## **Assignments**

<u>(Definition</u>: X and Y entered an agreement/it is an outright transfer of personality or reality/this assignment takes effect by way of declaration of trus/takes effect as a direction to a trustee [] to transfer the trust property [] to a third party [] whereby..., which is an immediate transfer of an existing proprietary right, vested or contingent, from an assignor to assignee (Norman). The contract must be capable of SP (Holroyd v Marshall).

5 Equity will not allow a statute to be used as a cloak for fraud, e.g., a fraudulent party cannot rely on an absence of writing to enforce either an oral disposition of an interest in land or an oral trust of an interest in land that flouts the Conveyancing Act (Last v Rosenfeld)

## 2 nature of the property: present property

<u>Present/future property:</u> After considering the nature of the assignor's right and the dead of assignment, the right is <u>present</u> property because it is an existing contractual right (tree) or the right is <u>future</u> property because it is a right to an unrealised future income stream (fruit) (<u>Shepherd</u>). Assuming that the property assigned is present property, the right to be paid <u>royalties</u>/shares/debt is a chose in action.

## Present property:

- <u>Legal right to future payment</u>: a legal right to payment at a future date is a present chose in action (i.e., even if the debt is not presently recoverable because it is not due and payable) and is assignable (minority approach in *Norman*).-requires consideration

OF

<u>Mere expectancies</u>: the purported assignment is the loan that is repayable in full on a day's notice, which was considered by the majority to be an expectancy in <u>Norman</u>, the right to the loan and its interest is regarded as future property. It is only capable of assignment in equity and only for consideration (<u>Holroyd</u>).

- --an object of a discretionary trust or power of appointment only has a mere expectancy (Kennon v Spry)
- Present assets: assignments of presently existing assets that may produce income in the future can be made without consideration (Shepherd).
- <u>Present equitable choses in action</u>: an assignment of a partner's share in a partnership, or part of that share, is an assignment of an equitable chose in action and hence an equitable assignment of present property, not an assignment of future income or future property (FCT v Everett).

## **Not Assignable property**:

--

- --<u>Bare rights to litigate</u>: are generally not assignable; unless, an assignee who is co-defendant and can show that he has a genuine commercial interest in the enforcement of another's claim and the terms of that assignment doesn't fall foul of the law of champerty (*Trendtex*). So this is an outright transfer of personalty (a chose in action) and there was no subsisting equitable interest, *CAs* 23C(1)(c) does not apply (*Vandervell*). So the assignment could have be oral.
- --<u>Modes of transfer</u>: if an assignment is intended to be effectuated by one mode, then it will not be enforced by treating it as having been intended to be effectuated by another mode: e.g., a declaration of trust will not be inferred from an invalid attempt to make a gift (Milroy v Lord); however, if, although the words used may indicate one method, the circumstances (e.g., the donee has no legal existence apart from as created by a trust deed, or the putative settlor was themselves one of the intended trustees) entail the only possible meaning of what seem to be words of outright gift are words of gift on trust, the latter will be adopted (*T Choithram v Pagarini*).

**3Writing requirements:** (whether s23C apply, if applies but oral  $\rightarrow$  SP) CAs 23C(1)(c) encompasses equitable interests in both land and personalty (Grey).