

Table of Contents

*Preface to the Special Mid-Year Supplement to Loring and Rounds:
A Trustee's Handbook (2021)*

Chapter 1	It Is Primarily via the Takings Clause and the Due Process Guarantee That the U.S. Constitution Imposes Limits on the Power of the United States and the States to Interfere with Private Equitable Property Rights Incident to a Trust Relationship	1
§1.1	Introduction	1
§1.2	The Common Law's Concept of Property Is Difficult to Corral	2
§1.3	Formal Definitions of the Trust, a Fiduciary Relationship with Respect to Property	3
§1.4	Legal Property Rights Incident to the Trust Relationship: The Trustee's "Estate" as per Local Law	5
§1.5	Equitable Property Rights Incident to the Trust Relationship: The Beneficiary's "Estate"	11
§1.5.1	Who and What Are Eligible to Own Equitable, Constitutionally Protected Property Rights, Whether Present or Future, That Are Incident to a Trust Relationship	16
§1.5.2	The Constitutionally Protected Property Rights of the Owner of an Equitable Interest Incident to a Trust Relationship, Whether the Interest Be Vested or Contingent	26
§1.6	The Guardian Ad Litem and the Virtual Representative: Advocating for the Current Procedural Economic Due-Process Rights of Trust Beneficiaries yet to be Conceived or Otherwise Determined, Rights That the U.S. Constitution Protects from Sovereign Interference	32
§1.7	The Constitution Regulates and Imposes Limits on the Deprivation via Governmental Action of a Person's Property Rights, Be They Legal or Equitable	45
§1.7.1	The Takings Clause	45
§1.7.2	The Due Process Clause	46

	§1.7.2.1	Substantive Economic Due Process Generally and in the Trust Context	46
	§1.7.2.2	Procedural Economic Due Process in the Trust Context	49
§1.8		The UTC's Qualified Beneficiary Concept Is Unconstitutional to the Extent It Would Negate Retroactively a Trust Beneficiary's Procedural Economic Due Process Rights	51
§1.9		The UTC's Ultimate Repose Feature: How Can the Legislative Taking of Economic Rights for Private Benefit and Without Notice Be Constitutional?	65
§1.10		Taking by the Retroactive Application of New Trust Law	68
	§1.10.1	Taking by Redefining Legislatively or Judicially the Terms "Issue," "Descendants," and the Like	68
	§1.10.2	Taking by Antilapse	71
	§1.10.3	Taking by Changing Legislatively or Judicially the Rules Governing the Allocation and Apportionment of Trust Income and Principal	72
	§1.10.4	Taking by Retroactively Applying a Modified Rule Against Perpetuities	73
	§1.10.5	Taking by Retroactive Judicial Reformation or Modification of a Trust's Dispositive Terms	74
§1.11		The Interest on Lawyers Trust Account (IOLTA) Takings Schemes Orchestrated by the States: The First Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and Fourteenth Amendment Considerations	74
		<i>Scalia Dissent in Brown v. Legal Foundation of Washington, 538 U.S. 216 (2003) (IOLTA)</i>	79
§1.12		To Judicially <i>Cy Pres</i> the Terms of a Charitable Trust in Order to Negate Its Unconstitutional Purpose or to Judicially Vindicate the Vested Property Rights of the Holders of the Equitable Reversion, a Constitutional Conundrum if There Ever Was One	84
Chapter 2 Vindicating the Contractual Rights of Out-of-State Judgment Creditors of a Settlor/Beneficiary of a Domestic Asset Protection Trust (DAPT): Is the U.S. Constitution's Full Faith and Credit Clause here a Paper Tiger?			89
§2.1		The Constitution's Full Faith and Credit Clause Generally	89
§2.2		Domestic Asset Protection Trusts in a Multijurisdictional Setting: Does the Full Faith and Credit Clause Have any Application?	91

Contents	vii
Chapter 3 The U.S. Constitution’s Contracts Clause Limits How a State May Cy Pres Its Charitable Trusts: Legislatures Need Not Apply	99
§3.1 The Contracts Clause Forecloses Legislative Cy Pres	99
§3.2 The Contracts Clause Intrudes into the Law of Trusts	104
Chapter 4 Trust Litigation in the Federal Courts	107
§4.1 In the Federal Courts There Is No Constitutional Right to Trial by Jury in Equity Cases	107
§4.2 The Constitution’s Diversity-of-Citizenship Requirement and Its Judge-Made “Probate Exception” Limit Access to the Federal Courts When It Comes to Trust-Related Disputes	110
§4.3 Pro-Se Representation by Trustee	115
Chapter 5 ERISA’s Idiosyncratic Trust Jurisprudence Is Cross-Jurisdictional Thanks to the U.S. Constitution’s Supremacy Clause	117
§5.1 The Constitution’s Supremacy Clause Allows ERISA to Have Nation-Wide Application	117
§5.2 Relevant ERISA in a Nutshell	118
§5.2.1 ERISA’s Spendthrift Provisions Apply also to Self-Settled Entrustments	122
§5.2.1.1 Self-Settled Trust Doctrine Under General Principles of Equity	122
§5.2.1.2 ERISA’s Limited Preemption of Equity Doctrine Applicable to the Creditor-Accessibility of Property Subject to Self-Settled Entrustment	132
§5.2.2 The U.S. Supreme Court Has Determined That ERISA Negated in Its Sphere of Pre-Emption a Traditional Protection Afforded Property Rights Incident to the Trust Relationship	133
<i>The Sotomayer Dissent in Thole v. U.S. Bank, N.A., 140 S. Ct. 1615 (2020)</i>	134
Chapter 6 The U.S. Constitution Expressly Authorized Congress to Federalize the Structuring and Adjudication of Bankruptcy Relief	147
Chapter 7 The Constitutionally Permissible Incentive Trust That the Equity Court Nonetheless Declines to Enforce on “Public Policy” Grounds	153

Chapter 8	Social Security “Trustees” Not True Trustees as per Federal Law	157
Chapter 9	Federal Trust Indenture Act of 1939 and the State-Specific Uniform Trust Code Distinguished	161
Chapter 10	Mutual Funds Regulated by the Federal Investment Company Act of 1940 Are Trusts in Function, Even Those That Are Not Trusts in Form	171