ESTATES, GIFTS, AND TRUSTS

Domestic Asset Protection Trusts

868-2nd

This Portfolio revises and supersedes 868 T.M. Portfolio 868 T.M. should be discarded.

Bloomberg Tax

TAX MANAGEMENT PORTFOLIOS™

ESTATES, GIFTS, AND TRUSTS

Domestic Asset Protection Trusts*

by

Richard W. Nenno, Esq. Wilmington Trust Company Wilmington, Delaware

Richard W. Nenno, Esquire, is a Senior Trust Counsel and Managing Director in the Wealth Management Division at Wilmington Trust Company, Wilmington, Delaware. Dick has over 40 years of estate planning experience and is admitted to the practice of law in Delaware and Pennsylvania. He is a Fiduciary Fellow of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel, a member of the Advisory Committee of the Heckerling Institute on Estate Planning, a Fellow of the American Bar Foundation, a member of the Bloomberg BNA Estates, Gifts, and Trusts Advisory Board, and a Distinguished Accredited Estate Planner. Prior to joining Wilmington Trust Company in 1982, he was an associate in the Estates Department of the Philadelphia law firm of Ballard, Spahr, Andrews and Ingersoll.

Dick is a *cum laude* graduate of Princeton University with an A.B. degree from the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. He earned his J.D. degree from Harvard Law School.

Dick is recognized as a national speaker and published authority on estate planning issues. He has presented at the Heckerling Institute on Estate Planning, the Hawaii Tax Institute, the Notre Dame Tax and Estate Planning Institute, the AICPA Advanced Estate Planning Conference, the NYU Institute on Federal Taxation, and The Tax & Estate Planning Forum (formerly the Southern California Tax & Estate Planning Forum). He is a member of the American Bar Association, Section of Real Property, Trust & Estate Law (former member of Council) and Section of Taxation; Delaware State Bar Association (former chair: Estates and Trusts Section); Estate Planning Council of Delaware, Inc. (former president); Philadelphia Bar Association.

Dick has written numerous publications. In addition to this Portfolio, he is the author of Federal Income- and Transfer-Tax Consequences of Domestic Asset-Protection Trusts, 45 Tax Mgmt. Est., Gifts & Tr. J. 75 (Mar. 12, 2020); Minimizing or Eliminating New York Income Taxes on Nongrantor Trusts, 45 Tax Mgmt. Est., Gifts & Tr. J. 27 (Jan. 9, 2020); Opportunities to Save State Income Taxes on Nongrantor Trusts Expanded by U.S. Supreme Court's "Kaestner Decision," 44 Tax Mgmt. Est., Gifts & Tr. J. 283 (Nov. 14, 2019); Forestalling Forties Follies, 153 Tr. & Est. 18 (June 2019) (Coauthor Emily B. Pickering, Esq.); 867 T.M., Choosing a Domestic Jurisdiction for a Long-Term Trust (2018); The Uniform Voidable Transactions Act: Why Transfers to Self-Settled Spendthrift Trusts by Settlors in Non-APT States Are Not Voidable Transfers Per Se, 42 Tax Mgmt. Est., Gifts & Tr. J. 173 (July 14, 2017) (Coauthors George D. Karibjanian and Daniel S. Rubin); Delaware Trusts 2017 (Wilm. Tr. Co. 2017); A Practitioner-Friendly Guide to the Delaware Asset-Protection Trust, 30 Prob. & Prop. 53 (Jan./Feb. 2016); Good Directions Needed When Using Directed Trusts, 42 Est. Plan. 12 (Dec. 2015); Getting a Stepped-Up Income-Tax Basis and More by Springing—or Not Springing—The Delaware Tax Trap the Old-Fashioned Way, 40 Tax Mgmt. Est., Gifts & Tr. J. 215 (Sept. 10, 2015); 869 T.M., State Income Taxation of Trusts (2013) and many other articles.

This Portfolio revises and supersedes 868 T.M., Domestic Asset Protection Trusts. Portfolio 868 T.M. should be discarded.

^{*} Content copyright 2020Wilmington Trust Company. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

BLOOMBERG TAX & ACCOUNTING makes available the following professional resources:

U.S. INCOME PORTFOLIO SERIES
MEMORANDUM
ESTATES, GIFTS AND TRUSTS PORTFOLIO SERIES
ESTATES, GIFTS AND TRUSTS JOURNAL
FOREIGN INCOME PORTFOLIO SERIES
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL
COMPENSATION PLANNING JOURNAL
REAL ESTATE JOURNAL

WEEKLY REPORT
TAX PRACTICE SERIES
FINANCIAL PLANNING JOURNAL
IRS PRACTICE ADVISER
ACCOUNTING POLICY & PRACTICE REPORT
ACCOUNTING PORTFOLIO SERIES
TRANSFER PRICING REPORT
STATE TAX PORTFOLIO SERIES
WEEKLY STATE TAX REPORT

For information, call 1-800-372-1033
- Visit our website at: https://pro.bloombergtax.com

BOARD OF EDITORS

Josh Eastright, CEO;
Lisa Fitzpatrick, PRESIDENT;
Jean McCormick, VICE PRESIDENT;

Benjamin A. Jung, Esq., DIRECTOR, FEDERAL TAX; Annabelle L. Gibson, Esq., DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL TAX; Marvin Cho, Steven Grodnitzky, Esq., Daniel A. Hauffe, Esq., Maria Menezes, Reema Patel, CPA, Dominick Schirripa, Esq., Shaun L. Terrill, Esq., Nicholas C. Webb, Esq., PRACTICE LEADS; Jayanti Singh, LL.M., ASSOCIATE PRACTICE LEAD; Eric H. Rubin, Esq., Kathleen M. Wise, Esq., MANAGING EDITORS;

