “dog leg” action by trust beneficiaries.⁶⁵⁵ “The validity or invalidity of the dog-leg claim, of course, is of only theoretical interest where the corporate trustee has assets adequate to meet a claim for breach of trust or where it has insurance.”⁶⁵⁶ A “dog leg” action is analogous to a derivative suit in the corporate context, or in the trust context for that matter.⁶⁵⁷

Personal liability of trust officers and other agents of the corporate trustee. A corporate trustee would be liable to the beneficiary for neglect or default of an internal agent, *i.e.*, an officer or employee, provided that the agent had been acting within the course of the employment.⁶⁵⁸ This would be the case whether or not the corporate trustee, itself, had engaged in any breach of trust in connection with the matter.⁶⁵⁹ The corporate trustee, for example, would be on the hook even if it had acted prudently in hiring and overseeing the activities of the internal agent.

⁶⁴⁵5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3

⁶⁴⁶5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁴⁷5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁴⁸5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁴⁹5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁵⁰*Francis v. United Jersey Bank*, 87 N.J. 15, 432 A.2d 814 (1981). *See generally* 5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3 (“It would seem, however, that the mere fact that the director or officer is guilty of inaction rather than of intentionally wrongful or negligent action should not negate personal liability”).

⁶⁵¹5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁵²5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁵³5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3.

⁶⁵⁴*HR v. JAPT*, [1997] O.P.L.R. 123 [England].

⁶⁵⁵*Gregson v. H.A.E. Trustees Ltd.*, [2008] EWHC 1006 (ch), [2008] All E.R. (D) 105 (May).

⁶⁵⁶Nicholas Le Poidevin, *Corporate trustees: The limits of responsibility*, 6(4) Tr. Q. Rev. 7 [a STEP publication].

⁶⁵⁷*See generally* §5.4.1.8 of this handbook (right and standing of beneficiary to proceed in stead of trustee against those with whom the trustee has contracted, against tortfeasors, and against the trustee’s agents *i.e.*, against third parties).

⁶⁵⁸Restatement (Second) of Trusts §225 cmt. b.

⁶⁵⁹Restatement (Second) of Trusts §225 cmt. b.

On the other hand, if the activities of an external agent, *i.e.*, independent contractor, had been the cause of the problem, whether or not there was liability to the beneficiary *on the part of the corporate trustee* would in part depend upon the prudence or lack thereof of the corporate trustee in selecting and retaining the external agent.⁶⁶⁰ As a general rule, a natural person has knowledge of a fact if the person has actual knowledge of it; has received a notice or notification of it; or from all the facts and circumstances known to the person at the time in question, has reason to know it.⁶⁶¹ On the other hand, a corporate trustee would have notice or knowledge of a fact only when the information is received by an employee having responsibility to act for the trust, or would have been brought to the employee's attention had the corporate trustee exercised reasonable diligence.⁶⁶² In other words, notice to a corporate trustee is not necessarily achieved by giving notice to a branch office.⁶⁶³ Nor does it necessarily acquire knowledge at the moment a notice arrives in the mailroom.⁶⁶⁴ A corporate trustee exercises reasonable diligence if it maintains reasonable routines for communicating significant information to the employee having responsibility to act for the trust and there is reasonable compliance with the routines.⁶⁶⁵ In any case, that a corporate trustee is found not liable to the beneficiaries for the malfeasance or nonfeasance of an external agent does not mean that the agent must be so found as well.

There are also instances where internal agents such as trust officers have been sued personally, along with their corporate employers, for breaches of fiduciary duty, notwithstanding the fact that the corporate employer was the named trustee.⁶⁶⁶ True, the trust company may be held liable for the acts of the trust officer under the doctrine of *respondeat superior*.⁶⁶⁷ It does not follow from this, however, that the trust officer is then relieved of liability.⁶⁶⁸ A trust officer is at some personal financial risk if the trust company does not carry employee liability insurance; the trust company is financially weak, bankrupt,⁶⁶⁹ or otherwise unable or unwilling to indemnify the trust officer; or the trust officer's homeowner's policy does not cover acts performed in the course of employment. Certainly the trust beneficiaries would be tempted to mount an effort to have the officer of the insolvent trust company saddled with liabilities that run to them directly. Why? Because the beneficiaries would merely be general creditors of the insolvent trust

⁶⁶⁰Restatement (Second) of Trusts §225(2)(c).

⁶⁶¹UTC §104(a) (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>).

⁶⁶²UTC §104(a) cmt. (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>).

⁶⁶³UTC §104(a) cmt. (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>).

⁶⁶⁴UTC §104(a) cmt. (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>).

