

| Article 7.Part 7. Office of Trustee | Article 7.Part 7. |
|--|--|
| <p>GENERAL COMMENT This article contains a series of default rules dealing with the office of trustee. Sections 701 and 702 address the process for getting a trustee into office, including the procedures for indicating an acceptance and whether bond will be required. Section 703 addresses cotrustees, permitting the cotrustees to act by majority action and specifying the extent to which one trustee may delegate to another. Sections 704 through 707 address changes in the office of trustee, specifying the circumstances when a vacancy must be filled, the procedure for resignation, the grounds for removal, and the process for appointing a successor. Sections 708 and 709 prescribe the standards for determining trustee compensation and reimbursement for expenses advanced.</p> <p>Except for the court’s authority to order bond, all of the provisions of this article are subject to modification in the terms of the trust. See Section 105.</p> <p>SECTION 62-7-701. Accepting or declining trusteeship.</p> <p>(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), a person designated as trustee accepts the trusteeship:</p> <p>(1) by substantially complying with a method of acceptance provided in the terms of the trust; or</p> <p>(2) if the terms of the trust do not provide a method or the method provided in the terms is not expressly made exclusive, by accepting delivery of the trust property, exercising powers or performing duties as trustee, or otherwise indicating acceptance of the trusteeship.</p> <p>(b) A person designated as trustee who has not yet accepted the trusteeship may reject the trusteeship. A designated trustee who does not accept the trusteeship within a reasonable time</p> | <p>GENERAL COMMENT This article contains a series of default rules dealing with the office of trustee. Sections 62-7-701 and 62-7-702 address the process for getting a trustee into office, including the procedures for indicating an acceptance and whether bond will be required. Section 62-7-703 addresses cotrustees, permitting the cotrustees to act by majority action and specifying the extent to which one trustee may delegate to another. Sections 62-7-704 through 62-7-707 address changes in the office of trustee, specifying the circumstances when a vacancy must be filled, the procedure for resignation, the grounds for removal, and the process for appointing a successor. Sections 62-7-708 and 62-7-709 prescribe the standards for determining trustee compensation and reimbursement for expenses advanced.</p> <p>Except for the court’s authority to order bond, all of the provisions of this article are subject to modification in the terms of the trust. See Section 62-7-105.</p> <p>SECTION 62-7-701.</p> <p>(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (c), a person designated as trustee accepts the trusteeship:</p> <p>(1) by substantially complying with a method of acceptance provided in the terms of the trust; or</p> <p>(2) if the terms of the trust do not provide a method or the method provided in the terms is not expressly made exclusive, by accepting delivery of the trust property, exercising powers or performing duties as trustee, or otherwise indicating acceptance of the trusteeship.</p> <p>(b) A person designated as trustee who has not yet accepted the trusteeship may reject the trusteeship. A designated trustee who does not accept the trusteeship within a reasonable time</p> |

after knowing of the designation is deemed to have rejected the trusteeship.

(c) A person designated as trustee, without accepting the trusteeship, may:

(1) act to preserve the trust property if, within a reasonable time after acting, the person sends a rejection of the trusteeship to the settlor or, if the settlor is dead or lacks capacity, to a qualified beneficiary; and

(2) inspect or investigate trust property to determine potential liability under environmental or other law or for any other purpose.

COMMENT

This section, which specifies the requirements for a valid acceptance of the trusteeship, implicates many of the same issues that arise in determining whether a trust has been revoked. Consequently, the two provisions track each other closely. Compare Section 701(a), with Section 602(c) (procedure for revoking or modifying trust). Procedures specified in the terms of the trust are recognized, but only substantial, not literal compliance is required. A failure to meet technical requirements, such as notarization of the trustee's signature, does not result in a failure to accept. Ordinarily, the trustee will indicate acceptance by signing the trust instrument or signing a separate written instrument. However, this section validates any other method demonstrating the necessary intent, such as by knowingly exercising trustee powers, unless the terms of the trust make the specified method exclusive. This section also does not preclude an acceptance by estoppel. For general background on issues relating to trustee acceptance and rejection, see Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 35 (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 102 (1959). Consistent with Section 201(b), which emphasizes that continuing judicial supervision of a trust is the rare exception, not the rule, the Uniform Trust Code does not

after knowing of the designation is deemed to have rejected the trusteeship.

(c) A person designated as trustee, without accepting the trusteeship, may:

(1) act to preserve the trust property if, within a reasonable time after acting, the person sends a rejection of the trusteeship to the settlor or, if the settlor is dead or lacks capacity, to a qualified beneficiary; and

(2) inspect or investigate trust property to determine potential liability under environmental or other law or for any other purpose.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

This section, which specifies the requirements for a valid acceptance of the trusteeship, implicates many of the same issues that arise in determining whether a trust has been revoked. Consequently, the two provisions track each other closely. Compare Section 62-7-701(a), with Section 62-7-602(c) (procedure for revoking or modifying trust). Procedures specified in the terms of the trust are recognized, but only substantial, not literal compliance is required. A failure to meet technical requirements, such as notarization of the trustee's signature, does not result in a failure to accept. Ordinarily, the trustee will indicate acceptance by signing the trust instrument or signing a separate written instrument. However, this section validates any other method demonstrating the necessary intent, such as by knowingly exercising trustee powers, unless the terms of the trust make the specified method exclusive. This section also does not preclude an acceptance by estoppel. For general background on issues relating to trustee acceptance and rejection, see Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 35 (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 102 (1959). Consistent with Section 62-7-201(b), which emphasizes that continuing judicial supervision of a trust is the rare exception, not the rule, the SCTC does not require that a

require that a trustee qualify in court.

To avoid the inaction that can result if the person designated as trustee fails to communicate a decision either to accept or to reject the trusteeship, subsection (b) provides that a failure to accept within a reasonable time constitutes a rejection of the trusteeship. What will constitute a reasonable time depends on the facts and circumstances of the particular case. A major consideration is possible harm that might occur if a vacancy in a trusteeship is not filled in a timely manner. A trustee's rejection normally precludes a later acceptance but does not cause the trust to fail. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 35 cmt. c (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). Regarding the filling of a vacancy in the event of a rejection, see Section 704.

A person designated as trustee who decides not to accept the trusteeship need not provide a formal rejection, but a clear and early communication is recommended. The appropriate recipient of the rejection depends upon the circumstances. Ordinarily, it would be appropriate to communicate the rejection to the person who informed the designee of the proposed trusteeship. If judicial proceedings involving the trust are pending, the rejection could be filed with the court. In the case of a person named as trustee of a revocable trust, it would be appropriate to communicate the rejection to the settlor. In any event, it would be best to inform a beneficiary with a significant interest in the trust because that beneficiary might be more motivated than others to seek appointment of a new trustee.

Subsection (c)(1) makes clear that a nominated trustee may act expeditiously to protect the trust property without being considered to have accepted the trusteeship. However, upon conclusion of the intervention, the nominated trustee must send a rejection of office to the settlor, if living and competent, otherwise to a qualified beneficiary.

Because of the potential liability that can inhere in trusteeship, subsection (c)(2) allows

trustee qualify in court.

To avoid the inaction that can result if the person designated as trustee fails to communicate a decision either to accept or to reject the trusteeship, subsection (b) provides that a failure to accept within a reasonable time constitutes a rejection of the trusteeship. What will constitute a reasonable time depends on the facts and circumstances of the particular case. A major consideration is possible harm that might occur if a vacancy in a trusteeship is not filled in a timely manner. A trustee's rejection normally precludes a later acceptance but does not cause the trust to fail. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 35 cmt. c (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). Regarding the filling of a vacancy in the event of a rejection, see Section 62-7-704.

A person designated as trustee who decides not to accept the trusteeship need not provide a formal rejection, but a clear and early communication is recommended. The appropriate recipient of the rejection depends upon the circumstances. Ordinarily, it would be appropriate to communicate the rejection to the person who informed the designee of the proposed trusteeship. If judicial proceedings involving the trust are pending, the rejection could be filed with the court. In the case of a person named as trustee of a revocable trust, it would be appropriate to communicate the rejection to the settlor. In any event, it would be best to inform a beneficiary with a significant interest in the trust because that beneficiary might be more motivated than others to seek appointment of a new trustee.

Subsection (c)(1) makes clear that a nominated trustee may act expeditiously to protect the trust property without being considered to have accepted the trusteeship. However, upon conclusion of the intervention, the nominated trustee must send a rejection of office to the settlor, if living and competent, otherwise to a qualified beneficiary.

Because of the potential liability that can inhere in trusteeship, subsection (c)(2) allows a

a person designated as trustee to inspect the trust property without accepting the trusteeship. The condition of real property is a particular concern, including possible tort liability for the condition of the premises or liability for violation of state or federal environmental laws such as CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. Section 9607. For a provision limiting a trustee's personal liability for obligations arising from ownership or control of trust property, see Section 1010(b).

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

South Carolina has no prior statutory counterpart. Generally, at common law, "in an express trust, a trustee must agree to serve as trustee because of the attendant duties and potential liability." S. Alan Medlin, *The Law of Wills and Trusts*, Vol. 1, Estate Planning in South Carolina (2002) at Section 502, citing *Anderson v. Earle*, 9 S.C 460 (S.C. 1878).

SECTION 62-7-702. Trustee's bond.

(a) A trustee shall provide bond to secure the performance of the trustee's duties if:

- (1) the terms of the governing instrument require the trustee to provide bond;
- (2) a beneficiary requests the trustee to provide bond and the court finds the request to be reasonable; or
- (3) the court finds that it is necessary for the trustee to provide bond in order to protect the interests of the beneficiaries who are not able to protect themselves and whose interests otherwise are not adequately represented.