Kathleen D. Adcock, Esq., M.B.A., Haji Aghayev, Esq., Jane Baniewicz, Esq., Alex Bayrak, J.D., Peter E. Burt, Esq., Mina O. Capouet, Esq., Joseph J. Ecuyer, Esq., Ashley Fausset, Esq., James H. Ferguson, Esq., Alessia Finocchiaro, LL.M., Stephanie Fiumara-Hudson, Esq., Amber Gorski, Esq., Lee J. Hadnum, FCA CTA, Joseph Hagedorn, Esq., Stephen J. Hetherington, Kelsey Jonas, Esq., Albert J. Kish, Esq., Tammara C. Madison, Esq., CPA, Nadia Masri, Esq., Barton Massey, CPA, Patricia A. McNeal, Esq., Juan P. Osman Moreno, LL.M., Ronald S. Newlin, Esq., CPA, Joanna Norland, J.D., Tiwa Nwogu, Esq., Lisa M. Pfenninger, Esq., Helen Prior, CTA, Peter H. Rho, Esq., Eric L. Rodriguez, Esq., Craig Rose, Nisreen Said, Kenneth S. Savell, Esq., Lauren H. Shapiro, Esq., Alexis Sharp, Esq., Tome Tanevski, Esq., Jocelyn U. Tilan, Esq., Ariam Tsighe, Esq., Seyi O. Tuyo, Esq., Robert I. Walker, Andrea White, Esq., Kevin Winters, Esq., Alexa Woods, J.D., LL.M., TAX LAW ANALYSTS; Larry Frank, Patrick Vincent, J.D., EDITORS; Sally Baird, SENIOR EDITORIAL PRODUCTION MANAGER

TECHNICAL ADVISORS
BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC
Lisa M. Starczewski, Esq., Technical Director

tall sig' (0) messo . The first of months

FOUNDER OF TAX MANAGEMENT PORTFOLIOS
Leonard L. Silverstein, Esq. (1922–2018)

Copyright Policy: Reproduction of this publication by any means, including facsimile transmission, without the express permission of The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. is prohibited except as follows: 1) Individual pages that are "Published by Tax Management Inc." may be reproduced without permission, but reproduction of entire chapters or tab sections is prohibited. 2) This publication may contain forms, notices, sample letters, or working papers. These may be copyrighted by Tax Management, but your permission fee includes permission to reproduce them for internal use or to serve individual clients or customers. 3) Subscribers who have registered with the Copyright Clearance Center and who pay \$1.00 per page per copy fee may reproduce other portions of this publication but not the entire contents. The Copyright Clearance Center is located at 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, Mass. 01923. Tel. (508) 750-8400. 4) Permission to reproduce Tax Management material otherwise can be obtained by calling (703) 341-5937. Fax (703) 341-1624.

TAX MANAGEMENT PORTFOLIOS™

ESTATES, GIFTS, AND TRUSTS

Domestic Asset Protection Trusts*

PORTFOLIO DESCRIPTION

Tax Management Portfolio, *Domestic Asset Protection Trusts**, No. 868-2nd, discusses various aspects of the domestic asset-protection trust (APT), including the reasons for and against recognizing such trusts; the benefits of such trusts; and the attributes of the Delaware, Alaska, Nevada, and South Dakota APT statutes.

The Portfolio then covers the income and transfer-tax ramifications of domestic APTs. The ability of a creditor to reach trust assets often impacts whether a transfer to a domestic APT is a completed gift and whether a domestic APT will be included in the settlor's gross estate.

An APT is an irrevocable trust in which the settlor retains some benefits that cannot be reached by the settlor's creditors. The Portfolio gives particular attention to potential application of the fraudulent transfer rules as well as to defending APTs against creditor attacks, noting, where appropriate, matters addressed by the Uniform Trust Code and the Restatement (Second) of Conflict of Laws.

After comparing Delaware APTs to Alaska, Nevada, and South Dakota APTs and comparing domestic APTs to foreign APTs, the Portfolio describes the designing, drafting, and funding of domestic APTs and various issues related to trust distributions. To avoid misunderstandings, the Portfolio recommends, among other things, that the attorney and trustee make clear to the APT's settlor at the beginning that the settlor will receive distributions only in accordance with the trust terms.

The Portfolio concludes with a discussion of the ethical and liability concerns of attorneys involved in domestic-APT planning.

The Worksheets provide citations to pertinent state statutes together with sample forms.

This Portfolio may be cited as Nenno, 868-2nd T.M., *Domestic Asset Protection Trusts.*

* This Portfolio, with commentary, is for informational purposes only and is not intended as an offer or solicitation for the sale of any financial product or service. It is not designed or intended to provide financial, tax, legal, accounting, or other professional advice since such advice always requires consideration of individual circumstances. If professional advice is needed, the services of a professional advisor should be sought.

Wilmington Trust is a registered service mark. Wilmington Trust Corporation is a wholly owned subsidiary of M&T Bank Corporation. Wilmington Trust Company, operating in Delaware only, Wilmington Trust, N.A., M&T Bank, and certain other affiliates, provide various fiduciary and non-fiduciary services, including trustee, custodial, agency, investment management, and other services. International corporate and institutional services are offered through Wilmington Trust Corporation's international affiliates. Loans, credit cards, retail and business deposits, and other business and personal banking services and products are offered by M&T Bank, member FDIC.

Wilmington Trust Company operates offices in Delaware only. Note that a few states, including Delaware, have special trust advantages that may not be available under the laws of your state of residence, including asset protection trusts and directed trusts.

IRS CIRCULAR 230: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that, while this Portfolio is not intended to provide tax advice, in the event that any information contained in this Portfolio is construed to be tax advice, the information was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding tax related penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any matters addressed herein.

