PREVIEW COPY

This document is a sample of study materials prepared by NCA Made Easy for National Committee on Accreditation (NCA) examination preparation. It is provided solely for preview and evaluation purposes.

The content is intended for educational use only and does not constitute legal advice. This material is not an official publication of, nor affiliated with, the National Committee on Accreditation, the Federation of Law Societies of Canada, or any Canadian governmental authority.

NCA PROPERTY LAW IRACs -Preview

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Topics covered in Property Law IRACs

CHAPTER 1: Property in Context

Topic 1: Sources of Canadian Property Law and the Nature of Property Rights

Covers:

- Indigenous traditions of landholding
- Aboriginal title (*Calder, Guerin, Delgamuukw, Tsilhqot'in*)
- Royal Proclamation 1763
- Reception of English law
- Feudal tenure & estates (*Quia Emptores, Tenures Abolition Act*)
- *Numerus Clausus* principle
- Property and the State (division of powers, Charter, constructive taking)

CHAPTER 2: Boundaries of Property

Topic 2: Boundaries of Land: Airspace, Subsurface, Adjoining Land, Water, and Fixtures

Covers:

- Cujus est solum doctrine
- Subsurface ownership & encroachment
- Mines and minerals
- Lateral & vertical support
- Riparian rights & accretion
- Fixtures test (degree & purpose of annexation)
- Tenant's fixtures
- Fixtures vs security interests

CHAPTER 3: Possession

Topic 3: Possession, Relative Title, Finders, Abandonment, and Gifts

Covers:

- Corpus & *animus possidendi*
- Possessory title (The *Tubantia*)
- Pre-possessory interest (*Popov v Hayashi*)
- Finders' rights (*Parker, Trachuk, Stewart*)
- Abandonment
- Gifts *inter vivos* (delivery, intention, acceptance)
- *Donatio mortis causa*

CHAPTER 4: Bailment

Topic 4: Bailment and Sub-Bailment: Creation, Duties, and Breach

Covers:

- What constitutes a bailment
- Types of bailments
- Standard of care
- Breach and remedies
- Sub-bailments and third-party rights

CHAPTER 5: Estates

Topic 5: Freehold Estates and Testamentary Interpretation

Covers:

- Fee simple (common law & statutory reforms)
- Fee tail (history & abolition)
- Life estates
- Powers & duties of life tenant (waste, encroachment)
- Interpretation of wills (*Re Walker, Re Taylor, Christiansen v Martini Estate*)

CHAPTER 6: Indigenous Rights in Land

Topic 6: Aboriginal Title, Consent, Infringement, and Duty to Consult

Covers:

- Nature, content & limits of Aboriginal title
- Proof of title
- *Tsilhqot'in* justification framework
- Duty to consult & accommodate (*Haida, Rio Tinto*)
- Rights short of title
- Indian Act reserves, CPs, Land Codes
- Modern treaties (*Nisga'a*)

CHAPTER 7: Equitable Interests

Topic 7: Equitable Interests and Trusts in Property

Covers:

- Development of equity
- Legal vs equitable ownership
- Statute of Uses
- Express trusts
- Resulting trusts & presumption of advancement (*Pecore*)
- Constructive trusts (institutional & remedial)
- Joint Family Venture (*Kerr v Baranow*)

CHAPTER 8: Conditional Transfers & Future Interests

Topic 8: Conditional Estates, Invalidity, and the Rule Against Perpetuities

Covers:

- Vested vs contingent interests
- Determinable estates vs conditions subsequent
- Uncertainty (*Hayes v Meade*)
- Marriage conditions
- Public policy (*Leonard Foundation, McCorkill*)
- Restraints on alienation
- Rule Against Perpetuities (elements & measuring lives)

CHAPTER 9: Leases and Licences

Topic 9: Leases, Assignments, Covenants, Termination, and Remedies

Covers:

- Nature of lease vs licence
- Assignment vs sublease
- Covenants running with the land (*Spencer's* Case)
- Consent to assignment (*Richfield*)
- Quiet enjoyment
- Termination & remedies (Highway Properties)
- Proprietary status of licences
- Residential tenancy reform (general principles)

CHAPTER 10: Shared Ownership

Topic 10: Co-Ownership: Joint Tenancy, Tenancy in Common, and Severance
Covers:

- Joint tenancy & four unities
- Intention & statutory presumptions
- Tenancy in common
- Severance (*Williams v Hensman*)
- Partition, sale, accounting between co-owners

CHAPTER 11: Servitudes

Topic 11: Easements and Restrictive Covenants Running with Land

Covers:

- Nature & requirements of easements
- Express & implied grant (necessity, *Wheeldon v Burrows*)
- Prescription & estoppel
- Scope & termination (*Harris v Flower, Laurie v Winch*)
- Restrictive covenants (*Tulk v Moxhay*)
- Benefit & burden
- Positive covenants (*Amberwood*)

1. Sources of Canadian Property Law & Nature of Property Rights

Issues:

1. Whether the claimed interest in land/property held by _____ [individual / community / state actor] is legally cognizable under Canadian property law, having regard to Indigenous traditions, Aboriginal title, and the reception of English law?

2. Whether the asserted property right falls within a recognized category of property interests under the *numerus clausus* principle, or is merely a personal or contractual right?

3. Whether the State's action _____ [legislation / regulation / approval / expropriation] constitutes a lawful regulation of property or an unconstitutional interference amounting to constructive taking?

Rules:

- Indigenous Property Systems (pre-contact legal orders)
- Royal Proclamation, 1763
- Aboriginal Title
    - *Calder v British Columbia (1973)*
    - *Guerin v The Queen (1984)*
    - *Delgamuukw v British Columbia (1997)*
    - *Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia (2014)* – Title Test
- Reception of English Law
- Feudal Tenure & Estates
    - *Quia Emptores, 1290*
    - *Tenures Abolition Act, 1660*
- Numerus Clausus Principle
- Property and the State
    - Division of Powers
    - Charter protections
    - Constructive taking doctrine (*Canadian Pacific Railway v Vancouver*; *Annapolis Group v Halifax*)

Analysis:

1. Nature and Sources of Canadian Property Law

Canadian property law is not derived from a single source. It is a composite legal system formed through the interaction of Indigenous legal traditions, English common law, and constitutional principles.

Prior to European sovereignty, Indigenous nations maintained complex systems of land tenure, grounded in communal stewardship, spiritual connection, and customary allocation of land use. These systems did not treat land as an alienable commodity but as a collective responsibility.

The assertion of Crown sovereignty did not automatically extinguish Indigenous land rights. This principle was first judicially recognized in *Calder v British Columbia*, where the Supreme Court confirmed that Aboriginal title existed prior to colonization and survived unless validly extinguished.

2. Aboriginal Title and Its Legal Character

Aboriginal title is a *sui generis* proprietary interest in land. In *Guerin v The Queen*, the Court held that Aboriginal title is neither a purely personal right nor a simple common law estate, but a unique interest that imposes a fiduciary duty on the Crown when dealing with Indigenous lands.

The modern content and proof of Aboriginal title were articulated in *Delgamuukw* and affirmed in *Tsilhqot'in Nation*, where the Court set out the three-part test for establishing title:

1. Sufficient occupation of the land prior to Crown sovereignty,
2. Continuity of occupation, where present occupation is relied upon, and
3. Exclusive occupation, demonstrating effective control.

Once established, Aboriginal title confers the right to exclusive use and occupation of land, subject only to internal limits (use must not be irreconcilable with the communal relationship to the land). Therefore, if _____ [Community Name] can satisfy this test, their interest constitutes a constitutionally protected proprietary interest under s.35 of the *Constitution Act, 1982*.