However, in no event shall bond be required of a trustee, including a trustee appointed by the court, if the governing instrument directs otherwise. On petition of the trustee or other interested person, the court may excuse a requirement of bond, reduce the amount of the bond, release the surety, or permit the substitution of another bond with the same or different sureties.

(b) If bond is required, it shall be filed in the

person designated as trustee to inspect the trust property without accepting the trusteeship. The condition of real property is a particular concern, including possible tort liability for the condition of the premises or liability for violation of state or federal environmental laws such as CERCLA, 42 U.S.C. Section 9607. For a provision limiting a trustee's personal liability for obligations arising from ownership or control of trust property, see Section 62-7-1010(b).

SECTION 62-7-702.

(a) A trustee shall provide bond to secure the performance of the trustee's duties if:

- (1) the terms of the governing instrument require the trustee to provide bond;
- (2) a beneficiary requests the trustee to provide bond and the court finds the request to be reasonable; or
- (3) the court finds that it is necessary for the trustee to provide bond in order to protect the interests of the beneficiaries who are not able to protect themselves and whose interests otherwise are not adequately represented.

However, in no event shall bond be required of a trustee, including a trustee appointed by the court, if the governing instrument directs otherwise. On petition of the trustee or other interested person, the court may excuse a requirement of bond, reduce the amount of the bond, release the surety, or permit the substitution of another bond with the same or different sureties.

(b) If bond is required, it shall be filed in the

court in the place in which the trust has its principal place of administration in amounts and with sureties and liabilities consistent with the requirements of South Carolina Code Sections 62-3-604 relating to bonds of personal representatives.

COMMENT

This section contains most but not all of the Code's provisions on cotrustees. Other provisions relevant to cotrustees include Sections 704 (vacancy in trusteeship need not be filled if cotrustee remains in office), 705 (notice of resignation must be given to cotrustee), 706 (lack of cooperation among cotrustees as ground for removal), 707 (obligations of resigning or removed trustee), 813 (reporting requirements upon vacancy in trusteeship), and 1013 (authority of cotrustees to authenticate documents).

Cotrustees are appointed for a variety of reasons. Having multiple decision-makers serves as a safeguard against eccentricity or misconduct. Cotrustees are often appointed to gain the advantage of differing skills, perhaps a financial institution for its permanence and professional skills, and a family member to maintain a personal connection with the beneficiaries. On other occasions, cotrustees are appointed to make certain that all family lines are represented in the trust's management.

Cotrusteeship should not be called for without careful reflection. Division of responsibility among cotrustees is often confused, the accountability of any individual trustee is uncertain, obtaining consent of all trustees can be burdensome, and unless an odd number of trustees is named deadlocks requiring court resolution can occur. Potential problems can be reduced by addressing division of responsibilities in the terms of the trust. Like the other sections of this article, this section is freely subject to modification in the terms of the trust. See Section 105.

Much of this section is based on comparable

court in the place in which the trust has its principal place of administration in amounts and with sureties and liabilities consistent with the requirements of South Carolina Code Sections 62-3-604 relating to bonds of personal representatives.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

South Carolina Trust Code Section 62-7-702 differs significantly from the Uniform Trust Code version of Section 702. SCTC Section 62-7-702 is in accord with former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-304, providing that a trustee will not normally be required to post bond.

provisions of the Restatement of Trusts, although with extensive modifications. Reference should also be made to ERISA Section 405 (29 U.S.C. Section 1105), which in recent years has been the statutory base for the most significant case law on the powers and duties of cotrustees.

Subsection (a) is in accord with Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 39 (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999), which rejects the common law rule, followed in earlier Restatements, requiring unanimity among the trustees of a private trust. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 194 (1959). This section is consistent with the prior Restatement rule applicable to charitable trusts, which allowed for action by a majority of trustees. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 383 (1959).

Under subsection (b), a majority of the remaining trustees may act for the trust when a vacancy occurs in a cotrusteeship. Section 704 provides that a vacancy in a cotrusteeship need be filled only if there is no trustee remaining in office.

Pursuant to subsection (c), a cotrustee must participate in the performance of a trustee function unless the cotrustee has properly delegated performance to another cotrustee, or the cotrustee is unable to participate due to temporary incapacity or disqualification under other law. Other laws under which a cotrustee might be disqualified include federal securities law and the ERISA prohibited transactions rules. Subsection (d) authorizes a cotrustee to assume some or all of the functions of another trustee who is unavailable to perform duties as provided in subsection (c). Subsection (e) addresses the extent to which a trustee may delegate the performance of functions to a cotrustee. The standard differs from the standard for delegation to an agent as provided in Section 807 because the two situations are different. Section 807, which is identical to Section 9 of the Uniform Prudent Investor Act, recognizes that many trustees are

not professionals. Consequently, trustees should be encouraged to delegate functions they are not competent to perform. Subsection (e) is premised on the assumption that the settlor selected cotrustees for a specific reason and that this reason ought to control the scope of a permitted delegation to a cotrustee. Subsection (e) prohibits a trustee from delegating to another trustee functions the settlor reasonably expected the trustees to perform jointly. The exact extent to which a trustee may delegate functions to another trustee in a particular case will vary depending on the reasons the settlor decided to appoint cotrustees. The better practice is to address the division of functions in the terms of the trust, as allowed by Section 105. Subsection (e) is based on language derived from Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 171 (1959). This section of the Restatement Second, which applied to delegations to both agents and cotrustees, was superseded, as to delegation to agents, by Restatement (Third) of Trusts: Prudent Investor Rule Section 171 (1992).

By permitting the trustees to act by a majority, this section contemplates that there may be a trustee or trustees who might dissent. Trustees who dissent from the acts of a cotrustee are in general protected from liability. Subsection (f) protects trustees who refused to join in the action. Subsection (h) protects a dissenting trustee who joined the action at the direction of the majority, such as to satisfy a demand of the other side to a transaction, if the trustee expressed the dissent to a cotrustee at or before the time of the action in question. However, the protections provided by subsections (f) and (h) no longer apply if the action constitutes a serious breach of trust. In that event, subsection (g) may impose liability against a dissenting trustee for failing to take reasonable steps to rectify the improper conduct. The responsibility to take action against a breaching cotrustee codifies the substance of Sections 184 and 224 of the

Restatement (Second) of Trusts (1959).

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

South Carolina Trust Code Section 62-7-702 differs significantly from the Uniform Trust Code version of Section 702. SCTC Section 62-7-702 is in accord with former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-304 by providing that a trustee will not normally be required to post bond.

SECTION 62-7-703. Cotrustees.

- (a) Cotrustees who are unable to reach a unanimous decision may act by majority decision.
- (b) If a vacancy occurs in a cotrusteeship, the remaining cotrustees may act for the trust.
- (c) A cotrustee must participate in the performance of a trustee's function unless the cotrustee is unavailable to perform the function because of absence, illness, disqualification under other law, or other temporary incapacity or the cotrustee has properly delegated the performance of the function to another trustee.
- (d) If a cotrustee is unavailable to perform duties because of absence, illness, disqualification under other law, or other temporary incapacity, and prompt action is necessary to achieve the purposes of the trust or to avoid injury to the trust property, the remaining cotrustee or a majority of the remaining cotrustees may act for the trust.
- (e) A trustee may not delegate to a cotrustee the performance of a function the settlor reasonably expected the trustees to perform jointly. Unless a delegation was irrevocable, a trustee may revoke a delegation previously made.
- (f) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (g), a trustee who does not join in an action of another trustee is not liable for the action.
- (g) Each trustee shall exercise reasonable care to:
 - (1) prevent a cotrustee from committing a

SECTION 62-7-703.

- (a) Cotrustees who are unable to reach a unanimous decision may act by majority decision.
- (b) If a vacancy occurs in a cotrusteeship, the remaining cotrustees may act for the trust.
- (c) A cotrustee must participate in the performance of a trustee's function unless the cotrustee is unavailable to perform the function because of absence, illness, disqualification under other law, or other temporary incapacity or the cotrustee has properly delegated the performance of the function to another trustee.
- (d) If a cotrustee is unavailable to perform duties because of absence, illness, disqualification under other law, or other temporary incapacity, and prompt action is necessary to achieve the purposes of the trust or to avoid injury to the trust property, the remaining cotrustee or a majority of the remaining cotrustees may act for the trust.
- (e) A trustee may not delegate to a cotrustee the performance of a function the settlor reasonably expected the trustees to perform jointly. Unless a delegation was irrevocable, a trustee may revoke a delegation previously made.
- (f) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (g), a trustee who does not join in an action of another trustee is not liable for the action.
- (g) Each trustee shall exercise reasonable care to:
 - (1) prevent a cotrustee from committing a serious breach of trust; and