* Content copyright 2020 Wilmington Trust Company. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

antenial enricement to the frontinger tremese when as yet at the determined ARTs

After community of the API's re Atask... No and South Datore API's and

This Bloomberg Tax Portfolio is not intended to provide legal, accounting, or tax advice for any purpose and does not apply to any particular person or factual situation. Neither the author nor the publisher assumes responsibility for the reader's reliance on information or opinions expressed in it, and the reader is encouraged to verify all items by reviewing the original sources.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			PAGE			DACE
DET	AILED ANAI	LYSIS	TAGE			PAGE
					12. Domestic APTs Can Even Benefit Tort	
I.	Introductio		A-1		Victims	A-13
	A. Backgrou		A-1		 Outright Gifts Are at Least as Hurtful to Creditors but Outright Gifts Are 	
		f the Rule Against Self-Settled			Allowed	A-13
	Trusts	0.160.41.175.40	A-2		I. Scope	A-13
		a Self-Settled Trust?	A-2			A-15
		Traditional Rule	A-3	II.	Benefits of Domestic Asset Protection	
		APT Option	A-3		Trusts	A-15
		ns of Creditor Protection Provided			A. Introduction	A-15
		Exemptions and Other Vehicles	A-4 A-4		B. Employ Tax Benefits	A-15
	 Introd Discla 	Court and	A-4 A-4		1. General	A-15
		cy-by-the-Entireties Property	A-5		2. Make Taxable Gifts to Reduce Federal	4 42
		leral Tax Lien	A-5		Transfer Tax	A-15
		alemantary.	A-6		3. Make Taxable Gifts to Reduce State	
		stitution	A-6		Death Tax	A-15
		stead Exemption	A-7		4. Assure Favorable Tax Treatment for	A 15
		leral Tax Lien	A-7		Grantor Trusts	A-15
		nkruptcy	A-7		C. Obtain Asset Protection 1. General	A-16 A-16
		Party Trusts	A-7		Protect Gifts and Inheritances	A-16
		leral Tax Lien	A-7		3. Protect Young Adults' Assets	A-16
	b. Res	stitution	A-8		4. Protect Assets from Future Ventures	A-16
	c. Chi	ld Support	A-8		5. Protect Vulnerable Persons	A-16
		Introduction	A-8		6. Provide Premarital Planning	A-16
		In re Cleopatra Cameron Gift			7. Protect Personal Injury Awards	A-16
		Trust	A-8		D. Protect CRTs and Other Estate Planning	10.02
	(3)	Comments	A-9		Vehicles	A-17
	Restitution	ution—Other Contexts	A-9		E. Shield Assets of Charitable Organizations	A-17
	7. Foreig	n APTs	A-9		F. Save State Income Tax	A-18
	G. Reasons	Against Recognizing Domestic			G. Provide Options for NRAs	A-18
	APTs		A-9		H. Provide Protection for Trusts Moved From	
		hould Pay One's Debts	A-9		Offshore or Other Domestic Jurisdictions	A-18
	Preser	ve Liability System	A-10			
		stic APTs "Always" Are	4	III.	Delaware Qualified Dispositions in	
	Fraudi		A-10		Trust Act	A-21
		for Recognizing Domestic APTs	A-10		A. Introduction	A-21
		rities Do Not Support the Scott			B. How to Create a Delaware APT	A-21
	Treatis		A-10		C. Who May Defeat a Delaware APT	A-22
	2. United	States Is Unique	A-10		1. Introduction	A-22
		ors Are Given More Rights Than	A 10		2. Creditors Who May Defeat a Delaware	
	Settlo		A-10		APT	A-22
	Ignore	sts of Other Beneficiaries Are	A-11		a. Pre-Transfer Claims	A-22
		r's Continuing Control Is	A-11		b. Post-Transfer Claims	A-22 A-23
	Releva		A-11		c. Family Claims d. Tort Claims	A-23
-		stic APTs Create Economic	74-11		D. Consequences if a Delaware APT Is	A-23
		ives and Encourage			Defeated	A-23
		preneurship	A-11		E. Moving Trusts to Delaware	A-24
		Self-Settled Vehicles Are	12.00		F. Infrastructure	A-24
	Recog		A-11		G. Tenancy-by-the-Entireties Property	A-24
		ess Blesses Domestic APTs	A-12		Contributed to Trust	A-25
		s Want APTs	A-12		H. Additional Protection for Trust	11-23
	10 Dom	estic APTs Preserve American			Distributions	A-26
	Busin		A-12	2.5		
		estic APTs Preserve United States		IV.		A-27
	Over	sight (the "Safe-Situs" Doctrine)	A-12		A. Introduction	A-27