3. Reception of English Law and the Feudal Framework

English property law was received into Canada through colonization and formal instruments such as the Royal Proclamation of 1763, which simultaneously:

- Recognized Aboriginal title, and
- Asserted Crown sovereignty over land transactions.

Under English law, land was held through the feudal system, based on the doctrines of tenure (how land is held) and estate (the quantum of interest held). All land was ultimately held of the Crown.

The statute Quia Emptores (1290) halted the creation of new sub-tenures and promoted free alienability of land, while the Tenures Abolition Act (1660) abolished most feudal incidents, converting landholding into free and common socage.

These reforms form the backbone of modern Canadian property law and explain why private ownership exists as estates in land, not absolute ownership.

4. Numerus Clausus and the Nature of Property Rights

Under the *numerus clausus* principle, property law recognizes a closed list of proprietary interests enforceable against the world (in rem). Parties cannot invent new property rights merely through agreement.

Accordingly:

- Rights such as fee simple, leasehold, easement, mortgage, and trust are recognized proprietary interests.
- Novel or informal arrangements that do not fit within these categories remain personal or contractual rights only.

Therefore, if the claimed interest of _____ does not fall within a recognized category, it cannot bind third parties, regardless of the parties' intentions.

5. Property and the State: Regulation vs Taking

Property rights in Canada are not absolute. Governments may regulate land use through zoning, environmental controls, and planning legislation.

However, where state action:

1. Acquires a beneficial interest in property, and
2. Removes all reasonable uses of the property from the owner,

the courts may find a constructive taking, even absent formal expropriation (*CPR v Vancouver*; *Annapolis Group*).

While the Charter does not expressly protect property rights, constitutional limits arise through:

- Division of powers, and
- The common law doctrine of constructive taking.

Thus, if the government's action _____ [describe action] effectively strips the owner of meaningful use while conferring a benefit on the state, compensation may be constitutionally required.

Conclusion:

Canadian property law is grounded in multiple, intersecting legal sources. Indigenous property systems and Aboriginal title form a constitutionally protected foundation, while English common law supplies the structural doctrines of tenure, estates, and recognized property interests. The numerus clausus principle limits what can constitute a proprietary right, and state regulation of property is constrained by constitutional and common-law doctrines preventing uncompensated takings.

NCA PROPERTY LAW NOTES-Preview

TOPIC #1: PROPERTY IN CONTEXT

1. The sources of Canadian Property Law

(a) Indigenous Traditions

Indigenous traditions form one of the most important, though historically marginalized, sources of Canadian property law. Long before European colonization, Indigenous nations across what is now Canada had their own complex systems of law and governance, including systems of land tenure. These traditions provide an alternative understanding of property, very different from the English common law model of private ownership.

I. Nature of Indigenous Landholding

- Communal Stewardship: Land was not viewed as an alienable commodity that individuals could buy and sell. Instead, it was understood as belonging collectively to the community or nation. Individual families or clans might have rights to use specific territories for hunting, fishing, or farming, but these rights were always exercised within a broader framework of communal responsibility.
- Spiritual and Cultural Connections**:** Land was tied to identity, spirituality, and survival. Sacred sites, hunting grounds, and fishing waters carried cultural meaning beyond their economic utility. This created an ethos of stewardship rather than exploitation.
- Functional Allocation of Use: Indigenous legal systems allocated land and resources based on custom, kinship ties, and seasonal cycles. For example, some groups rotated hunting and fishing areas to maintain ecological balance. This ensured sustainability for future generations.

In short, Indigenous property systems were not based on *exclusive ownership and alienability, but on responsibility, reciprocity, and communal benefit*.

II. Recognition by the Crown – The Royal Proclamation of 1763

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 was issued after Britain gained control over French territories in North America. It is often called the "Indian Magna Carta" because it was the first formal recognition of Aboriginal land rights by the Crown.