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>serious breach of trust; and (2) compel a cotrustee to redress a serious breach of trust. (h) A dissenting trustee who joins in an action at the direction of the majority of the trustees and who notified any cotrustee of the dissent at or before the time of the action is not liable for the action unless the action is a serious breach of trust.</p> <p>COMMENT This section contains most but not all of the Code's provisions on cotrustees. Other provisions relevant to cotrustees include Sections 704 (vacancy in trusteeship need not be filled if cotrustee remains in office), 705 (notice of resignation must be given to cotrustee), 706 (lack of cooperation among cotrustees as ground for removal), 707 (obligations of resigning or removed trustee), 813 (reporting requirements upon vacancy in trusteeship), and 1013 (authority of cotrustees to authenticate documents). Cotrustees are appointed for a variety of reasons. Having multiple decision-makers serves as a safeguard against eccentricity or misconduct. Cotrustees are often appointed to gain the advantage of differing skills, perhaps a financial institution for its permanence and professional skills, and a family member to maintain a personal connection with the beneficiaries. On other occasions, cotrustees are appointed to make certain that all family lines are represented in the trust's management. Cotrusteeship should not be called for without careful reflection. Division of responsibility among cotrustees is often confused, the accountability of any individual trustee is uncertain, obtaining consent of all trustees can be burdensome, and unless an odd number of trustees is named deadlocks requiring court resolution can occur. Potential problems can be reduced by addressing division of responsibilities in the terms of the trust. Like the other sections of this article, this section is</p> | <p>(2) compel a cotrustee to redress a serious breach of trust. (h) A dissenting trustee who joins in an action at the direction of the majority of the trustees and who notified any cotrustee of the dissent at or before the time of the action is not liable for the action unless the action is a serious breach of trust.</p> <p>REPORTER'S COMMENT This section contains most but not all of the Code's provisions on cotrustees. Other provisions relevant to cotrustees include Sections 62-7-704 (vacancy in trusteeship need not be filled if cotrustee remains in office), 62-7-705 (notice of resignation must be given to cotrustee), 62-7-706 (lack of cooperation among cotrustees as ground for removal), 62-7-707 (obligations of resigning or removed trustee), 62-7-813 (reporting requirements upon vacancy in trusteeship), and 62-7-1013 (authority of cotrustees to authenticate documents). Cotrustees are appointed for a variety of reasons. Having multiple decision-makers serves as a safeguard against eccentricity or misconduct. Cotrustees are often appointed to gain the advantage of differing skills, perhaps a financial institution for its permanence and professional skills, and a family member to maintain a personal connection with the beneficiaries. On other occasions, cotrustees are appointed to make certain that all family lines are represented in the trust's management. Cotrusteeship should not be called for without careful reflection. Division of responsibility among cotrustees is often confused, the accountability of any individual trustee is uncertain, obtaining consent of all trustees can be burdensome, and, unless an odd number of trustees is named, deadlocks requiring court resolution can occur. Potential problems can be reduced by addressing division of responsibilities in the terms of the trust. Like the other sections of this article, this section is freely subject to modification in the</p> |
|--|---|

freely subject to modification in the terms of the trust. See Section 105.

Much of this section is based on comparable provisions of the Restatement of Trusts, although with extensive modifications. Reference should also be made to ERISA Section 405 (29 U.S.C. Section 1105), which in recent years has been the statutory base for the most significant case law on the powers and duties of cotrustees.

Subsection (a) is in accord with Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 39 (Tentative Draft No.2, approved 1999), which rejects the common law rule, followed in earlier Restatements, requiring unanimity among the trustees of a private trust. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 194 (1959). This section is consistent with the prior Restatement rule applicable to charitable trusts, which allowed for action by a majority of trustees. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 383 (1959).

Under subsection (b), a majority of the remaining trustees may act for the trust when a vacancy occurs in a cotrusteeship. Section 704 provides that a vacancy in a cotrusteeship need be filled only if there is no trustee remaining in office.

Pursuant to subsection (c), a cotrustee must participate in the performance of a trustee function unless the cotrustee has properly delegated performance to another cotrustee, or the cotrustee is unable to participate due to temporary incapacity or disqualification under other law. Other laws under which a cotrustee might be disqualified include federal securities law and the ERISA prohibited transactions rules. Subsection (d) authorizes a cotrustee to assume some or all of the functions of another trustee who is unavailable to perform duties as provided in subsection (c). Subsection (e) addresses the extent to which a trustee may delegate the performance of functions to a cotrustee. The standard differs from the standard for delegation to an agent as provided in Section 807 because the two

terms of the trust. See Section 62-7-105.

Much of this section is based on comparable provisions of the Restatement of Trusts, although with extensive modifications. Reference should also be made to ERISA Section 405 (29 U.S.C. Section 1105), which in recent years has been the statutory base for the most significant case law on the powers and duties of cotrustees.

Subsection (a) is in accord with Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 39 (Tentative Draft No.2, approved 1999), which rejects the common law rule, followed in earlier Restatements, requiring unanimity among the trustees of a private trust. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 194 (1959). This section is consistent with the prior Restatement rule applicable to charitable trusts, which allowed for action by a majority of trustees. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 383 (1959). Under subsection (b), a majority of the remaining trustees may act for the trust when a vacancy occurs in a cotrusteeship. Section 62-7-704 provides that a vacancy in a cotrusteeship need be filled only if there is no trustee remaining in office.

Subsections (b) and (d) provide for the proper administration of the trust in the event a cotrustee is unavailable or temporarily incapacitated. Subsection (c) compels a cotrustee to participate in the trustee's function or delegate such a duty unless excused by "absence, illness, disqualification under the law, or other temporary incapacity." Other laws under which a cotrustee might be disqualified include federal securities law and the ERISA prohibited transactions rules.

Subsection (e) addresses the extent to which a trustee may delegate the performance of functions to a cotrustee. The standard differs from the standard for delegation to an agent as provided in Section 62-7-807 because the two situations are different. Section 62-7-807, which is identical to Section 9 of the Uniform Prudent Investor Act, recognizes that many trustees are not professionals. Consequently,

situations are different. Section 807, which is identical to Section 9 of the Uniform Prudent Investor Act, recognizes that many trustees are not professionals. Consequently, trustees should be encouraged to delegate functions they are not competent to perform. Subsection (e) is premised on the assumption that the settlor selected cotrustees for a specific reason and that this reason ought to control the scope of a permitted delegation to a cotrustee. Subsection (e) prohibits a trustee from delegating to another trustee functions the settlor reasonably expected the trustees to perform jointly. The exact extent to which a trustee may delegate functions to another trustee in a particular case will vary depending on the reasons the settlor decided to appoint cotrustees. The better practice is to address the division of functions in the terms of the trust, as allowed by Section 105. Subsection (e) is based on language derived from Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 171 (1959). This section of the Restatement Second, which applied to delegations to both agents and cotrustees, was superseded, as to delegation to agents, by Restatement (Third) of Trusts: Prudent Investor Rule Section 171 (1992).

By permitting the trustees to act by a majority, this section contemplates that there may be a trustee or trustees who might dissent. Trustees who dissent from the acts of a cotrustee are in general protected from liability. Subsection (f) protects trustees who refused to join in the action. Subsection (h) protects a dissenting trustee who joined the action at the direction of the majority, such as to satisfy a demand of the other side to a transaction, if the trustee expressed the dissent to a cotrustee at or before the time of the action in question. However, the protections provided by subsections (f) and (h) no longer apply if the action constitutes a serious breach of trust. In that event, subsection (g) may impose liability against a dissenting trustee for failing to take reasonable steps to rectify the

trustees should be encouraged to delegate functions they are not competent to perform. Subsection (e) is premised on the assumption that the settlor selected cotrustees for a specific reason and that this reason ought to control the scope of a permitted delegation to a cotrustee. Subsection (e) prohibits a trustee from delegating to another trustee functions the settlor reasonably expected the trustees to perform jointly. The exact extent to which a trustee may delegate functions to another trustee in a particular case will vary depending on the reasons the settlor decided to appoint cotrustees. The better practice is to address the division of functions in the terms of the trust, as allowed by Section 62-7-105. Subsection (e) is based on language derived from Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 171 (1959). This section of the Restatement Second, which applied to delegations to both agents and cotrustees, was superseded, as to delegation to agents, by Restatement (Third) of Trusts: Prudent Investor Rule Section 171 (1992).

By permitting the trustees to act by a majority, this section contemplates that there may be a trustee or trustees who might dissent. The safeguard for a dissenting cotrustee is sprinkled throughout subsections (f), (g) and (h), Subsection (f) provides for a limitation on liability for a non-joining co-trustee, but that limitation on liability is tempered in subsection (g) by providing that a trustee must exercise “reasonable care”. Under subsection (g), a trustee may not passively dissent to an improper action by a cotrustee. Subsection (h) protects a dissenting cotrustee who joins in an action at the direction of the majority and notifies any cotrustee of his dissent. Subsection (h) does not require the dissent to be in writing. Further, under subsections (g) and (h) together, a cotrustee can not dissent and thereafter remain passive for actions by the majority of cotrustees amounting to a “serious breach of trust.” The dissenting trustee must exercise “reasonable care” to correct the conduct of the cotrustee(s). The responsibility

improper conduct. The responsibility to take action against a breaching cotrustee codifies the substance of Sections 184 and 224 of the Restatement (Second) of Trusts (1959).

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

This Section provides for majority vote by cotrustees on decisions that cannot be reached unanimously.

The safeguard for a dissenting cotrustee is sprinkled throughout subsections (f), (g) and (h). Subsection (f) provides for a limitation on liability for a non-joining cotrustee, but that limitation on liability is tempered in subsection (g) by providing that a trustee must exercise “reasonable care”. Under subsection (g), a trustee may not passively dissent to an action by a cotrustee. Subsection (h) protects a dissenting cotrustee who joins in an action at the direction of the majority and notifies any cotrustee of his dissent. Subsection (h) does not require the dissent to be in writing. Further, under subsections (g) and (h) together, a cotrustee can not dissent and thereafter remain passive for actions by the majority of cotrustees amounting to a “serious breach of trust.” The dissenting trustee must exercise “reasonable care” to correct the conduct of the cotrustee(s).

Subsections (b) and (d) provide for the proper administration of the trust in the event a cotrustee is unavailable or temporarily incapacitated.

Subsection (c) compels a cotrustee to participate in the trustee’s function or delegate such a duty unless excused by “absence, illness, disqualification under the law, or other temporary incapacity.”