		PAGE		PAGE
	B. How to Create an Alaska APT	A-27	c. Robinette v. Helvering	A-45
	C. Who May Defeat an Alaska APT	A-27	d. Estate of Kolb v. Commissioner	A-46
	D. Consequences if an Alaska APT Is	117.00	e. Ellis v. Commissioner	A-46
	Defeated	A-28	f. Rev. Rul. 80-255	A-47
	E. Moving Trusts to Alaska	A-28	g. Outwin v. Commissioner	A-47
	F. Infrastructure	A-29	5. Effect of Nongeneral Testamentary	
		A-23	Power of Appointment	A-47
/.	Nevada Spendthrift Trust Act	A-31	6. Impact of § 2702	A-48
	A. Introduction	A-31	a. Background	A-48
	B. How to Create a Nevada APT	A-31	b. Scope of § 2702	A-48
	C. Who May Defeat a Nevada APT	A-31	c. Implications	A-48
	D. Consequences if a Nevada APT Is	11 51	d. Exceptions to § 2702	A-48
	Defeated	A-32	e. Comment	A-48
	E. Moving Trusts to Nevada	A-32	f. Guidance	A-48
	F. Infrastructure	A-32	(1) Background	A-48
	r. Illitastructure	A-32	(2) PLR 9141027	A-48
/1.	South Dakota Qualified Dispositions in		(3) Rev. Rul. 2004-64	A-48
	Trust Act	A-35	(4) CCA 201208026	A-48
	A. Introduction	A-35	7. Structuring a Domestic APT to Be an	A-40
	B. How to Create a South Dakota APT	A-35		A-49
	C. Who May Defeat a South Dakota APT	A-35	Incomplete Gift	A-49
	Introduction	A-35	8. Structuring a Domestic APT to Be a	A 40
	2. Creditors Who May Defeat a South	A-33	Completed Gift	A-49
	Dakota APT	A-36	9. Report Gift	A-50
	a. Pre-Transfer Claims	A-36	E. Estate Tax	A-50
		A-36	1. Background	A-50
	b. Post-Transfer Claims		a. Section 2033	A-50
	c. Family Claims	A-36	b. Section 2036(a)(1)	A-50
	D. Consequences if a South Dakota APT Is	1 26	c. Section 2036(a)(2)	A-50
	Defeated	A-36	d. Section 2037	A-50
	E. Moving Trusts to South Dakota	A-37	e. Section 2038(a)(1)	A-50
	F. Infrastructure	A-37	f. Section 2041	A-50
/II.	Federal Income- and Transfer-Tax		g. Section 2042(2)	A-50
	Consequences of Domestic APTs	A-39	2. Relegation-of-Creditors Doctrine	A-50
	The state of the s		a. Background	A-50
	A. Introduction	A-39	b. In re Estate of Uhl	A-50
	B. Income Tax	A-39	c. Rev. Rul. 76-103	A-51
	1. General	A-39	d. Outwin v. Commissioner	A-51
	2. Tax Reimbursement—Discretionary	A-39	Retained Powers Not Resulting in	
	3. Tax Reimbursement—Mandatory	A-39	Estate Tax Inclusion	A-51
	4. State Income-Tax Reduction	A-39	a. Background	A-51
	C. Transfer Taxes	A-39	b. United States v. Byrum	A-51
	D. Gift Tax	A-40	c. Estate of Tully	A-52
	1. Introduction	A-40	d. PLR 8037116	A-52
	Relegation-of-Creditors Doctrine —		e. Rev. Rul. 80-255	A-52
	General	A-40	f. Estate of Wells v. Commissioner	A-52
	Relegation-of-Creditors Doctrine — Tax		g. Estate of German v. United States	A-53
	Context	A-41	h. Estate of Paxton v. Commissioner	A-53
	a. Background	A-41	i. TAM 8819001	A-53
	b. Paolozzi v. Commissioner	A-41	j. PLR 9141027	A-53
	c. In re Estate of Uhl	A-41	k. PLR 9332006	A-54
	d. Commissioner v. Vander Weele	A-41	1. PLR 9837007	A-54
	e. Rev. Rul. 76-103	A-42	m. Rev. Rul. 2004-64	A-54
	f. Rev. Rul. 77-378	A-42	n. PLR 200944002	A-54
	g. Outwin v. Commissioner	A-43	4. Commentary	A-54
	h. Estate of German v. United States	A-43	F. Assessing Creditors Who May Reach	4,5,0,0
	i. PLR 9332006	A-44	Domestic APT Assets	A-55
	j. PLR 9837007	A-44		A-56
	k. Rev. Rul. 2004-64	A-44	G. Planning Considerations	A-56
	1. PLR 200944002	A-45	H. Domestic APT Developments	A-30
	m. CCA 201208026	A-45	I. Structuring a Domestic APT to Be an	
		A-43	Incomplete Gift and a Nongrantor Trust:	A-56
	Exceptions to Relegation-of-Creditors Doctrine	A 15	The ING Trust	
		A-45 A-45	J. GST Tax	A-57
	a. Dackground		VIII. Fraudulent Transfer Rules	A-59
	b. Smith v. Shaughnessy	A-45	VIII. I I adduction I falloloi Trulos	100

	PAGE	PAG
A. Introduction	A-59	10. Recent Case Analysis Actually
Background	A-59	
2. A "Transfer" Must Occur	A-59	
3. Actual Fraud and Constructive Fraud	A-60	
4. Creditors' Remedies	A-61	W. Zilli South City
5. Burden of Proof	A-62	or action out the state of the
6. Limitations Periods	A-62	Bessions
a. General	A-62	c. Waldron v. Haber (in te Haber)
b. TrustCo Bank v. Mathews	A-63	d. In te Mortensen
7. Rules in Alaska	A-63	c. Offici cases
B. Claims by Future Creditors—Cases	A-63	11. Why This is a Distriction with a
1. Introduction	A-63	Difference:
Cases Recognizing Limited Nature of	11 05	12. Significance of the Comments and
Future Creditors' Rights	A-64	Backlash A-8
a. Background	A-64	13. State Ellactifichts of the CVIA
b. Jayne v. Hymer	A-64	a. Introduction A-6
c. Coleman v. Tepel	A-64	b. Arkansas A-o
d. Cram v. Cram	A-64	c. Indiana A-6
e. Wantulok v. Wantulok	A-65	d New York A-8
f. Klein v. Klein	A-65	
	A-65	
g. Pagano v. Pagano h. Palumbo v. Palumbo	A-65	
	A-03	A. Introduction
i. First National Bank in Kearney v.	1 65	B. Obstacle 1: Non-DAPT Court Might Lack
Bunn	A-65 A-65	Junsdiction
j. In re Oberst		I Introduction A-8
k. Hurlbert v. Shackelton	A-66	2. In Rem Jurisdiction A-8
Matter of Joseph Heller Inter Vivos	1 11	3. Personal Jurisdiction—General
Trust	A-66	Principles A-8
m. In re Piper Aircraft Corp.	A-66	4 Personal Jurisdiction—Trustee Concerns A-8
n. Riechers v. Riechers	A-66	5 Personal Jurisdiction—Federal Courts A-8
o. Case v. Fargnoli	A-66	6 Implications Δ-0
p. In re Earle	A-67	C. Obstacle 2: Non-DAPT Court Should/Must
q. Danis v. Great American Insurance	1.042	Dealing Invidiation A C
Co.	A-67	1. Restatement Approach—Movables A-9
Cases Not Recognizing Limited Nature		2 Destatement Assessed Land A.C.
of Future Creditors' Rights	A-67	2 LITC A
a. Background	A-67	4 LIDTA A
b. United States v. Townley	A-67	5 5 1 15 1 1 2 1 1 2 1 1
c. United States v. Nassar	A-67	
4. Estate Planning Motives Not		D. Obstacle 3: Venue Might Be Bad A-9
Determinative	A-67	
C. Claims by Future Creditors—Commentary	A-68	
D. Applicable Law	A-69	Judgments Given Full Faith and Credit A-9
1. Introduction	A-69	1. Introduction A-9
2. Terry v. June	A-70	2. The Right to Limit Remedies A-9
3. In re Heritage Organization, LLC	A-71	3. The Restrictive Domestic APT Remedy A-9
4. Other Authorities	A-72	4. APTs Are Not Inherently Fraudulent A-9
5. TrustCo Bank v. Mathews	A-72	
6. Implications of the UVTA	A-73	
E. The Uniform Voidable Transactions Act	A-73	(1) P 1 1
Introduction	A-73	(a) D m C C 1
2. Background	A-73	
2 C CINTA CIO	A-74	(a) D
	A-74	
	A-74	
C D: COM I T II	14-14	Nominee Trusts, and Related Issues A-9
6. Dissecting SST Law—Trust Law or	A 75	
Voidable Transaction Law?	A-75	사용하다 그 아니라 아이는 아이는 아이는 아이를 하는 것이 아니라 아이를 하는 것이 아니라 아니라 아이를 하는 것이다.
7. Origins in English Law—The Statute		
of Henry VII vs. the Statute of	A 76	
Elizabeth I	A-75	N. F. Col.
8. Application of the Restatements of	4 70	Not Entities A-S
Trusts and the Uniform Trust Code	A-75	
9. Historical Case Law Analysis—Flawed		Trusts Are Not Persons A-5
Arguments for Support	A-76	4. Trustees Can Be Alter Egos A-9