⁶⁶⁵UTC §104(b) (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>).

⁶⁶⁶*See generally* 5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3, n. 1; 4 Scott on Trusts §326.3.

⁶⁶⁷*See generally* §6.1.4 of this handbook (the trustee's duty not to delegate critical fiduciary functions). *See also* §7.3.3 of this handbook (trustee's liability as legal owner in tort to nonbeneficiaries) and §8.32 of this handbook (whether the trustee may escape liability for making a mistake of law if he acted in good faith on advice of counsel). The UTC provides that a corporate trustee that conducts activities through employees has notice or knowledge of a fact involving a trust only from the time the information was received by an employee having responsibility to act for the trust, or would have been brought to the employee's attention if the corporate trustee had exercised reasonable diligence. UTC §104(b) (available at <<http://www.uniformlaws.org/Act.aspx?title=Trust%20Code>>). A corporate trustee exercises reasonable diligence if it maintains reasonable routines for communicating significant information to the employee having responsibility to act for the trust and there is reasonable compliance with the routines. UTC §104(b). Would a corporate trustee's exercise of "reasonable diligence" insulate it from vicarious liability for the actions of the employees?

⁶⁶⁸*See* Bogert §901 n.10 and accompanying text; 4 Scott on Trusts §326.3; 5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3 (noting that the claim of a corporation against its directors or officers for causing it to incur fiduciary liability is a corporate asset).

⁶⁶⁹*See generally* 4 Scott on Trusts §326.3.

company, at least to the extent the trust property itself could not be traced into the bankruptcy estate.⁶⁷⁰ Thus, it would be particularly unwise for a trust officer to park trust cash on the commercial side if the trust company's insolvency is a real possibility. Actual insolvency could well expose the trust officer to personal liability *to the beneficiaries* for any of the cash that could not be traced and recovered for the trusts, at least to the extent the trust officer knew or should have known about the entity's precarious financial situation.⁶⁷¹

Whether trust counsel has a fiduciary duty to the trust beneficiaries. As discussed in Section 8.8 of this handbook, the cases are all over the lot on the question of whether trust counsel represents the trustees, the beneficiaries, or both classes together. It is settled law, however, that in matters unrelated to the rendering of legal advice, a lawyer for a trustee has the same duty of undivided loyalty to the beneficiaries as does the trustee.⁶⁷² In one case, for example, a lawyer who was representing trustees in the sale of trust real estate secretly arranged with the brokers to take a portion of any commissions they might earn on the transaction. While the trustees were not found culpable, and although the trust ultimately was not harmed by the lawyer's machinations, the court nonetheless reduced the lawyer's compensation and ordered him to turn over the kickback to the trust estate.⁶⁷³

When trust counsel knowingly participates in a breach of trust. It goes without saying that trust counsel may not knowingly participate with the trustee in an act that would constitute a breach of trust, such as the sale of a parcel of trust real estate to counsel for less than fair market value in violation of the terms of the trust.⁶⁷⁴ A trustee who pays counsel out of entrusted funds legal fees that are demonstrably excessive is wasting trust assets.⁶⁷⁵ It is self-evident that counsel is a knowing participant in that breach.⁶⁷⁶ Suffice it to say, a trust counsel who knowingly participates in any act that might reasonably be considered by a court to be a breach of trust is asking for trouble.⁶⁷⁷

On the other hand, trust counsel generally would not be liable to the trust beneficiaries for participating in a breach of trust if all that counsel did was render naked legal advice to the trustee as to the law applicable to an act of the trustee that was in a breach of trust, or to an act that if undertaken by the trustee would be in breach of trust.⁶⁷⁸ That is not to say that counsel could not incur liability to the trustee, and possibly to the beneficiaries, as well, for negligently rendering faulty legal advice.⁶⁷⁹ But that would be for the commission of a tort, a legal proscription, not for the participation in a breach of trust, which is an equitable proscription.⁶⁸⁰

The third party who pays directly to the beneficiary a debt owed the trust. A third party who bypasses the trustee does so at his, her, or its peril. Take, for example, the trustee who holds legal title to

⁶⁷⁰5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.3 (Directors and Officers of Corporate Trustee).

⁶⁷¹*See generally* 3 Scott & Ascher §17.2.14.1.

⁶⁷²*See* Clarke's Estate, 12 N.Y.2d 183, 187, 188 N.E.2d 128, 130, 237 N.Y.S.2d 694, 697 (1962).