SECTION 62-7-704. Vacancy in trusteeship; appointment of successor.

- (a) A vacancy in a trusteeship occurs if:
 - (1) a person designated as trustee rejects the trusteeship;
 - (2) a person designated as trustee cannot be

to take action against a breaching cotrustee codifies the substance of Sections 184 and 224 of the Restatement (Second) of Trusts (1959).

SECTION 62-7-704.

- (a) A vacancy in a trusteeship occurs if:
 - (1) a person designated as trustee rejects the trusteeship;
 - (2) a person designated as trustee cannot be

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>identified or does not exist;</p> <p>(3) a trustee resigns;</p> <p>(4) a trustee is disqualified or removed;</p> <p>(5) a trustee dies; or</p> <p>(6) a guardian or conservator is appointed for an individual serving as trustee.</p> <p>(b) If one or more cotrustees remain in office, a vacancy in a trusteeship need not be filled. A vacancy in a trusteeship must be filled if the trust has no remaining trustee.</p> <p>(c) A vacancy in a trusteeship of a noncharitable trust that is required to be filled must be filled in the following order of priority:</p> <p>(1) by a person designated in the terms of the trust to act as successor trustee;</p> <p>(2) by a person appointed by unanimous agreement of the qualified beneficiaries; or</p> <p>(3) by a person appointed by the court.</p> <p>(d) A vacancy in a trusteeship of a charitable trust that is required to be filled must be filled in the following order of priority:</p> <p>(1) by a person designated in the terms of the trust to act as successor trustee;</p> <p>(2) by a person selected by the charitable organizations expressly designated to receive distributions under the terms of the trust if the Attorney General concurs in the selection; or</p> <p>(3) by a person appointed by the court.</p> <p>(e) Whether or not a vacancy in a trusteeship exists or is required to be filled, the court may appoint an additional trustee or special fiduciary whenever the court considers the appointment necessary for the administration of the trust. The procedure for such appointment and the notice requirement shall be the same as set forth for special administrators under South Carolina Code Section 62-3-614.</p> <p>COMMENT</p> <p>This section lists the ways in which a trusteeship becomes vacant and the rules on filling the vacancy. See also Sections 701 (accepting or declining trusteeship), 705 (resignation), and 706 (removal). Good</p> | <p>identified or does not exist;</p> <p>(3) a trustee resigns;</p> <p>(4) a trustee is disqualified or removed;</p> <p>(5) a trustee dies; or</p> <p>(6) a guardian or conservator is appointed for an individual serving as trustee.</p> <p>(b) If one or more cotrustees remain in office, a vacancy in a trusteeship need not be filled. A vacancy in a trusteeship must be filled if the trust has no remaining trustee.</p> <p>(c) A vacancy in a trusteeship of a noncharitable trust that is required to be filled must be filled in the following order of priority:</p> <p>(1) by a person designated in the terms of the trust to act as successor trustee;</p> <p>(2) by a person appointed by unanimous agreement of the qualified beneficiaries; or</p> <p>(3) by a person appointed by the court.</p> <p>(d) A vacancy in a trusteeship of a charitable trust that is required to be filled must be filled in the following order of priority:</p> <p>(1) by a person designated in the terms of the trust to act as successor trustee;</p> <p>(2) by a person selected by the charitable organizations expressly designated to receive distributions under the terms of the trust if the Attorney General concurs in the selection; or</p> <p>(3) by a person appointed by the court.</p> <p>(e) Whether or not a vacancy in a trusteeship exists or is required to be filled, the court may appoint an additional trustee or special fiduciary whenever the court considers the appointment necessary for the administration of the trust. The procedure for such appointment and the notice requirement shall be the same as set forth for special administrators under South Carolina Code Section 62-3-614.</p> <p>REPORTER'S COMMENT</p> <p>This section provides a definition for a vacancy in a trusteeship and the procedure for appointment of a successor trustee if no provisions for dealing with these matters are set forth in the trust. See also Sections 62-7-701 (accepting or declining trusteeship), 62-7-705 (resignation), and 62-7-706 (removal). Good</p> |
|--|---|

drafting practice suggests that the terms of the trust deal expressly with the problem of vacancies, naming successors and specifying the procedure for filling vacancies. This section applies only if the terms of the trust fail to specify a procedure.

The disqualification of a trustee referred to in subsection (a)(4) would include a financial institution whose right to engage in trust business has been revoked or removed. Such disqualification might also occur if the trust's principal place of administration is transferred to a jurisdiction in which the trustee, whether an individual or institution, is not qualified to act.

Subsection (b) provides that a vacancy in the cotrusteeship must be filled only if the trust has no remaining trustee. If a vacancy in the cotrusteeship is not filled, Section 703 authorizes the remaining cotrustees to continue to administer the trust. However, as provided in subsection (e), the court, exercising its inherent equity authority, may always appoint additional trustees if the appointment would promote better administration of the trust. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 34 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 108 cmt. a (1959).

Subsection (c) provides a procedure for filling a vacancy in the trusteeship of a noncharitable trust. Absent an effective provision in the terms of the trust, subsection (c)(2) permits a vacancy in the trusteeship to be filled, without the need for court approval, by a person selected by unanimous agreement of the qualified beneficiaries. An effective provision in the terms of the trust for the designation of a successor trustee includes a procedure under which the successor trustee is selected by a person designated in those terms. Pursuant to Section 705(a)(1), the qualified beneficiaries may also receive the trustee's resignation. If a trustee resigns following notice as provided in Section 705, the trust may be transferred to a successor appointed pursuant to subsection

drafting practice suggests that the terms of the trust deal expressly with the problem of vacancies, naming successors and specifying the procedure for filling vacancies. This section applies only if the terms of the trust fail to specify a procedure.

Subsection (a) provides a list of matters causing a vacancy in trusteeship. The disqualification of a trustee referred to in subsection (a)(4) would include a financial institution whose right to engage in trust business has been revoked or removed. Such disqualification might also occur if the trust's principal place of administration is transferred to a jurisdiction in which the trustee, whether an individual or institution, is not qualified to act.

Subsection (b) grants authority to the remaining trustee(s) for the administration of the trust following a vacancy. If a vacancy in the cotrusteeship is not filled, Section 62-7-703 authorizes the remaining cotrustees to continue to administer the trust. However, as provided in subsection (e), the court, exercising its inherent equity authority, may always appoint additional trustees if the appointment would promote better administration of the trust. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 34 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 108 cmt. a (1959).

Subsection (c) provides a procedure for filling a vacancy in trusteeship if such a vacancy is required to be filled. Vacancies in this context could arise when the sole remaining trustee no longer is available to serve or the trust requires cotrustees and only one is named in the trust. Subsection (c) provides priority of succession of trustees in a non-charitable trust. Absent an effective provision in the terms of the trust, subsection (c)(2) permits a vacancy in the trusteeship to be filled, without the need for court approval, by a person selected by unanimous agreement of the qualified beneficiaries. An effective provision in the terms of the trust for the designation of a

(c)(2) of this section, all without court involvement. A nonqualified beneficiary who is displeased with the choice of the qualified beneficiaries may petition the court for removal of the trustee under Section 706.

If the qualified beneficiaries fail to make an appointment, subsection (c)(3) authorizes the court to fill the vacancy. In making the appointment, the court should consider the objectives and probable intention of the settlor, the promotion of the proper administration of the trust, and the interests and wishes of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 34 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 108 cmt. d (1959).

Subsection (d) specifies a procedure for filling a vacancy in the trusteeship of a charitable trust. Absent an effective designation in the terms of the trust, a successor trustee may be selected by the charitable organizations expressly designated to receive distributions in the terms of the trust but only if the attorney general concurs in the selection. If the attorney general does not concur in the selection, however, or if the trust does not designate a charitable organization to receive distributions, the vacancy may be filled only by the court.

In the case of a revocable trust, the appointment of a successor will normally be made directly by the settlor. As to the duties of a successor trustee with respect to the actions of a predecessor, see Section 812.

2001 Amendment. Subsection (d), which creates a procedure for the filling of a vacancy in the trusteeship of a charitable trust, was added by a 2001 amendment.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

This Section provides a definition for a vacancy in a trusteeship and the procedure for appointment of a successor trustee if no provisions for dealing with these matters are set forth in the trust.

Subsection (a) provides a list of matters

successor trustee includes a procedure under which the successor trustee is selected by a person designated in those terms. Pursuant to Section 62-7-705(a)(1), the qualified beneficiaries may also receive the trustee's resignation. If a trustee resigns following notice as provided in Section 62-7-705, the trust may be transferred to a successor appointed pursuant to subsection (c)(2) of this section, all without court involvement. A nonqualified beneficiary who is displeased with the choice of the qualified beneficiaries may petition the court for removal of the trustee under Section 62-7-706.

If the qualified beneficiaries fail to make an appointment, subsection (c)(3) authorizes the court to fill the vacancy. In making the appointment, the court should consider the objectives and probable intention of the settlor, the promotion of the proper administration of the trust, and the interests and wishes of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 34 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 108 cmt. d (1959).

Subsection (d) provides for priority of succession in a charitable trust. These sections provide a method for the vacancy to be filled without court approval. Subsection (d) includes the language added by the 2004 Amendments to the UTC, dealing with the concurrence of the Attorney General. If the attorney general does not concur in the selection, however, or if the trust does not designate a charitable organization to receive distributions, the vacancy may be filled only by the court.

Subsection (e) provides for a court appointed special trustee or "special fiduciary" if necessary for the "administration of the trust." The provisions of subsection (e) are unqualified and provide "whether or not a vacancy in a trusteeship exists or is required to be filled" the court has authority to appoint such an additional trustee. Such a trustee would have the authority provided by the court in its order

causing a vacancy in trusteeship. Subsection (b) grants authority to the remaining trustee(s) for the administration of the trust following a vacancy.