	PAGE		PAC
5. The Alter-Ego Theory and Trusts		(2) Administration	A-1
Around the Country	A-99	(3) Construction	A-1
a. State Statutes	A-99	(4) Restraints on Alienation of	74-1
•			Α 1
b. Other Jurisdictions	A-100	Beneficiaries' Interests	A-I
(1) Introduction	A-100	f. Type of Question—Effectiveness of	4.5
(2) The TransFirst Case	A-100	Designation	A-1
(3) The TransFirst Commentary	A-101	(1) Validity	A-1
(4) Other Authorities—Alter-Ego		(a) Trust of Movables Created	
Theory Not Available	A-102	Inter Vivos	A-1
(a) Introduction	A-102	(b) Substantial Relation to the	
(b) In re Huber	A-102	Trust	A-1
(c) In re Reuter	A-102	(c) Strong Public Policies	A-1
(d) In re Raymond	A-102	(d) Most Significant Relationship	A-1
(e) Church Joint Venture v.	11 102	(e) Trust of Land Created Inter	
Blasingame	A-102	Vivos	A-1
	A-102	(2) Restraints on Alienation of	A-1
(5) Other Authorities—Alter-Ego	4 100		A 1
Theory Available	A-102	Beneficiaries' Interests	A-1
(a) Introduction	A-102	(a) Trust of Movables Created	
(b) United States v. O'Shea	A-102	Inter Vivos	A-1
(c) United States v. Scherer	A-103	(b) Trust of Land Created Inter	
(d) United States v. Williams	A-103	Vivos	A-
(e) United States v. Nelson	A-103	Restatement Approach—Application	A-
(f) Saepoff v. North Cascade		 a. Restatement Approach—Movables 	A-
Trustee Services, Inc.	A-103	(1) Introduction	A-
6. Applying the Alter-Ego Doctrine in the	10.00	(2) Validity	A-
Trust Context	A-103	(a) Introduction	A-
7. Protectiveness of Nevada and Delaware	11-105	(b) Questions of Validity	A-:
	A-103		A-
Entities		(c) Substantial Relation to the	
8. Sham-Trust Theory	A-104	Trust	A-
9. Sham-Trust Theory—Limited Tax	4.444	(d) Strong Public Policy	A-
Holdings	A-104	(e) Most Significant Relationship	9.0
Sham-Trust Theory—Unrevealing		to the Matter at Issue	A-
State Law Holdings	A-105	(3) Restatement (Second) of Conflict	
11. In re Baum—A Federal Attempt to		of Laws § 273—Restraints on	
Divine State Law	A-106	Alienation of Beneficiaries'	
12. The Nominee-Trust Theory	A-106	Interests	A-
13. The Nominee-Trust Theory: State	12,227	b. Restatement Approach—Land	A-
Authorities	A-106	c. Matter of Cleopatra Cameron Gift	
a. Introduction	A-106	Trust, Dated May 26, 1998	A-
	A-106		A-
c. Nevada	A-107	2. Applicable Law	A-
d. New Jersey	A-107	4. UTC Approach—Introduction	A-
e. New York	A-107	UTC Approach—Application	A-
f. Pennsylvania	A-107	a. Introduction	A-
g. Other States	A-107	b. Specifics	A-
The Nominee-Trust Theory: Federal	10 m	(1) Place of Trust's Creation	A-
Tax Authorities	A-108	(2) Location of Trust Property	A-
a. Introduction	A-108	(3) Trustee's Domicile	A-
b. Popular Federal Test	A-108	(4) Settlor's Domicile	A-
15. Applicable Law	A-109	(5) Beneficiaries' Domiciles	A-
16. Distributions Are Not Proof of an	A-107		
	A 100		
Alter-Ego, Sham, or Nominee Trust	A-109	State—Domestic APT State Not	Α.
17. Retained Powers and Interests Don't	4 440	the Forum	A-
Make a Sham or Nominee Trust	A-110	(7) Policies of Forum	
G. Obstacle 6: Non-DAPT Court Should		State—Domestic APT State as	
Apply Domestic APT State Law	A-111	the Forum	A-
1. Introduction	A-111	(8) Policies of Non-Forum State	A-
2. Restatement Approach—Introduction	A-111	(9) Justified Expectations, Certainty,	
a. Background	A-111	Predictability, and Uniformity of	
b. Framework		Results	A-
c. Type of Asset	A-112 A-112	6. Rules for Foreign APTs	A-
	A-112 A-112	7. Why the Rules Are Different	A-
d. Type of Trust			11.
e. Type of Question—Definitions	A-113	8. Judicial Hostility to Domestic APTs	
(1) Validity	A-113	Will Only Promote Foreign APTs	A-