⁶⁷³Clarke's Estate, 12 N.Y.2d 183, 187, 188 N.E.2d 128, 130, 237 N.Y.S.2d 694, 697 (1962). *See also* In re Bond & Mortgage Guar. Co. (In re Half Moon Hotel), 303 N.Y. 423, 103 N.E.2d 721 (1952) (attorneys for trustee held liable for breach of the duty of undivided loyalty to the trust beneficiaries when they purchased at arm's length through third-party brokers interests in the underlying property, though there was no evidence of actual fraud, bad faith, or "manipulation of the trust dealings" by the attorneys).

⁶⁷⁴5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.4 (Attorneys and Other Agents).

⁶⁷⁵*See generally* §6.2.1.3 of this handbook (the trustee's duty not to waste the trust property).

⁶⁷⁶*See, e.g.,* McCormick v. Cox, 118 So. 3d 980, 982, 38 Fla. L. Weekly D1723 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2013) (upholding a finding of the trial court that the legal fees paid to trust counsel were "substantially unreasonable and unsupported by the evidence").

⁶⁷⁷5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.4.

⁶⁷⁸5 Scott & Ascher §30.6.4.

⁶⁷⁹*See generally* §8.8 of this handbook (whom trust counsel represents).

⁶⁸⁰*See generally* §8.8 of this handbook (whom trust counsel represents).

contractual rights against a third party, such as rights against the corporate issuer of a bond or rights against an insurance company incident to one of its insurance policies.⁶⁸¹ In other words, a bond or an insurance contract is a trust asset. The third party, instead of making a payment to the trustee, who is the other party to the contract, takes it upon itself to make a payment directly to the trust beneficiary, who is not of full age and legal capacity. The trustee may have a fiduciary duty to seek to compel the third party to make the payment a second time, this time to the trustee.⁶⁸²

A third party definitely risks having to pay twice if it makes a payment to the beneficiary designated in the governing instrument in the face of a valid assignment of the equitable interest, even when the “original” beneficiary is of full age and legal capacity and even if the third party had no notice, actual or constructive, of the assignment.⁶⁸³ The trustee to whom the obligation ran and to whom the payment should have been made did not receive it.⁶⁸⁴ Nor did the assignee, the current possessor of the equitable property interest, receive the payment.⁶⁸⁵ If the third party has any recourse, it is against the original or former beneficiary.

Liability of third-party purchasers of trust property to the beneficiaries. As we have noted throughout this handbook, a third party who knowingly participates with a trustee in a breach of trust shares with the trustee liability for any losses occasioned by the breach. If the trustee transfers trust property in breach of trust to a third-party purchaser who is aware of the breach, the third-party purchaser holds the trust property subject to the terms of the trust.⁶⁸⁶ Otherwise, “such a purchaser is liable only if the trustee commits a breach of trust in making the transfer and the purchaser has notice that the trustee is doing so.”⁶⁸⁷ At common law, however, it was doctrine that even the innocent third-party purchaser had a continuing obligation running to the trust beneficiaries to see to it that the trustee properly applied the purchase price.⁶⁸⁸ In the United States, such an innocent third party either by case law or by statute has been relieved of such an obligation.⁶⁸⁹ “In England, the old rule has been repudiated by statute.”⁶⁹⁰

Liability of a third party who fails to honor a Uniform Trust Code Section 1013 certification. The trustee of the typical trust will have numerous occasions to transact with third parties in furtherance of the trust’s lawful purposes. This is appropriate as the trustee holds the legal title to the trust property,

⁶⁸¹See generally §9.9.4 of this handbook (bank accounts and other such debtor-creditor contractual arrangements are not trusts) and §9.9.1 of this handbook (life insurance and other such third-party beneficiary contracts are not trusts).

⁶⁸²The third-party obligor who makes a payment directly to the trust beneficiary instead of to the title-holding trustee, the other party to the contract, does so at his, her, or its peril, unless directed to do so by the trustee. 5 Scott & Ascher §32.1 (Discharge by Beneficiary of Claim Against Third Person). If the beneficiary is not of full age and legal capacity, the third-party obligor runs the risk of having to pay twice. 5 Scott & Ascher §32.1 (Discharge by Beneficiary of Claim Against Third Person). There is a similar risk if following the direction were to constitute a knowing participation with the trustee in a breach of trust, or if the trust were a spendthrift trust. 5 Scott & Ascher §32.1 (Discharge by Beneficiary of Claim Against Third Person).

⁶⁸³5 Scott & Ascher §32.1 (Discharge by Beneficiary of Claim Against Third Person). See generally §5.3.2 of this handbook (voluntary transfers of the equitable (beneficial) interest under a trust).