Subsection (c) provides a procedure for filling a vacancy in trusteeship if such a vacancy is required to be filled. Vacancies in this context could arise when the sole remaining trustee no longer is available to serve or the trust requires cotrustees and only one is named in the trust. Subsection (c) provides priority of succession of trustees in a non-charitable trust and subsection (d) provides for priority of succession in a charitable trust. These sections provide a method for the vacancy to be filled without court approval. Subsection (d) includes the language added by the 2004 Amendments to the UTC, dealing with the concurrence of the Attorney General.

Subsection (e) provides for a court appointed special trustee or “special fiduciary” if necessary for the “administration of the trust.” The provisions of subsection (e) are unqualified and provide “whether or not a vacancy in a trusteeship exists or is required to be filled” the court has authority to appoint such an additional trustee. Such a trustee would have the authority provided by the court in its order of appointment. If the order of appointment contains no limitations, the additional trustee would succeed to the full powers of a trustee under the trust.

SECTION 62-7-705. Resignation of trustee.

- (a) A trustee may resign:
 - (1) upon at least 30 days notice in writing to the qualified beneficiaries, the settlor, if living, and all cotrustees; or
 - (2) with the approval of the court.
- (b) In approving a resignation, the court may issue orders and impose conditions reasonably necessary for the protection of the trust property.
- (c) Any liability of a resigning trustee or of any sureties on the trustee’s bond for acts or

of appointment. If the order of appointment contains no limitations, the additional trustee would succeed to the full powers of a trustee under the trust.

In the case of a revocable trust, the appointment of a successor will normally be made directly by the settlor. As to the duties of a successor trustee with respect to the actions of a predecessor, see Section 62-7-812.

SECTION 62-7-705.

- (a) A trustee may resign:
 - (1) upon at least 30 days notice in writing to the qualified beneficiaries, the settlor, if living, and all cotrustees; or
 - (2) with the approval of the court.
- (b) In approving a resignation, the court may issue orders and impose conditions reasonably necessary for the protection of the trust property.
- (c) Any liability of a resigning trustee or of any sureties on the trustee’s bond for acts or

omissions of the trustee is not discharged or affected by the trustee's resignation.

COMMENT

This section rejects the common law rule that a trustee may resign only with permission of the court, and goes further than the Restatements, which allow a trustee to resign with the consent of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 36 (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 106 (1959). Concluding that the default rule ought to approximate standard drafting practice, the drafting committee provided in subsection (a) that a trustee may resign by giving notice to the qualified beneficiaries, a living settlor, and any cotrustee. A resigning trustee may also follow the traditional method and resign with approval of the court.

Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 36 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999), and Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 106 cmt. b (1959), provide, similar to subsection (c), that a resignation does not release the resigning trustee from potential liabilities for acts or omissions while in office. The act of resignation can give rise to liability if the trustee resigns for the purpose of facilitating a breach of trust by a cotrustee. See *Ream v. Frey*, 107 F.3d 147 (3rd Cir. 1997).

Regarding the residual responsibilities of a resigning trustee until the trust property is delivered to a successor trustee, see Section 707.

In the case of a revocable trust, because the rights of the qualified beneficiaries are subject to the settlor's control (see Section 603), resignation of the trustee is accomplished by giving notice to the settlor instead of the beneficiaries.

2001 Amendment. By a 2001 amendment, subsection (a)(1) was amended to require that notice of a trustee's resignation be given to a living settlor. Previously, notice to a living settlor was required for a revocable but not

omissions of the trustee is not discharged or affected by the trustee's resignation.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

This section rejects the common law rule that a trustee may resign only with permission of the court, and goes further than the Restatements, which allow a trustee to resign with the consent of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 36 (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 106 (1959). Concluding that the default rule ought to approximate standard drafting practice, the drafting committee provided in subsection (a) that a trustee may resign by giving notice to the qualified beneficiaries, a living settlor, and any cotrustee. A resigning trustee may also follow the traditional method and resign with approval of the court.

Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 36 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999), and Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 106 cmt. b (1959), provide, similar to subsection (c), that a resignation does not release the resigning trustee from potential liabilities for acts or omissions while in office. The act of resignation can give rise to liability if the trustee resigns for the purpose of facilitating a breach of trust by a cotrustee. See *Ream v. Frey*, 107 F.3d 147 (3rd Cir. 1997).

Regarding the residual responsibilities of a resigning trustee until the trust property is delivered to a successor trustee, see Section 62-7-707.

In the case of a revocable trust, because the rights of the qualified beneficiaries are subject to the settlor's control (see Section 62-7-603), resignation of the trustee is accomplished by giving notice to the settlor instead of the beneficiaries.

Section 62-7-705(a)(1) adds to the Uniform Trust Code version of Section 705 the words "in writing" after "notice" for clarification, as a writing is the reasonable and customary choice for notification.

irrevocable trust. Notice to the settlor of a revocable trust was required because the rights of the qualified beneficiaries, including the right to receive a trustee's resignation, are subject to the settlor's exclusive control. See Section 603.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

Section 62-7-705(a)(1) adds to the Uniform Trust Code version of Section 705 the words "in writing" after "notice" for clarification, as a writing is the reasonable and customary choice for notification.

This Section incorporates some of the provisions of former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-705, except that this Section introduces a thirty (30) day written notice provision for resignation. The former South Carolina statute allowed the Trustee to resign if the document so provided, all beneficiaries consented, or the court approved the resignation. Subsection (c) makes clear that a mere resignation does not terminate a trustee's liability.

SECTION 62-7-706. Removal of trustee.

- (a) For the reasons set forth in subsection (b), the settlor, a cotrustee, or a beneficiary may request the court to remove a trustee, or a trustee may be removed by the court on its own initiative.
- (b) The court may remove a trustee if:
 - (1) the trustee has committed a serious breach of trust;
 - (2) lack of cooperation among cotrustees substantially impairs the administration of the trust;
 - (3) because of unfitness, unwillingness, or persistent failure of the trustee to administer the trust effectively, the court determines that removal of the trustee best serves the interests of the beneficiaries; or
 - (4) there has been a substantial change of circumstances or removal is requested by all of the qualified beneficiaries, the court finds that

This Section incorporates some of the provisions of former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-705, except that this Section introduces a thirty (30) day written notice provision for resignation. The former South Carolina statute allowed the Trustee to resign if the document so provided, all beneficiaries consented, or the court approved the resignation. Subsection (c) makes clear that a mere resignation does not terminate a trustee's liability.

SECTION 62-7-706.

- (a) For the reasons set forth in subsection (b), the settlor, a cotrustee, or a beneficiary may request the court to remove a trustee, or a trustee may be removed by the court on its own initiative.
- (b) The court may remove a trustee if:
 - (1) the trustee has committed a serious breach of trust;
 - (2) lack of cooperation among cotrustees substantially impairs the administration of the trust;
 - (3) because of unfitness, unwillingness, or persistent failure of the trustee to administer the trust effectively, the court determines that removal of the trustee best serves the interests of the beneficiaries; or
 - (4) there has been a substantial change of circumstances or removal is requested by all of the qualified beneficiaries, the court finds that

removal of the trustee best serves the interests of all of the beneficiaries and is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust, and a suitable cotrustee or successor trustee is available.

(c) Pending a final decision on a request to remove a trustee, or in lieu of or in addition to removing a trustee, the court may order such appropriate relief under Section 62-7-1001(b) as may be necessary to protect the trust property or the interests of the beneficiaries.

COMMENT

Subsection (a), contrary to the common law, grants the settlor of an irrevocable trust the right to petition for removal of a trustee. The right to petition for removal does not give the settlor of an irrevocable trust any other rights, such as the right to an annual report or to receive other information concerning administration of the trust. The right of a beneficiary to petition for removal does not apply to a revocable trust while the settlor has capacity. Pursuant to Section 603(a), while a trust is revocable and the settlor has capacity, the rights of the beneficiaries are subject to the settlor's exclusive control.

Trustee removal may be regulated by the terms of the trust. See Section 105. In fashioning a removal provision for an irrevocable trust, the drafter should be cognizant of the danger that the trust may be included in the settlor's federal gross estate if the settlor retains the power to be appointed as trustee or to appoint someone who is not independent. See Rev. Rul. 95-58, 1995-2 C.B. 191.

Subsection (b) lists the grounds for removal of the trustee. The grounds for removal are similar to those found in Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). A trustee may be removed for untoward action, such as for a serious breach of trust, but the section is not so limited. A trustee may also be removed under a variety of circumstances in which the court concludes that the trustee is not best serving

removal of the trustee best serves the interests of all of the beneficiaries and is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust, and a suitable cotrustee or successor trustee is available.

(c) Pending a final decision on a request to remove a trustee, or in lieu of or in addition to removing a trustee, the court may order such appropriate relief under Section 62-7-1001(b) as may be necessary to protect the trust property or the interests of the beneficiaries.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

This section sets forth the grounds for removal of a trustee.

Subsection (a), contrary to the common law, grants the settlor of an irrevocable trust the right to petition for removal of a trustee. The right to petition for removal does not give the settlor of an irrevocable trust any other rights, such as the right to an annual report or to receive other information concerning administration of the trust. The right of a beneficiary to petition for removal does not apply to a revocable trust while the settlor has capacity. Pursuant to Section 62-7-603(a), while a trust is revocable and the settlor has capacity, the rights of the beneficiaries are subject to the settlor's exclusive control.