		PAGE		PAGE
	9. Rules in Federal Court	A-125	(ii) Facts	A-144
H.	Obstacle 7: Domestic APT Court Might		(iii) Issue	A-144
	Not Have to Give Full Faith and Credit to		(iv) Bankruptcy Code	
	Non-DAPT Court Judgment	A-126	§ 541(c)(2)	A-144
	1. Introduction	A-126	(v) Bankruptcy Code	10000
	2. Respect Due Statutes	A-126	§ 548(e)(1)	A-145
	3. Implications	A-126	(c) In re Vorhes	A-145
	4. Statutory Safeguard: Statutory		(d) In re Cyr	A-145
	Auto-Removal Rules and Related		(3) Case Law Involving Domestic	
	Tactics	A-127	APTs	A-146
	Respect Due Judgments—Collateral		(4) Commentary	A-146
	Attack and Important Domestic APT		d. Bankruptcy Trustee's Remedies	A-147
	Interests	A-128	e. Limitations Periods	A-148
	6. The Role of Strong Public Policy	A-130	5. Post-Petition Distributions	A-148
	Obstacle 8: Domestic APTs Should Survive		a. Introduction	A-148
	Bankruptcy	A-130	b. 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(5)(A)	A-148
	1. Introduction	A-130	c. 11 U.S.C. § 541(a)(7)	A-150
	a. General	A-130	J. Status of Domestic APTs	A-151
	b. The Bankruptcy Estate	A-131	Introduction	
	c. Exclusions vs. Exemptions	A-131		A-151
	2. The Limited Nature of Bankruptcy	74.75.0	2. Unsuccessful Domestic APTs	A-151
	Concerns	A-132	a. Introduction	A-151
	a. Involuntary Bankruptcies Are Rare	A-132	b. FTC v. Ameridebt, Inc.	A-151
	b. Why Involuntary Petitions Are	20.00	c. In re Mortensen	A-151
	Attractive to Creditors	A-132	(1) Introduction	A-151
	c. Why Involuntary Petitions Are	152	(2) Mortensen I	A-151
	Unattractive to Creditors	A-133	(3) Mortensen II	A-152
	(1) Introduction	A-133	(4) Mortensen III (2011)	A-153
	(2) Challenging an Involuntary	11 100	(5) Comment	A-154
	Petition	A-133	d. Waldron v. Huber (In re Huber)	A-154
	(3) Bond Requirement	A-133	(1) Introduction	A-154
	(4) Pre-Trial Motion Practice and	11-155	(2) Facts	A-154
	Discovery	A-133	(3) Issues	A-154
	(5) Certain Creditors Do Not Count	A-133	(4) Applicable Law; Validity of	
	(6) Certain Claims Do Not Count	A-133	Trust	A-154
	(7) "Generally" Failing to Pay	A-155	(a) Choice of Law	A-154
	Debts as They Become Due	A-134	(b) Validity of Trust	A-156
	(8) Sanctions for Unsuccessful	71-154	(5) Alter-Ego Doctrine	A-156
	Involuntaries: Damages, Fees,		(6) Bankruptcy Code § 548(e)(1)	A-156
	Expenses	A-134	(7) Fraudulent Transfer	A-156
	(9) Credit Counseling	A-134	(8) Bankruptcy Discharge	A-156
	3. Bankruptcy Code § 541's Trust	11.10	e. Dahl v. Dahl	A-157
	Exclusion .	A-134	(1) Introduction	A-157
	a. Introduction	A-134	(2) Facts	A-157
	b. Bankruptcy Code § 541(c)(2) and		(3) Issues	A-157
	Applicable Nonbankruptcy Law: A		(4) Whether the Trust Should Be	
	Three-Pronged Test and Two Key		Construed According to Nevada	
	Questions Cuestiand Two Key	A-136	or Utah Law	A-157
	c. Bankruptcy Code § 541(c)(2) and	A-150	(5) Whether Wife Had an	11 10
	Applicable Nonbankruptcy Law:		Enforceable Right in the Trust	
	Does the Law of the Debtor's		Property	A-157
	Domicile Apply?	A-137	(6) Conclusion	A-158
	d. Implications for Foreign APTs	A-139	3. Successful Domestic APTs	A-158
	BAPCPA and Bankruptcy Code	A-139		A-158
		A 120		
	§ 548(e)'s 10-Year Look-Back Rule	A-139 A-139	b. TrustCo Bank v. Mathews	A-158
	a. Bankruptcy Code § 548(a)(1)		(1) Introduction	A-158
	b. Bankruptcy Code § 544(b)(1)	A-142	(2) Facts	A-158
	c. Bankruptcy Code § 548(e)(1)	A-143	(3) Issues	A-158
	(1) Introduction	A-143	(4) Laches vs. Statute of Limitations	A-158
	(2) Case Law Involving Domestic	A 144	(5) The Delaware Borrowing Statute	A-159
	APTs	A-144	(6) The Most Significant	
	(a) In re Potter (2008)	A-144	Relationship Test	A-159
	(b) Safanda v. Castellano (i) Introduction	A-144 A-144	(7) The Qualified Dispositions in	A-160
	(1) Introduction	A = 1/1/1	Truct Act	4 - 1611