Key principles:

- Aboriginal title to land was recognized.
- Land could only be transferred to the Crown, not to private individuals.
- Cession of land required formal treaties.

While the Proclamation recognized Indigenous interests in principle, in practice colonial expansion often ignored these requirements. Many lands were settled without treaties, leading to long-standing disputes.

III. The Survival of Aboriginal Title at Common Law

A central question in Canadian property law is whether Aboriginal land rights survived the Crown's assertion of sovereignty. For much of Canadian history, courts and governments assumed that Indigenous rights had been extinguished unless explicitly recognized.

However, the Supreme Court of Canada gradually shifted this view:

- *Calder v British Columbia* (1973): The Court recognized, for the first time, that Aboriginal title existed in Canadian law prior to colonization and survived unless extinguished by the Crown. Although the claim in *Calder* ultimately failed on procedural grounds, it was a turning point.
- *Guerin v The Queen* (1984): The Court described Aboriginal title as sui generis (unique). It is not simply a common law right, but also not a mere "personal right." It arises from the historic occupation of land by Indigenous peoples. Importantly, the Court imposed a fiduciary duty on the Crown when dealing with reserve lands, meaning the Crown must act in the best interests of Indigenous peoples.

IV. The Content of Aboriginal Title – *Delgamuukw* and *Tsilhqot'in*

The modern law of Aboriginal title was developed in *Delgamuukw v British Columbia* (1997) and *Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia* (2014).

- *Delgamuukw* (1997): The Court held that Aboriginal title is a right in land itself, not just a right to hunt or fish. It includes the right to exclusive use and occupation. However, it has important limits: land cannot be used in ways that are irreconcilable with the collective relationship to it (e.g., cannot be strip-mined if that undermines cultural survival).
- *Tsilhqot'in* (2014): For the first time, the Court issued a declaration of Aboriginal title over a specific area of land. It confirmed that title includes the right to decide how land is used, the right to enjoy its benefits, and the right to exclude others. The Court also set out the test for proving title:
  - Sufficient occupation at the time of Crown sovereignty;
  - Continuous occupation (not necessarily unbroken, but consistent with patterns of land use);
  - Exclusive occupation, meaning effective control over the land.

While Aboriginal title is powerful, it is not absolute. The Crown can infringe Aboriginal title if it meets a justification test: the infringement must serve a compelling and substantial public purpose (such as resource development or infrastructure) and must be consistent with the Crown's fiduciary duty.

V. Constitutional Protection – Section 35

Section 35 of the *Constitution Act*, 1982 affirms the existing Aboriginal and treaty rights of Indigenous peoples. Courts have interpreted s. 35 as providing constitutional protection to Aboriginal title, which cannot be infringed except under strict justification. This marks a major departure from earlier eras when Indigenous property systems were ignored.

VI. Ongoing Challenges

Despite legal recognition, practical challenges remain:

- Many Indigenous nations continue to assert title over lands not covered by treaties.
- Negotiations between governments and Indigenous groups are slow and complex.
- Conflicts frequently arise in resource development projects, where governments and corporations seek to use land that Indigenous groups claim under Aboriginal title.

Cases like *Haida Nation v British Columbia* (2004) and *Rio Tinto Alcan v Carrier Sekani* (2010) require governments to consult and, where appropriate, accommodate Indigenous groups even before title is legally proven.

(b) English law

(i) Feudal Structures and the Doctrines of Tenures and Estates

The feudal system was the backbone of English property law and continues to influence Canadian property law in subtle but important ways. Introduced after the Norman Conquest of 1066, feudalism reorganized the entire system of landholding around the supremacy of the Crown. The core idea was that all land was ultimately owned by the King, and no individual subject could claim absolute ownership in the modern sense. Instead, individuals became "tenants," holding land from the Crown or from another lord higher in the hierarchy, in return for obligations of service, loyalty, or rent. This structure created a pyramid of landholding, with the Crown at the top, tenants-in-chief (such as nobles and bishops) below, and layers of sub-tenants beneath them.