For clarification, Section 62-7-706(a) adds to the Uniform Trust Code version the words "for the reasons set forth in subsection (b)." The UTC Comment makes clear that a beneficiary's rights under a revocable trust are subject to those of the settlor.

Trustee removal may be regulated by the terms of the trust. See Section 62-7-105. In fashioning a removal provision for an irrevocable trust, the drafter should be cognizant of the danger that the trust may be included in the settlor's federal gross estate if the settlor retains the power to be appointed as trustee or to appoint someone who is not independent. See Rev. Rul. 95-58, 1995-2 C.B. 191.

Subsection (b) lists the grounds for removal

the interests of the beneficiaries. The term “interests of the beneficiaries” means the beneficial interests as provided in the terms of the trust, not as defined by the beneficiaries. See Section 103(7). Removal for conduct detrimental to the interests of the beneficiaries is a well-established standard for removal of a trustee. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 107 cmt. a (1959).

Subsection (b)(1), consistent with Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a and g (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999), makes clear that not every breach of trust justifies removal of the trustee. The breach must be “serious.” A serious breach of trust may consist of a single act that causes significant harm or involves flagrant misconduct. A serious breach of trust may also consist of a series of smaller breaches, none of which individually justify removal when considered alone, but which do so when considered together. A particularly appropriate circumstance justifying removal of the trustee is a serious breach of the trustee’s duty to keep the beneficiaries reasonably informed of the administration of the trust or to comply with a beneficiary’s request for information as required by Section 813. Failure to comply with this duty may make it impossible for the beneficiaries to protect their interests. It may also mask more serious violations by the trustee.

The lack of cooperation among trustees justifying removal under subsection (b)(2) need not involve a breach of trust. The key factor is whether the administration of the trust is significantly impaired by the trustees’ failure to agree. Removal is particularly appropriate if the naming of an even number of trustees, combined with their failure to agree, has resulted in deadlock requiring court resolution. The court may remove one or more or all of the trustees. If a cotrustee remains in office following the removal, under

of the trustee. The grounds for removal are similar to those found in Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). A trustee may be removed for untoward action, such as for a serious breach of trust, but the section is not so limited. A trustee may also be removed under a variety of circumstances in which the court concludes that the trustee is not best serving the interests of the beneficiaries. The term “interests of the beneficiaries” means the beneficial interests as provided in the terms of the trust, not as defined by the beneficiaries. See Section 62-7-103(7). Removal for conduct detrimental to the interests of the beneficiaries is a well-established standard for removal of a trustee. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 107 cmt. a (1959).

Subsection (b)(1), consistent with Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a and g (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999), makes clear that not every breach of trust justifies removal of the trustee. The breach must be “serious.” A serious breach of trust may consist of a single act that causes significant harm or involves flagrant misconduct. A serious breach of trust may also consist of a series of smaller breaches, none of which individually justify removal when considered alone, but which do so when considered together. A particularly appropriate circumstance justifying removal of the trustee is a serious breach of the trustee’s duty to keep the beneficiaries reasonably informed of the administration of the trust or to comply with a beneficiary’s request for information as required by Section 62-7-813. Failure to comply with this duty may make it impossible for the beneficiaries to protect their interests. It may also mask more serious violations by the trustee. “Serious breach of trust” is defined in SCTC Subsection 62-7-103(24).

The lack of cooperation among trustees justifying removal under subsection (b)(2) need

Section 704 appointment of a successor trustee is not required.

Subsection (b)(2) deals only with lack of cooperation among cotrustees, not with friction between the trustee and beneficiaries. Friction between the trustee and beneficiaries is ordinarily not a basis for removal. However, removal might be justified if a communications breakdown is caused by the trustee or appears to be incurable. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999).

Subsection (b)(3) authorizes removal for a variety of grounds, including unfitness, unwillingness, or persistent failure to administer the trust effectively. Removal in any of these cases is allowed only if it best serves the interests of the beneficiaries. For the definition of “interests of the beneficiaries,” see Section 103(7). “Unfitness” may include not only mental incapacity but also lack of basic ability to administer the trust. Before removing a trustee for unfitness the court should consider the extent to which the problem might be cured by a delegation of functions the trustee is personally incapable of performing. “Unwillingness” includes not only cases where the trustee refuses to act but also a pattern of indifference to some or all of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). A “persistent failure to administer the trust effectively” might include a long-term pattern of mediocre performance, such as consistently poor investment results when compared to comparable trusts.

It has traditionally been more difficult to remove a trustee named by the settlor than a trustee named by the court, particularly if the settlor at the time of the appointment was aware of the trustee’s failings. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 107 cmt. f-g (1959). Because of the discretion

not involve a breach of trust. The key factor is whether the administration of the trust is significantly impaired by the trustees’ failure to agree. Removal is particularly appropriate if the naming of an even number of trustees, combined with their failure to agree, has resulted in deadlock requiring court resolution. The court may remove one or more or all of the trustees. If a cotrustee remains in office following the removal, under Section 62-7-704 appointment of a successor trustee is not required.

Subsection (b)(2) deals only with lack of cooperation among cotrustees, not with friction between the trustee and beneficiaries. Friction between the trustee and beneficiaries is ordinarily not a basis for removal. However, removal might be justified if a communications breakdown is caused by the trustee or appears to be incurable. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999).

Subsection (b)(3) authorizes removal for a variety of grounds, including unfitness, unwillingness, or persistent failure to administer the trust effectively. Removal in any of these cases is allowed only if it best serves the interests of the beneficiaries. For the definition of “interests of the beneficiaries,” see Section 62-7-103(7). “Unfitness” may include not only mental incapacity but also lack of basic ability to administer the trust. Before removing a trustee for unfitness the court should consider the extent to which the problem might be cured by a delegation of functions the trustee is personally incapable of performing. “Unwillingness” includes not only cases where the trustee refuses to act but also a pattern of indifference to some or all of the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). A “persistent failure to administer the trust effectively” might include a long-term pattern of mediocre performance, such as consistently poor investment results when compared to comparable trusts.

normally granted to a trustee, the settlor's confidence in the judgment of the particular person whom the settlor selected to act as trustee is entitled to considerable weight. This deference to the settlor's choice can weaken or dissolve if a substantial change in the trustee's circumstances occurs. To honor a settlor's reasonable expectations, subsection (b)(4) lists a substantial change of circumstances as a possible basis for removal of the trustee. Changed circumstances justifying removal of a trustee might include a substantial change in the character of the service or location of the trustee. A corporate reorganization of an institutional trustee is not itself a change of circumstances if it does not affect the service provided the individual trust account. Before removing a trustee on account of changed circumstances, the court must also conclude that removal is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust, that it will best serve the interests of the beneficiaries, and that a suitable cotrustee or successor trustee is available.

Subsection (b)(4) also contains a specific but more limited application of Section 411. Section 411 allows the beneficiaries by unanimous agreement to compel modification of a trust if the court concludes that the particular modification is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust. Subsection (b)(4) of this section similarly allows the qualified beneficiaries to request removal of the trustee if the designation of the trustee was not a material purpose of the trust. Before removing the trustee the court must also find that removal will best serve the interests of the beneficiaries and that a suitable cotrustee or successor trustee is available.

Subsection (c) authorizes the court to intervene pending a final decision on a request to remove a trustee. Among the relief that the court may order under Section 1001(b) is an injunction prohibiting the trustee from performing certain acts and the appointment of a special fiduciary to perform some or all of

It has traditionally been more difficult to remove a trustee named by the settlor than a trustee named by the court, particularly if the settlor at the time of the appointment was aware of the trustee's failings. *See* Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 37 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 107 cmt. f-g (1959). Because of the discretion normally granted to a trustee, the settlor's confidence in the judgment of the particular person whom the settlor selected to act as trustee is entitled to considerable weight. This deference to the settlor's choice can weaken or dissolve if a substantial change in the trustee's circumstances occurs. To honor a settlor's reasonable expectations, subsection (b)(4) lists a substantial change of circumstances as a possible basis for removal of the trustee. Changed circumstances justifying removal of a trustee might include a substantial change in the character of the service or location of the trustee. A corporate reorganization of an institutional trustee is not itself a change of circumstances if it does not affect the service provided the individual trust account. Before removing a trustee on account of changed circumstances, the court must also conclude that removal is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust, that it will best serve the interests of the beneficiaries, and that a suitable cotrustee or successor trustee is available.

Subsection (b)(4) also contains a specific but more limited application of Section 62-7-411. Section 62-7-411 allows the beneficiaries by unanimous agreement to compel modification of a trust if the court concludes that the particular modification is not inconsistent with a material purpose of the trust. Subsection (b)(4) of this section similarly allows the qualified beneficiaries to request removal of the trustee if the designation of the trustee was not a material purpose of the trust. Before removing the trustee the court must also find that removal will best serve the interests of the beneficiaries and that a suitable cotrustee or

the trustee's functions. Pursuant to Section 1004, the court may also award attorney's fees as justice and equity may require.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

This section sets forth the grounds for removal of a trustee.

For clarification, Section 62-7-706(a) adds to the Uniform Trust Code version the words "for the reasons set forth in subsection (b)." The UTC Comment makes clear that a beneficiary's rights under a revocable trust are subject to those of the settlor.

"Serious breach of trust" is defined in SCTC Subsection 62-7-103(24).

SECTION 62-7-707. Delivery of property by former trustee.

(a) Unless a cotrustee remains in office or the court otherwise orders, and until the trust property is delivered to a successor trustee or other person entitled to it, a trustee who has resigned or been removed has the duties of a trustee and the powers necessary to protect the trust property.