⁶⁸⁴5 Scott & Ascher §32.1.

⁶⁸⁵5 Scott & Ascher §32.1.

⁶⁸⁶See generally §5.4.2 of this handbook (rights of the beneficiary as against transferees of the underlying trust property).

⁶⁸⁷5 Scott & Ascher §30.1 (Misapplication of Payments Made to Trustee).

⁶⁸⁸5 Scott & Ascher §30.1. See also §8.15.69 of this handbook (third party liability for trustee’s misapplication of payments to the trustee).

⁶⁸⁹5 Scott & Ascher §30.1, n.5 (Case Law) & n.7 (Statute).

⁶⁹⁰5 Scott & Ascher §30.1 (referring to Trustee Act, 1925, 15 Geo. V., c. 19, §14 (England)).

and, thus, “as to the world” is its owner. A third party might be selling an asset to, or purchasing an entrusted asset from, the trustee. A third party might be loaning funds to the trustee in his fiduciary capacity or borrowing entrusted property from the trustee. A third party might be selling goods and services to the trustee or purchasing goods and services from the trustee, all in furtherance of the trust’s lawful purposes. The trustee also may properly retain third-party agents in furtherance of the trust’s lawful purposes, such as attorneys-at-law and investment managers.

Section 1013(h) of the Uniform Trust Code provides as follows: “A person...[other than a beneficiary]...making a demand for the trust instrument in addition to a certification of trust or excerpts is liable for damages if the court determines that the person did not act in good faith in demanding the instrument.”

The information in a trustee’s Uniform Trust Code §1013 certification is limited to the following bits of information:

- That the trust exists and its date of execution
- The identity of the settlors
- The powers of the trustee
- The revocability or irrevocability of the trust and the identity of any persons holding a power to revoke
- The authority of cotrustees to sign or otherwise authenticate and whether all or less than all are required in order to exercise the powers of the trustee
- The trust’s taxpayer identification number
- The manner of taking title to trust property
- A statement that the trust has not been revoked, modified, or amended in any manner that would cause the representations contained in the certification to be incorrect.

A Uniform Trust Code §1013 certification, however, “need not contain the dispositive terms of a trust.” Unexplained are the nature of the “liability” and “damages” that are being contemplated by subsection (h). Nor is a definition of “good faith” even supplied in this context. Presumably, the third party is subject to some type of tort liability, but what duty of care is implicated by the “making of a demand for a trust instrument”? According to the section’s official commentary, left to “other law” is the issue of “how damages for a bad faith refusal are to be computed.” Also unspecified is to whom this demanding “person” would be liable in the face of a judicial determination of liability.

A third party contemplating dealing with a trustee should be able contractually to defang Uniform Trust Code §1013(h), assuming it actually has fangs. Time will tell whether it actually does in the face of all this statutory vagueness.

May Uniform Trust Code §1013’s general applicability be negated effectively *ab initio* by the trust’s terms? In the face of subsection (g) of Uniform Trust Code §1013, some settlors may want to consider doing just that so as to better protect the equitable property rights of the beneficiaries of their trusts. Subsection (g) provides as follows: “A person who in good faith enters into a transaction in reliance upon a certification of trust may enforce the transaction *against the trust property* [emphasis supplied] as if the representations contained in the certification were correct.” The problem is that the third party who is not furnished a copy of the trust instrument, only a cryptic trustee certification, will not be privy to the Uniform Trust Code §1013 negation provision and therefore may well not be bound by its terms.

Related sections. As to whether a trustee may shift liability for breaches of fiduciary duty on to the shoulders of his agents, see Section 3.2.6 of this handbook (Considerations in the Selection of a Trustee). As to the beneficiary’s right to proceed in the stead of the trustee directly against the trustee’s agents, the

reader is referred to Section 5.4.1.8 of this handbook (Right (of Beneficiary) to Proceed in Stead of Trustee against Those with Whom the Trustee Has Contracted, against Tortfeasors, and against His Agents, *i.e.*, against Third Parties). As to the duties, if any, that a trustee's counsel may have to the beneficiaries, the reader is referred to Section 8.8 of this handbook (Whom Does Counsel Represent?). So too *a beneficiary* who consents to a breach of trust and/or participates in a breach of trust may incur liability to the other beneficiaries for so doing, a topic that is covered in Section 5.6 of this handbook.⁶⁹¹ For a discussion of the inbound external liabilities of third parties generally to the trustee or the beneficiary, or both, see Section 3.6 of this handbook.

⁶⁹¹*See also* 4 Scott & Ascher §25.2.6.3 (Participation by Beneficiary in Breach of Trust).