The doctrine of tenure expressed this relationship: it defined *how* land was held, namely, of whom it was held and on what terms. The doctrine of **estates**, by contrast, explained *what* interest a tenant held in land and for *how long*. A person might hold an estate for life, for a fixed term of years, or in fee simple, which represented the most extensive form of inheritable interest. Together, the doctrines of tenures and estates ensured that landholding was not absolute but conditional, structured, and linked to duties within the social and political order. This arrangement gave the monarch control, provided a stable system of governance, and ensured that land could be distributed in a way that reinforced loyalty and service.

Although military and religious aspects of tenure eventually became obsolete, the conceptual framework of tenures and estates was transplanted to Canada through the reception of English law and remains foundational to our property system today.

ii) Origin and Rationale

The origins of the feudal system lay in the political and military circumstances of medieval England. After the Norman Conquest, William I needed to consolidate his power over a newly conquered territory and to secure military support against future threats.

Land was the principal source of wealth and stability, and so the Crown used it as the foundation of governance. By declaring that all land ultimately belonged to the King, William created a system in which every subject's relationship to land was also a relationship to the Crown. In exchange for a grant of land, tenants-in-chief owed services, usually military, and in turn could grant portions of their land to sub-tenants who owed them obligations. In this way, the Crown could rely on a chain of duties and loyalties that reached throughout the kingdom.

The rationale of the system was both practical and symbolic. Practically, it provided a ready supply of armed men and ensured that those who held land had a direct stake in the defense and stability of the realm. Symbolically, it reinforced the supremacy of the Crown by making clear that no one held land free of the King's authority. At the same time, the doctrines of tenure and estates introduced order and predictability to landholding. Tenure explained the obligations of the tenant to the lord, while estates defined the temporal scope of the tenant's interest, whether for a lifetime, a term of years, or indefinitely in fee simple. This legal framework created a structured society in which rights to land were inseparable from duties, and it served to bind subjects together in a hierarchy that was both economic and political.

Although the feudal system no longer operates in its medieval form, its origin and rationale explain why Canadian property law still retains features such as the doctrine of estates and the principle that land is ultimately held of the Crown. These remnants continue to shape the way property rights are conceptualized today.

iii) Forms, Especially Free and Common Socage

Feudal tenures were classified into various forms, with the most significant for Canadian property law being free and common socage. Free and common socage was a form of tenure that involved the holding of land in return for non-military services, often agricultural work or a monetary rent. It was a relatively stable and secure form of landholding compared to other feudal tenures like knight service or serjeanty.

In Canada, free and common socage became the predominant form of land tenure after the decline of the feudal system. It provided landholders with greater security and certainty, as obligations were fixed and predictable.

iv) Incidents of Tenure

The incidents of tenure were obligations and rights that arose from the feudal relationship between lord and tenant.

Key incidents included:

- Homage and Fealty: Acts of loyalty and allegiance to the lord.
- Military Service: The primary obligation in the feudal system, though it became less common over time.
- Relief: A payment made by an heir upon inheriting an estate.
- Wardship and Marriage: The lord's rights to control the estate and marriage of a minor heir.
- Escheat: The reversion of land to the lord if the tenant died without heirs.

These incidents were gradually phased out or modified, especially as the feudal system began to decline.

v) Truncation and Decay of the Feudal Structure

The feudal structure began to decay due to several key legal developments:

- Quia Emptores, 1290: This statute allowed tenants to sell or transfer their land without the lord's consent, effectively halting the creation of new sub-tenures and promoting the free alienability of land. It marked the beginning of the end for the rigid feudal hierarchy.
- Tenures Abolition Act, 1660: This act abolished many feudal incidents in England, including knight service, wardship, and marriage, transitioning most

tenures to free and common socage. This change was essential in simplifying landholding and making land ownership more secure and less burdensome.