(b) A trustee who has resigned or been removed shall proceed expeditiously to deliver the trust property within the trustee's possession to the cotrustee, successor trustee, or other person entitled to it.

COMMENT

This section addresses the continuing authority and duty of a resigning or removed trustee. Subject to the power of the court to make other arrangements or unless a cotrustee remains in office, a resigning or removed trustee has continuing authority until the trust property is delivered to a successor. If a cotrustee remains in office, there is no reason to grant a resigning or removed trustee any continuing authority, and none is granted under this section. In addition, if a cotrustee remains in office, the former trustee need not submit a final trustee's report. See Section 813(c).

successor trustee is available.

Subsection (c) authorizes the court to intervene pending a final decision on a request to remove a trustee. Among the relief that the court may order under Section 62-7-1001(b) is an injunction prohibiting the trustee from performing certain acts and the appointment of a special fiduciary to perform some or all of the trustee's functions. Pursuant to Section 62-7-1004, the court may also award attorney's fees as justice and equity may require.

SECTION 62-7-707.

(a) Unless a cotrustee remains in office or the court otherwise orders, and until the trust property is delivered to a successor trustee or other person entitled to it, a trustee who has resigned or been removed has the duties of a trustee and the powers necessary to protect the trust property.

(b) A trustee who has resigned or been removed shall proceed expeditiously to deliver the trust property within the trustee's possession to the cotrustee, successor trustee, or other person entitled to it.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

This section addresses the continuing authority and duty of a resigning or removed trustee. This section is comparable to South Carolina Probate Code Sections 62-3-608 through 62-3-611 concerning the termination of a personal representative. Subject to the power of the court to make other arrangements or unless a cotrustee remains in office, a resigning or removed trustee has continuing authority until the trust property is delivered to a successor. If a cotrustee remains in office, there is no reason to grant a resigning or removed trustee any continuing authority, and

There is ample authority in the Uniform Trust Code for the appointment of a special fiduciary, an appointment which can avoid the need for a resigning or removed trustee to exercise residual powers until a successor can take office. See Sections 704(e) (court may appoint additional trustee or special fiduciary whenever court considers appointment necessary for administration of trust), 705(b) (in approving resignation, court may impose conditions necessary for protection of trust property), 706(c) (pending decision on petition for removal, court may order appropriate relief), and 1001(b)(5) (to remedy breach of trust, court may appoint special fiduciary as necessary to protect trust property or interests of beneficiary).

If the former trustee has died, the Uniform Trust Code does not require that the trustee's personal representative windup the deceased trustee's administration. Nor is a trustee's conservator or guardian required to complete the former trustee's administration if the trustee's authority terminated due to an adjudication of incapacity. However, to limit the former trustee's liability, the personal representative, conservator or guardian may submit a trustee's report on the former trustee's behalf as authorized by Section 813(c). Otherwise, the former trustee remains liable for actions taken during the trustee's term of office until liability is otherwise barred.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

This Section is comparable to South Carolina Probate Code Sections 62-3-608 through 62-3-611 concerning the termination of a personal representative.

SECTION 62-7-708. Compensation of trustee.

(a) If the terms of a trust do not specify the trustee's compensation, a trustee is entitled to compensation that is reasonable under the

none is granted under this section. In addition, if a cotrustee remains in office, the former trustee need not submit a final trustee's report. See Section 62-7-813(c).

There is ample authority in the SCTC for the appointment of a special fiduciary, an appointment which can avoid the need for a resigning or removed trustee to exercise residual powers until a successor can take office. See Sections 62-7-704(e) (court may appoint additional trustee or special fiduciary whenever court considers appointment necessary for administration of trust), 62-7-705(b) (in approving resignation, court may impose conditions necessary for protection of trust property), 62-7-706(c) (pending decision on petition for removal, court may order appropriate relief), and 62-7-1001(b)(5) (to remedy breach of trust, court may appoint special fiduciary as necessary to protect trust property or interests of beneficiary).

If the former trustee has died, the SCTC does not require that the trustee's personal representative wind up the deceased trustee's administration. Nor is a trustee's conservator or guardian required to complete the former trustee's administration if the trustee's authority terminated due to an adjudication of incapacity. However, to limit the former trustee's liability, the personal representative, conservator or guardian may submit a trustee's report on the former trustee's behalf as authorized by Section 62-7-813(c). Otherwise, the former trustee remains liable for actions taken during the trustee's term of office until liability is otherwise barred.

SECTION 62-7-708.

(a) If the terms of a trust do not specify the trustee's compensation, a trustee is entitled to compensation that is reasonable under the

circumstances.

(b) If the terms of a trust specify the trustee's compensation, the trustee is entitled to be compensated as specified, but the court may allow more or less compensation if:

- (1) the duties of the trustee are substantially different from those contemplated when the trust was created; or
- (2) the compensation specified by the terms of the trust would be unreasonably low or high.

COMMENT

Subsection (a) establishes a standard of reasonable compensation. Relevant factors in determining this compensation, as specified in the Restatement, include the custom of the community; the trustee's skill, experience, and facilities; the time devoted to trust duties; the amount and character of the trust property; the degree of difficulty, responsibility and risk assumed in administering the trust, including in making discretionary distributions; the nature and costs of services rendered by others; and the quality of the trustee's performance. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. c (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. b (1959). In setting compensation, the services actually performed and responsibilities assumed by the trustee should be closely examined. A downward adjustment of fees may be appropriate if a trustee has delegated significant duties to agents, such as the delegation of investment authority to outside managers. See Section 807 (delegation by trustee). On the other hand, a trustee with special skills, such as those of a real estate agent, may be entitled to extra compensation for performing services that would ordinarily be delegated. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. d (1959).

Because "trustee" as defined in Section 103(19) includes not only an individual trustee

circumstances.

(b) If the terms of a trust specify the trustee's compensation, the trustee is entitled to be compensated as specified, but the court may allow more or less compensation if:

- (1) the duties of the trustee are substantially different from those contemplated when the trust was created; or
- (2) the compensation specified by the terms of the trust would be unreasonably low or high.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

This section incorporates and clarifies the provisions of current South Carolina law for determination of trustee fees. Former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-205 required the trustee to return the excess part of any fee determined to be unreasonable by the court.

Subsection (a) establishes a standard of reasonable compensation. Relevant factors in determining this compensation, as specified in the Restatement, include the custom of the community; the trustee's skill, experience, and facilities; the time devoted to trust duties; the amount and character of the trust property; the degree of difficulty, responsibility and risk assumed in administering the trust, including in making discretionary distributions; the nature and costs of services rendered by others; and the quality of the trustee's performance. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. c (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. b (1959).

In setting compensation, the services actually performed and responsibilities assumed by the trustee should be closely examined. A downward adjustment of fees may be appropriate if a trustee has delegated significant duties to agents, such as the delegation of investment authority to outside managers. See Section 62-7-807 (delegation by trustee). On the other hand, a trustee with special skills, such as those of a real estate agent, may be entitled to extra compensation for performing

but also cotrustees, each trustee, including a cotrustee, is entitled to reasonable compensation under the circumstances. The fact that a trust has more than one trustee does not mean that the trustees together are entitled to more compensation than had either acted alone. Nor does the appointment of more than one trustee mean that the trustees are eligible to receive the compensation in equal shares. The total amount of the compensation to be paid and how it will be divided depend on the totality of the circumstances. Factors to be considered include the settlor's reasons for naming more than one trustee and the level of responsibility assumed and exact services performed by each trustee. Often the fees of cotrustees will be in the aggregate higher than the fees for a single trustee because of the duty of each trustee to participate in administration and not delegate to a cotrustee duties the settlor expected the trustees to perform jointly. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. i (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). The trust may benefit in such cases from the enhanced quality of decision-making resulting from the collective deliberations of the trustees.

Financial institution trustees normally base their fees on published fee schedules. Published fee schedules are subject to the same standard of reasonableness under the Uniform Trust Code as are other methods for computing fees. The courts have generally upheld published fee schedules but this is not automatic. Among the more litigated topics is the issue of termination fees. Termination fees are charged upon termination of the trust and sometimes upon transfer of the trust to a successor trustee. Factors relevant to whether the fee is appropriate include the actual work performed; whether a termination fee was authorized in the terms of the trust; whether the fee schedule specified the circumstances in which a termination fee would be charged; whether the trustee's overall fees for administering the trust from the date of the

services that would ordinarily be delegated. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. d (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. d (1959).

Because "trustee" as defined in Section 62-7-103(19) includes not only an individual trustee but also cotrustees, each trustee, including a cotrustee, is entitled to reasonable compensation under the circumstances. The fact that a trust has more than one trustee does not mean that the trustees together are entitled to more compensation than had either acted alone. Nor does the appointment of more than one trustee mean that the trustees are eligible to receive the compensation in equal shares. The total amount of the compensation to be paid and how it will be divided depend on the totality of the circumstances. Factors to be considered include the settlor's reasons for naming more than one trustee and the level of responsibility assumed and exact services performed by each trustee. Often the fees of cotrustees will be in the aggregate higher than the fees for a single trustee because of the duty of each trustee to participate in administration and not delegate to a cotrustee duties the settlor expected the trustees to perform jointly. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. i (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999). The trust may benefit in such cases from the enhanced quality of decision-making resulting from the collective deliberations of the trustees.