	PAGE		PAGE
(8) Analysis Under New York's		(3) Parsons v. Mumford	A-172
Statute of Limitations	A-160	(4) Mennen v. Wilmington Trust	10000
c. Klabacka v. Nelson (1) Introduction	A-160	Company	A-172
(2) Facts	A-160 A-161	c. Nevada	
(3) Issues	A-161	(1) Introduction (2) Breedlove v Breedlove	A-173
(4) Wife's Remedy	A-161	(a) Discussion in Discussion	A-173
(5) District Court's Errors	A-161	(3) Phillips v. Morrow (4) Maki v. Chong	A-173
(6) Equalization of APTs	A-161	(5) In re Graziadei	A-173
(7) Alimony and Child Support	A-161	(6) Henry v. Rizzolo	A-173 A-173
(8) Comments	A-161	(7) In re Tarkanian	A-173
4. Commentary	A-162	(8) Klabacka v. Nelson	A-174 A-174
		d. South Dakota	A-174
X. A Comparison of the Leading Domestic Asset Protection Trust States	1 1/5	e. Alaska	A-174
	A-165	7. Availability of Alter-Ego, Sham, and	A-1/4
A. Introduction	A-165	Nominee Theories	A-174
B. Infrastructure	A-165	a. Introduction	A-174
1. Introduction	A-165	b. South Dakota	A-174
2. Population	A-165	(1) Introduction	A-174
3. Trust Climate	A-165	(2) 2007 Statute	A-174
4. Liability System	A-166	(3) United States v. Nelson	A-174
5. ACTEC Fellows 6. Trust Conference	A-166	c. Nevada	A-175
7. Trust Management Minor	A-166	(1) Introduction	A-175
C. Critical Issues	A-166	(2) 2009 Legislation	A-175
1. Introduction	A-167	(3) TransFirst Group, Inc. v.	
2. Exclusive Jurisdiction	A-167 A-167	Magliarditi	A-175
a. Background	A-167	(4) United States v. Steele	A-175
b. Delaware	A-167	(5) Klabacka v. Nelson	A-176
c. Alaska	A-167	d. Delaware	A-176
d. South Dakota	A-167	e. Alaska	A-176
e. Nevada	A-167	8. Model for Other States	A-176
3. Limitations Periods	A-167	D. Alaska vs. Delaware	A-176
a. Introduction	A-167	1. Introduction	A-176
b. Fraudulent Transfer Claims	A-168	2. APTs	A-176
c. Offshore Option	A-168	a. Advantages of Alaska	A-176
d. Bankruptcy	A-168	(1) Constructive vs. Actual Fraud	A-176
e. Other States	A-168	(2) Spousal Claims	A-177
4. Exception Creditors	A-168	(3) Child Support	A-177
a. Introduction	A-168	(4) Tort Claims	A-177
 Exception Creditors — Specifics 	A-168	(6) Counsel Fee Awards	A-177
(1) Alaska	A-168	(5) Validation of Claims	A-177
(2) Delaware	A-168	b. Advantages of Delaware	A-178
(3) Nevada	A-169	(1) Illiastructure	A-178
(4) South Dakota	A-169	(2) Court System	A-178
c. Exception Creditors — Application	A-169	(3) Fraudulent Transfer Claims	A-178
(1) Matter of Cleopatra Cameron		(4) Distribution Options	A-178
Irrevocable Gift Trust, Dated	1 100	(5) Income Taxes	A-178
May 26, 1998	A-169	(6) Basis Planning (7) Automatic Resignation	A-178
(2) Scenario 1: Ms. Cameron Creates Domestic APT Prior to		Company of the compan	A-178
	A 160	(8) Elective-Share Claims (9) Tenancy-by-the-Entireties	A-178
Marriage (3) Scenario 2: Ms. Cameron	A-169	Property	A 170
Creates Domestic APT During		(10) Public Policy	A-178 A-178
Marriage	A-169	(11) Court Decisions and	A-176
(4) Scenario 3: Ms. Cameron	A-109	Commentary	A-178
Creates Domestic APT After		E. Nevada vs. Delaware	A-178 A-179
Divorce and Child Support		1. Introduction	A-179
Ordered	A-170	2. APTs	A-179
5. Counsel Fee Awards	A-170	a. Advantages of Nevada	A-179
6. Judicially Created Exceptions	A-171	(1) Shorter Limitations Periods	A-179
a. Introduction	A-171	(2) Family Claims	A-179
b. Delaware	A-171	(a) Statutory Expension	A-179
(1) Garretson v. Garretson (1973)	A-171	(b) Federal Essentian	A-179
(2) Gibson v. Speegle	A-171	(c) Judicially Created Exception	A-179