These reforms were mirrored in Canadian property law, leading to a more modern system of land tenure.

(c) Reception of English Law and Overlay of English Law on Pre-existing Aboriginal Property Rights

The reception of English law in Canada occurred through the colonization process. When British settlers arrived in Canada, they brought with them English common law and legal principles, including those related to property. The reception was formalized through various statutes and proclamations, such as the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and subsequent colonial laws.

English property law provided the foundational legal framework for land ownership, transfer, and dispute resolution in Canada. This reception ensured continuity and stability in legal principles, which were adapted to Canadian circumstances over time.

The imposition of English law on pre-existing Aboriginal property rights is a critical and contentious aspect of Canadian property law. Before European colonization, Indigenous peoples in Canada had their own systems of land tenure and use, which were based on communal ownership, stewardship, and deep spiritual connections to the land.

The Royal Proclamation of 1763 acknowledged Aboriginal title to land and established protocols for land cessions, requiring that land could only be ceded to the Crown through formal treaties. However, the implementation of these principles was inconsistent, and many Indigenous land rights were ignored or overridden by colonial expansion and settlement.

The overlay of English property law often led to the dispossession and marginalization of Indigenous peoples. While some treaties were negotiated, many Indigenous lands were taken without consent or adequate compensation, leading to ongoing legal and political disputes.

In recent decades, there has been a growing recognition of Indigenous land rights and title in Canadian law, reflected in landmark court cases such as *Calder v. British Columbia (Attorney General) (1973), R. v. Guerin (1984), Delgamuukw v. British Columbia (1997), and Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia (2014).* These cases have affirmed that Aboriginal title exists and is protected by the Canadian Constitution, leading to a more complex and evolving legal landscape where Indigenous and common law property rights coexist and interact.

Tsilhqot'in Nation v. British Columbia (2014)

The case of *Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia* (2014) is a landmark decision by the Supreme Court of Canada that further clarified the nature and extent of Aboriginal title. The Tsilhqot'in Nation claimed Aboriginal title to a large area of land in British Columbia. The Supreme Court recognized the Tsilhqot'in Nation's title to this land, marking the first time that a Canadian court had made such a declaration for a specific piece of land.

The decision established several important principles:

- Nature of Aboriginal Title: Aboriginal title confers the right to use and control the land and enjoy its benefits. This title is a collective right held by the community and is sui generis (unique).
- Land Use and Development: While Aboriginal title includes the right to determine how the land is used, this right is not absolute. The government can infringe on Aboriginal title if it meets a justification test, showing that the infringement is for a compelling and substantial public purpose and is consistent with the Crown's fiduciary duty to the Aboriginal group.
- Continuity and Sufficiency of Occupation: To prove Aboriginal title, the claimant group must show sufficient, continuous, and exclusive occupation of the land at the time of sovereignty.

The Tsilhqot'in decision has profound implications for resource development, land use planning, and the reconciliation process between Indigenous peoples and the Canadian state. It underscores the necessity of negotiating and accommodating Indigenous land rights in any developments on traditional territories.

Therefore, the sources of Canadian property law are deeply rooted in historical and legal traditions. The feudal structures and doctrines of tenures and estates laid the groundwork for landholding practices, while the reception of English law provided a comprehensive legal framework.

The overlay of English law on pre-existing Aboriginal property rights highlights the complex and often fraught interactions between colonial and Indigenous legal systems. Landmark cases like *Tsilhqot'in Nation v British Columbia* demonstrate the evolving recognition and affirmation of Indigenous land rights, contributing to a more just and equitable legal landscape in Canada. Understanding these sources is crucial for grasping the development and current state of property law in Canada.

NCA PROPERTY LAW Q&As Set-Preview

QUESTION 1 [35 marks]

Karla Kauer passed away on November 15, 2024. Her will reads in part as follows:

3. My house on [address] shall pass to Ricardo, and on his death to Esther.

4. I leave my farm to Maxwell and Francine for as long as the land is used to grow Canola. If the land is no longer used to grow Canola, my estate may re-enter.

