Money Matters

Brought to you by the Fiduciary Institute of South Africa (FISA)



Cohabitees and "Universal partnerships"

Estate planning

As fiduciary specialists we are often asked about 'common law marriages'. There is a prevailing (mis) perception that one can acquire rights (such as to maintenance) simply by virtue of co-habiting with a romantic partner. This (mis) perception probably stems from anecdotal knowledge of the current debates internationally about

this issue. For example, the Law Commission of the United Kingdom has proposed amendments to the law of intestacy in England & Wales, in particular to allow someone who had cohabited with a partner who dies without a will, to inherit from his or her estate under the intestacy rules. The rule would be that the cohabitation lasted for five years or – if the couple had a child who was living in the same household at the date of death – for two years. However, in our law, no duty of

support arises by operation of law

in the case of unmarried cohabit-

ants. Thus in the case of the death

of one partner or on the break-up

of a relationship, a cohabitee does

not have any automatic claim to any

part of the other partner's estate

or to maintenance. It is only if

partners choose to marry or enter

into a contract to that effect, that a

mutual obligation of support arises. Ponelat v Schrepfer

Ponelat v Schrepfer
In certain circumstances, some cohabitees have managed to establish
contractual claims for a share of a
former partner's estate, on the basis
of what is known as a 'universal
partnership" or a 'joint venture

agreement. The recent Supreme Court of Appeal case, *Ponelat v Schrepfer*, illustrates the impact of the existence of a contract of

universal partnership.
Erica Schrepfer successfully led
evidence of facts that proved the

existence of such a contract for a

period of some 16 years. As a result, she was awarded a 35% share of the 'partnership' estate, and her former partner (Hans Ponelat) was awarded a 65% share. Ms

Schrepfer's evidence was that Mr.

Ponelat invited her to live with him

permanently as his life partner and support her and look after her 16 year old son. His deceased's wife's will stipulated that he would forfeit a share of his inheritance to his

of her death.

sons if he married within 10 years

Therefore he promised to marry Ms

Schrepfer after the 10 year period had lapsed. They lived together and shared a joint household, he told her repeatedly "what is mine is yours". She made all her assets and income available to the joint household. In relation to his electrical business, she assisted with administration after hours, helped when Mr. Ponelat's secretary was absent, entertained guests and business associates and acted as his

confidant and advisor. The court found that certain decisions that Mr. Ponelat made on her advice, contributed to the generation of income and or capital for the benefit of the partnership. Also, she was actively involved in improving a farm that Mr. Ponelat purchased (for example in the construction

of two self-contained apartments

which she then managed as tourist accommodation to generate additional income for the joint household). Furthermore she assisted in rearing and feeding cows and calves and the felling of trees which netted approximately R70 0000. She also performed administrative, book-keeping and cleri-

cal tasks, supervised employees,

negotiated agreements and oversaw

disputes. When Mr. Ponelat sold

the farm, he invested R1,2 million

in an Old Mutual insurance policy

which provided for one lump sum

payment to be payable to the sur-

vivor on the death of one of them.

Requirements for a Universal Partnership

The court summarized the essentials of a universal partnership as follows and confirmed that they can apply between spouses or cohabitees where they agree to pool their resources:

- each of the partners bring something into the partnership, whether it be money, labour or skill;
- (2) the business should be carried on for the joint benefit of the parties; and
 (3) the object should be to make
- (3) the object should be to make a profit
- (4) the contract should be legitimate

Where a tacit agreement is alleged, the claimant must prove that it was more probable than not that it had been concluded. In another recent SCA case (McDonald v Young, (24 March 2011), Mr McDonald cohabited with Ms Young for eight

years and tried to claim a 50% share of her property on the basis of an alleged joint venture agreement. The Court found that the evidence and conduct of the parties in that case did not justify the inference that there was consensus between them.

Summary In South African law, certain family

child, husband and wife, create a duty of support. In line with the Constitution, contractual rights of support are also supported by the common law. For example, the courts have recognized a contractual right of support arising out of a marriage in terms of Islamic law, and have found that a common law duty of support could, in certain circumstances, be extended to per-

son in a same-sex relationship

However whether such a contrac-

tual duty of support exists or not,

depends on the circumstances of

Contributions to this column came

relationships, such as parent and

from FISA member Tanya Cohen, Head Glacier Fiduciary Services. A list of FISA-registered practitioners

each case.

list of FISA-registered practitioners is available from secretariat@fidsa. org.za. Visit our website at www. fidsa.org.za FISA is a non-profit organisation that represents practitioners in the fiduciary industry and sets high minimum standards to

protect the public's interests. Activi-

ties of FISA members include but

are not restricted to the drafting of

wills, administration of trusts and estates, tax and financial advice and the management of client funds. FISA has more than 600 individual members who collectively manage in excess of R200 billion. Membership is open to any professional who meets the membership criteria.

¹ Volks NO v Robinson & others (2005), para 56

(2005), para 56 ² (802/10) [2011] ZASCA 167, 29 September 2011

September 2011 ³ Amod v Multilateral Motor Vehicle Accidents Fund

⁴ Satchwell v President of the Republic of South Africa