## **Adverse Possession**

## **Principles**

- Possession of land gives right to proprietary interest > Perry v Clissold [1907] AC
- Possession title against whole world except those w' superior prior claim > <u>Asher v Whitlock (1865) QB</u> (heir entitled to AP ∴ successfully ejected D)
- Title (and AP title) can be inherited, entitled, conveyed > Asher v Whitlock (1865) QB
- AP entitles to all pos rights ie. Compensation from compulsory expulsion > <u>Perry v Clissold [1907] AC</u> (Act applied for compensation PC allowed compensation for Crown resumed land for school TO not known)

## **Limitation Act 2005**

**s.19(1)** Recover of Land - 12 yrs

s.3(6) + s.65(1) Cause of action deemed to have accrued

**s.75** Extinguishes title after 12 yrs **s.19(2)** Cannot AP crown land - **s.76** 

## Elements

\*\*Cannot set up jus tertii arg.

- 1. **Dispossession**? (driving out); or **Discontinuance** (A followed by B)
- 2. Has there been actual possession by one not entitled to possession? (s.5 Limitation Act)
  - 1) **Factual** Possession
  - 1) Single/continuous 2) appropriate degree of control 3) clear intention to deal as owner > <u>Powell v</u>
     McFarlane (1979)
  - No consent; adverse; open/not secret; peaceful/not by force; continuous > <u>Mulchahy v Curramore [1974]</u>
    NSW per Bowen CJ (20 yrs aggregated between G & H to est AP)
  - Appropriate Degree of **physical control**: Depends on circs > <u>Petkov v Lucerne Nominees (1992) WAR Clement v Jones [1909] CLR</u>: 2+ properties fenced in presumed separately owned unless proved otherwise, grazing cow not enough by C, use of timber, talk of rent/sale & fence by J (TO) <u>Whittlesea v Abatangelo (2009) ALR</u>: removing dividing fence, playground, feeding trough <u>Riley v Pentila [1974]</u>: enclosing land (tennis court then garden w' **easement** already granted) not AP

Red House Farms: firing over swampy lands w'no agricultural use = enough for AP

Buckingham City Council v Moran (1989) UK: lock, key, gates, garden, taxes

\*\*Nature of Land & Manner in which commonly used/enjoyed > <u>Powell v McFarlane</u> per Slade J

- 2) **Intention** to possess (Animus possidendi)
- Clear intention to possess exclusively > <u>Perry v Clissold</u>; <u>Petkov v Lucerne</u> (AP portion of neighbours land WA following <u>Powell</u>)
  - \*\* Enclosure best sign > <u>Buckingham CC</u>; <u>Seddon v Smith</u>
  - \*\* padlock, key = keeping others out > <u>Buckingham CC</u>
  - \*\* conscious intention to exclude TO no nec, just intention to possess exclusively > <u>Petkov</u>
- Intention to exclude not own > Whittlesea v Abatangelo (2009) ALR (planning application acknowledged 'not in title'); JA Pye v Graham (2003) AC (grazing lease)
- Acknowledgment of future plans doesn't negate intention to exclude > <u>Buckingham CC</u> (council plans to build road)
- 3. Has this AP continued for 12 yrs (clock) (Limitation Act s.19(1))
  - 1) Has AP **abandoned**? \*\*"Abandonment leaves no cloud on the true owner's title"\*\*> <u>Mulchahy v Curramore</u>
    - Physical AND intentional
    - **Non-use** not nec abandonment > <u>Nicholas v Andrews (1920) NSW</u>
  - 2) Has **12 yrs** passed? > (*Limitation Act s.***75**)
  - 3) **Series** of AP?