6. All my worldly goods and possessions shall go to Kim. …

You are additionally informed of the following. Ricardo is 40 years old. Esther is married. Francine doesn't want to be a canola farmer. Maxwell was recently diagnosed with a life-threatening illness. Kim and Francine are both claiming a camping trailer that is located on the canola farm. The wheels of the trailer have been removed some time ago, and the trailer is resting on its own weight.

Identify and assess all property rights and claims with respect to the house [9 marks), the farm (13 marks), and the trailer (13 marks). Explain how those rights would be affected if Maxwell should pass away. In answering the questions pay careful attention to the instructions given at the beginning of the exam.

[HINT: Chapters 4, 7 & 2]

Sample Answer

In analysing the distribution of Karla Kauer's estate, specifically her house, farm, and trailer, each asset presents distinct legal issues under property law, particularly regarding estates, future interests, and the doctrine of fixtures. We will examine each component of her will, emphasizing relevant legal principles and case law to assess the property rights of the designated beneficiaries: Ricardo, Esther, Maxwell, Francine, and Kim.

The House [9 Marks]

Karla's will stipulate that her house "shall pass to Ricardo, and on his death to Esther." This language strongly suggests a life estate to Ricardo with a remainder interest to Esther. Under common law principles, a life estate grants Ricardo possessory rights over the property for his lifetime, after which ownership passes to Esther.

This interpretation is well-supported in ***Thomas v. Murphy***, where the court reinforced that a life estate confers only possessory rights, not ownership, to the life tenant.

Ricardo's life estate grants him the right to use, occupy, and benefit from the property; however, he must avoid waste, which refers to actions that would decrease the property's value or alter its fundamental character. The doctrine against waste is explained in ***Sifton v. Sifton***, where the court held that life tenants are obligated to preserve the property's value for the remainderman. Ricardo, therefore, cannot significantly alter or damage the property, ensuring that Esther receives it in a similar condition.

Esther's interest is classified as a vested remainder in fee simple. A remainder is a future interest that takes effect after the termination of a preceding life estate. ***Stuartburn (Municipality) v. Kiansky*** underscores that a vested remainder provides a present, though deferred, right to future ownership, ensuring that Esther's interest is secure upon Ricardo's death, irrespective of any intervening circumstances. Esther's vested interest means that she holds the absolute title to the property, effective once Ricardo's life estate ends. This clear sequence of life estate and remainder creates a straightforward legal relationship, unaffected by Maxwell's potential death or other external events.

In summary, Ricardo holds a life estate in the house, with Esther holding a vested remainder in fee simple. This arrangement ensures a seamless transfer of property upon Ricardo's death, aligning with common law principles regarding life estates and vested remainders, as illustrated in relevant case law.

The Farm [13 Marks]

Karla's will convey her farm to Maxwell and Francine "for as long as the land is used to grow Canola." Additionally, the will includes a clause allowing "my estate to re-enter" if the Canola farming condition is breached. This provision creates a **fee simple determinable estate**, meaning Maxwell and Francine's interest in the property is inherently conditional and terminable upon the cessation of Canola farming.

A fee simple determinable estate is a defeasible interest that automatically ends if a specific condition is unmet, as affirmed in ***Caroline (Village) v. Roper***.

Under common law, the phrase "may re-enter" implies that Karla's estate holds a possibility of reversion, a future interest that activates if Maxwell and Francine fail to fulfil the Canola farming condition. This right of re-entry permits the grantor (or their estate) to reclaim the property without further action if the condition is breached, as seen in ***Blackburn v. McCallum***. Here, the court enforced a re-entry right for failing a condition subsequent, highlighting the enforceability of reversionary clauses when tied to specific uses or purposes.