	PAGE			PAGE
(d) Comment	A-179		2. Less Financial Risk for Settlor and	
(3) Tort Claims	A-180		Beneficiaries	A-189
b. Advantages of Delaware	A-180		3. Tax Treatment More Favorable	A-189
(1) Income Taxes	A-180		4. Less Expensive	A-190
(2) Basis Planning	A-180		5. Less Risk of Fine or Imprisonment	A-190
	A-180		a. Introduction	A-190
(3) Spendthrift Clauses			b. Some General Principles Regarding	71-190
(4) Automatic Resignation	A-180			A-190
(5) Consequences of Successful	A 100		Civil Contempt Law c. The Cases	A-191
Challenge	A-180			A-191
(6) Distribution Options	A-180		(1) The Anderson Case	
(7) Tenancy-by-the-Entireties			(2) The Lawrence Case	A-192
Property	A-180		(3) The Bilzerian Case	A-192
(8) Public Policy	A-180		(4) The Eulich Case	A-193
(9) Other Self-Settled Vehicles	A-180		(5) The Solow Case	A-194
(10) Judicial Decisions	A-180		(6) The Grant Case	A-195
(11) Alter-Ego, Sham, or Nominee			(7) The Wyly Case	A-195
Trusts	A-180		(8) The Olson Case	A-195
F. South Dakota vs. Delaware	A-180		(9) The Rensin Case	A-196
1. Introduction	A-180		d. Implications	A-196
a. Background	A-180	XII.	Decigning Drofting and Funding a	
b. Worrisome Case Law	A-181	AII.	Designing, Drafting, and Funding a	A 100
(1) Introduction	A-181		Domestic Asset Protection Trust	A-199
(2) McDevitt v. Wellin	A-181		A. Introduction	A-199
(3) In re Marvin M. Schwan	12 101		B. Due Diligence	A-199
Charitable Foundation	A-181		C. Involvement of Domestic APT Counsel	A-199
	A-182		D. Drafting the Domestic APT	A-199
c. Wayfair Decision	A-182		E. Trustee Selection	A-200
2. APTs				A-200
a. Advantages of South Dakota	A-182		F. Funding the Domestic APT: An Overview	A-200
(1) Shorter Limitations Periods	A-182		G. Asset Selection: Amount to Entrust (a	
(2) Validating Claims	A-182		Quantitative Issue)	A-200
(3) Actual Fraud Test	A-182		H. Asset Selection: What to Entrust (a	4.555
(4) Tort Claims	A-182		Qualitative Issue)	A-201
(5) Counsel Fee Awards	A-182		I. Cost of Establishing and Administering the	
 Advantages of Delaware 	A-182		Domestic APT	A-203
(1) Additional Distribution Option	A-182		J. Basic Administration Concepts: Procedures	
(2) Income Tax	A-182		and Distributions	A-203
(3) Basis Planning	A-183	2/10	Distribution From Demonstr Asset	
(4) Family Claims	A-183	XIII.	Distributions From Domestic Asset	
(5) Elective-Share Rights	A-183		Protection Trusts: Who Is in Charge	
(6) Tenancy-by-the-Entireties			and Other Issues	A-205
Property	A-183		A. Introduction	A-205
(7) Other Self-Settled Vehicles	A-183		B. Recommendations	A-205
(8) Case Law	A-183		1. Avoid Misunderstanding at Beginning	- A-205
(9) Alter-Ego or Nominee Remedy	A-183		2. Fund With Nest Egg	A-205
a [1] - [2] [2] [2] [2] [2] [2] [2] [2] [2] [2]			3. Choose Proper Law	A-205
A Comparison of Foreign and Domestic			4. Choose Proper Trustee and Follow	0.5
Asset Protection Trusts	A-185		Proper Request Procedures	A-205
A. Introduction	A-185		5. Name Other Beneficiaries	A-205
B. Advantages of Foreign Asset Protection			6. Domestic APTs Make It Easier for	71-205
Trusts	A-185			A-205
Offer Protective Features	A-185		Other Beneficiaries to Sue	A-203
	A-186		7. Settlors May Expressly Reserve Certain	1 200
2. Might Be Superior			Rights to Income	A-206
a. Introduction	A-186		C. Another Problem: Confused Distribution	7 222
b. Rush University Medical Center v.	4 400		Standards	A-207
Sessions	A-186		 The Nature of the Problem: 	
(1) Introduction	A-186		Contradictory Terms	A-207
(2) Facts	A-186		2. The Consequences: Unwanted Demands	
(3) Issue	A-187		and/or Bankruptcy Problems	A-207
(4) Analysis	A-187		3. Why Spendthrift Clauses Alone Are	
(5) Observation	A-188		Not Enough in Bankruptcy	A-207
3. Full Faith and Credit Not Due U.S.		VIII .		
Judgments	A-188	XIV.	Concerns for Attorneys	A-209
C. Advantages of Domestic APTs	A-188		A. Ethical Principles	A-209
1. Constitutional Issues Might Favor	A-188		B. Potential Liability to the Client	A-210

XI.

	I	PAGE .			PAGE	
. PRL-/ . 1.	Introduction	A-210 A-210		6. Other Remedies 7. Statutory Protections for		
		A-210	TABLE (OF WORKSHEETS	pagalitavida B-1	
		A-210 A-211	081-A		ameant (1) B-1	
		A-211				
	Some General Principles Regarding					
1001-X	Civil Contempt Fow			lubershipe to results		
	To The Cases				general Challeng	
101 AV	(2) The Lowrence Case -1		081-7	lon Options by The Emilianus		
	The Biberia Case 1				Proporty	
	(i) The Eulion Lise					
481-7	(S) The Solice Case			ili Setilori Vehician		
(201-X (201-A)	(b) The Orani Case	4			suphit will in a contract to	
	11 (8) The Olsan Care Tv.			CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY AND		
961-18	1 (9) The Remin Case		081-A		i E Sould Dakom ve	
	kij Implications				negrobopel is	
	Designing: Drafting, and Funding a	Hix				
000-20-	Domestic Asset Protection Trust 1 - 12		III-A		b. Wintrome I	
001-01-0	no trubpant .7		181-A	PURE BURGANIAN		
	B. Dui Dingsace					
	C. Involvement of Domester Al'T Occursely					
A-190 A-200	D. Draffing the Domestic AMT				S APPS	
	Funding the Drinsease of a lor Organies			or South Dospus		
	3. Assi Selection: Amount or onner in		0.182	Limitations Periods		
(E)C-A	Ought France				(1), Validatir	
	1. Assat, Selection. White the Edition 1.		SRI			
	Quadrative Items		Z81-1		(d) Torr Cla (5) Counsel	
	Cost of Emblishing and Johnnistermy In					
	Besic Pluministration Concerns Procedure			al Distribution Option.		
7,05,7	www.multipe.Co.bue				(3) Inoutin	
50	Distributions From Domestic Assot.				(3) Basis Pi	
	Protection Trusts: Who Is In Charge		E81-A		(4) Family (
	and Other Issues			section in the artificial		
	napspiorni v		[] - A	***	enegasti.	
	d., Reconstraint and the			il Seilled Vallicle		
	 Avoid hellomedersmeding at transming 2, think with New Egg 		181 A	w o sp. Nominer Remedy	Edoto Caso La	
	J. Choked Proper Law					
	d. Charlet Proper Torries and Instance			oreign and Domestia		
A 2005	Propili Parguest Pracultures				Asset Protection, T	
gra-A	Marrid Jellier Bons (sciances					
*=4-1X	6. Danielik AEPs Valur II Eusen vor "Other Beneumnick to Stice					
	7 Schook by A Councily Reserve Census			Southes :		
	Rightship Income			The rom	T. Mught Re vites	
1866.	C Another Pobleric Continua, Distribution				noitemboriul s	
MA-A	icandidate on the Alan Architecture			say Medical Contar y	Senings	
	b - Line May be of the troubling - Configuraciony Science			100	schemat (1) 1	
	The Coplemence: Havanted Fanona				· - (2) Fileti	
	and over the damped by so their					
7/11	3. With Spiriditalit Charact Alone And				(4yr Analysis (5) Onkerws	
107	hist English to Bintoring					
A-209	Concerns for Attorneys				Judgments	
	Lithicat Principles				C. Advantages of Do	
	in Porential Lightly for ma Citem				Listenstation of the Listensed of	