Francine's disinterest in farming complicates matters, as this reluctance could result in a breach of the condition if she and Maxwell do not uphold Canola farming on the land. According to ***Caroline (Village) v. Roper***, when the determinable condition ceases to be met, the interest automatically terminates, allowing Karla's estate to re-enter and reclaim ownership. If Maxwell were to pass away, Francine would inherit his interest, assuming they hold the property as joint tenants. However, her unwillingness to farm could soon lead to the condition's breach, triggering the estate's re-entry right. This possibility illustrates the inherent risk in conditional estates, where possessory rights are contingent on fulfilling specific obligations.

In conclusion, Maxwell and Francine hold a fee simple determinable in the farm, conditional on its use for Canola farming. Karla's estate retains a right of re-entry, which becomes effective if the farming condition is unmet. Should Maxwell pass away, Francine would assume full possession but must uphold the Canola farming condition to prevent the estate from reclaiming the property.

The Trailer [13 Marks]

The trailer, located on the Canola farm, presents additional complexity. Kim and Francine both claim the trailer, with Karla's will stating, "all my worldly goods and possessions shall go to Kim." This provision typically includes personal property or chattels, but whether the trailer qualifies depends on its classification as either a chattel or a fixture. Initially a chattel, the trailer's legal classification may shift if it has become affixed to the land with an intent of permanence. The trailer's wheels have been removed, and it now rests immovably on the ground, suggesting it may have become a fixture, rather than personal property. The legal doctrine of fixtures, as outlined in ***Stack v. Eaton***, dictates that items permanently affixed to property with the intention of permanence are considered part of the real estate.

The doctrine of fixtures examines the degree of annexation and purpose of attachment to determine whether an object is a fixture or remains personal property. ***La Salle Recreations Ltd. v. Canadian Camdex Investments Ltd***. reinforced that an item becomes part of the real property if it is physically attached to the land in a way that signifies permanence. In this case, the trailer, now fixed on the property, would likely be classified as a fixture, making it part of the farm's real property and subject to Maxwell and Francine's conditional ownership. Consequently, as a fixture, the trailer would not fall under Kim's inheritance of "worldly goods and possessions" since it has become integral to the real estate of the farm.

An alternative argument exists if the trailer were deemed a chattel, in which case it would fall under Kim's claim to Karla's personal property. However, courts typically emphasize the physical and intended permanency when applying fixture doctrine. In ***Stack v. Eaton*** **and** ***La Salle***, the courts ruled that once an item is attached with a degree of permanence, it typically cannot revert to personal property status. Therefore, it is more likely that the trailer will be treated as a fixture based on its physical attachment, classifying it as part of the farm and excluding it from Kim's inheritance.

If Maxwell passes away, Francine's control over the trailer as a fixture would remain, provided she continues Canola farming to maintain her determinable interest. If the farming condition ceases, however, Karla's estate could re-enter, reclaiming both the land and any attached fixtures, including the trailer. Therefore, the estate's reversionary interest prevails over both Francine's and Kim's claims if the farming condition is not upheld.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, Karla's estate plan assigns Ricardo a life estate in the house, with Esther holding a vested remainder in fee simple. This arrangement allows Ricardo possessory rights during his lifetime, with Esther's interest secured for the future. The farm is conveyed as a fee simple determinable estate, with Maxwell and Francine's possession contingent on maintaining Canola farming. This conditional interest allows Karla's estate to re-enter upon breach, reflecting the automatic termination principle upheld in defeasible interests.

Lastly, the trailer, likely deemed a fixture, becomes part of the farm property under Maxwell and Francine's conditional interest rather than a separate personal possession for Kim. Should Maxwell pass away, Francine's continued possession of the farm and trailer depends on fulfilling the Canola farming condition. Any cessation of farming would enable the estate to reclaim the property in full, in accordance with common law principles governing conditional estates, re-entry rights, and the doctrine of fixtures.