Financial institution trustees normally base their fees on published fee schedules. Published fee schedules are subject to the same standard of reasonableness under the SCTC as are other methods for computing fees. The courts have generally upheld published fee schedules but this is not automatic. Among the more litigated topics is the issue of termination fees. Termination fees are charged upon termination of the trust and sometimes upon transfer of the trust to a successor trustee. Factors relevant to whether the fee is appropriate include the actual work performed;

trust's creation, including the termination fee, were reasonable; and the general practice in the community regarding termination fees. Because significantly less work is normally involved, termination fees are less appropriate upon transfer to a successor trustee than upon termination of the trust. For representative cases, see *Cleveland Trust Co. v. Wilmington Trust Co.*, 258 A.2d 58 (Del. 1969); *In re Trusts Under Will of Dwan*, 371 N.W. 2d 641 (Minn. Ct. App. 1985); *Mercer v. Merchants National Bank*, 298 A.2d 736 (N.H. 1972); *In re Estate of Payson*, 562 N.Y.S. 2d 329 (Surr. Ct. 1990); *In re Indenture Agreement of Lawson*, 607 A. 2d 803 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1992); *In re Estate of Ischy*, 415 A.2d 37 (Pa. 1980); *Memphis Memorial Park v. Planters National Bank*, 1986 Tenn. App. LEXIS 2978 (May 7, 1986); *In re Trust of Sensenbrenner*, 252 N.W. 2d 47 (Wis. 1977).

This Code does not take a specific position on whether dual fees may be charged when a trustee hires its own law firm to represent the trust. The trend is to authorize dual compensation as long as the overall fees are reasonable. For a discussion, see Ronald C. Link, *Developments Regarding the Professional Responsibility of the Estate Administration Lawyer: The Effect of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct*, 26 Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. 1, 22-38 (1991).

Subsection (b) permits the terms of the trust to override the reasonable compensation standard, subject to the court's inherent equity power to make adjustments downward or upward in appropriate circumstances. Compensation provisions should be drafted with care. Common questions include whether a provision in the terms of the trust setting the amount of the trustee's compensation is binding on a successor trustee, whether a dispositive provision for the trustee in the terms of the trust is in addition to or in lieu of the trustee's regular compensation, and whether a dispositive provision for the trustee is conditional on the person performing

whether a termination fee was authorized in the terms of the trust; whether the fee schedule specified the circumstances in which a termination fee would be charged; whether the trustee's overall fees for administering the trust from the date of the trust's creation, including the termination fee, were reasonable; and the general practice in the community regarding termination fees. Because significantly less work is normally involved, termination fees are less appropriate upon transfer to a successor trustee than upon termination of the trust. For representative cases, see *Cleveland Trust Co. v. Wilmington Trust Co.*, 258 A.2d 58 (Del. 1969); *In re Trusts Under Will of Dwan*, 371 N.W. 2d 641 (Minn. Ct. App. 1985); *Mercer v. Merchants National Bank*, 298 A.2d 736 (N.H. 1972); *In re Estate of Payson*, 562 N.Y.S. 2d 329 (Surr. Ct. 1990); *In re Indenture Agreement of Lawson*, 607 A. 2d 803 (Pa. Super. Ct. 1992); *In re Estate of Ischy*, 415 A.2d 37 (Pa. 1980); *Memphis Memorial Park v. Planters National Bank*, 1986 Tenn. App. LEXIS 2978 (May 7, 1986); *In re Trust of Sensenbrenner*, 252 N.W. 2d 47 (Wis. 1977).

This Code does not take a specific position on whether dual fees may be charged when a trustee hires its own law firm to represent the trust. For a discussion, see Ronald C. Link, *Developments Regarding the Professional Responsibility of the Estate Administration Lawyer: The Effect of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct*, 26 Real Prop. Prob. & Tr. J. 1, 22-38 (1991).

Subsection (b) permits the terms of the trust to override the reasonable compensation standard, subject to the court's inherent equity power to make adjustments downward or upward in appropriate circumstances. Compensation provisions should be drafted with care. Common questions include whether a provision in the terms of the trust setting the amount of the trustee's compensation is binding on a successor trustee, whether a dispositive provision for the trustee in the terms of the trust is in addition to or in lieu of the

services as trustee. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. f (1959).

Compensation may be set by agreement. A trustee may enter into an agreement with the beneficiaries for lesser or increased compensation, although an agreement increasing compensation is not binding on a nonconsenting beneficiary. See Section 111(d) (matters that may be resolved by nonjudicial settlement). See also Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. i (1959). A trustee may also agree to waive compensation and should do so prior to rendering significant services if concerned about possible gift and income taxation of the compensation accrued prior to the waiver. See Rev. Rul. 66-167, 1966-1 C.B. 20. See also Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. g (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. j (1959).

Section 816(15) grants the trustee authority to fix and pay its compensation without the necessity of prior court review, subject to the right of a beneficiary to object to the compensation in a later judicial proceeding. Allowing the trustee to pay its compensation without prior court approval promotes efficient trust administration but does place a significant burden on a beneficiary who believes the compensation is unreasonable. To provide a beneficiary with time to take action, and because of the importance of trustee's fees to the beneficiaries' interests, Section 813(b)(4) requires a trustee to provide the qualified beneficiaries with advance notice of any change in the method or rate of the trustee's compensation. Failure to provide such advance notice constitutes a breach of trust, which, if sufficiently serious, would justify the trustee's removal under Section 706.

trustee's regular compensation, and whether a dispositive provision for the trustee is conditional on the person performing services as trustee. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. a (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. f (1959).

Compensation may be set by agreement. A trustee may enter into an agreement with the beneficiaries for lesser or increased compensation, although an agreement increasing compensation is not binding on a nonconsenting beneficiary. See Section 62-7-111(b) (matters that may be resolved by nonjudicial settlement). See also Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. f (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. i (1959). A trustee may also agree to waive compensation and should do so prior to rendering significant services if concerned about possible gift and income taxation of the compensation accrued prior to the waiver. See Rev. Rul. 66-167, 1966-1 C.B. 20. See also Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. g (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 242 cmt. j (1959).

Section 62-7-816(15) grants the trustee authority to fix and pay its compensation without the necessity of prior court review, subject to the right of a beneficiary to object to the compensation in a later judicial proceeding. Allowing the trustee to pay its compensation without prior court approval promotes efficient trust administration but does place a significant burden on a beneficiary who believes the compensation is unreasonable. To provide a beneficiary with time to take action, and because of the importance of trustee's fees to the beneficiaries' interests, Section 813(b)(4) requires a trustee to provide the qualified beneficiaries with advance notice of any change in the method or rate of the trustee's compensation. Failure to provide such advance notice constitutes a breach of trust, which, if

Under Sections 501-502 of the Uniform Principal and Income Act (1997), one-half of a trustee's regular compensation is charged to income and the other half to principal. Chargeable to principal are fees for acceptance, distribution, or termination of the trust, and fees charged on disbursements made to prepare property for sale.

SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT

This section incorporates and clarifies the provisions of current South Carolina law for determination of trustee fees. Former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-205 required the trustee to return the excess part of any fee determined to be unreasonable by the court.

SECTION 62-7-709. Reimbursement of expenses.

(a) A trustee is entitled to be reimbursed out of the trust property, with interest at the legal rate as appropriate, for:

- (1) expenses that were properly incurred in the administration of the trust; and
- (2) to the extent necessary to prevent unjust enrichment of the trust, expenses that were not properly incurred in the administration of the trust.

(b) An advance by the trustee of money for the protection of the trust gives rise to a lien against trust property to secure reimbursement with reasonable interest.

(c) A prospective trustee is entitled to be reimbursed from trust property for expenses reasonably incurred by the prospective trustee pursuant to Section 62-7-701(c) to protect or investigate the trust assets before deciding whether or not to accept the trusteeship.

COMMENT

A trustee has the authority to expend trust funds as necessary in the administration of the trust, including expenses incurred in the hiring of agents. See Sections 807 (delegation by

sufficiently serious, would justify the trustee's removal under Section 62-7-706.

Under Sections 62-7-925 and 62-7-926 of the South Carolina Uniform Principal and Income Act, one-half of a trustee's regular compensation is charged to income and the other half to principal. Chargeable to principal are fees for acceptance, distribution, or termination of the trust, and fees charged on disbursements made to prepare property for sale.

SECTION 62-7-709.

(a) A trustee is entitled to be reimbursed out of the trust property, with interest at the legal rate as appropriate, for:

- (1) expenses that were properly incurred in the administration of the trust; and
- (2) to the extent necessary to prevent unjust enrichment of the trust, expenses that were not properly incurred in the administration of the trust.

(b) An advance by the trustee of money for the protection of the trust gives rise to a lien against trust property to secure reimbursement with reasonable interest.

(c) A prospective trustee is entitled to be reimbursed from trust property for expenses reasonably incurred by the prospective trustee pursuant to Section 62-7-701(c) to protect or investigate the trust assets before deciding whether or not to accept the trusteeship.

REPORTER'S COMMENT

A trustee has the authority to expend trust funds as necessary in the administration of the trust, including expenses incurred in the hiring of agents. See Sections 62-7-807 (delegation

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>trustee) and 816(15) (trustee to pay expenses of administration from trust).</p> <p>Subsection (a)(1) clarifies that a trustee is entitled to reimbursement from the trust for incurring expenses within the trustee’s authority. The trustee may also withhold appropriate reimbursement for expenses before making distributions to the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. b (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 244 cmt. b (1959). A trustee is ordinarily not entitled to reimbursement for incurring unauthorized expenses. Such expenses are normally the personal responsibility of the trustee.</p> <p>As provided in subsection (a)(2), a trustee is entitled to reimbursement for unauthorized expenses only if the unauthorized expenditures benefited the trust. The purpose of this provision, which is derived from Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 245 (1959), is not to ratify the unauthorized conduct of the trustee, but to prevent unjust enrichment of the trust. Given this purpose, a court, on appropriate grounds, may delay or even deny reimbursement for expenses which benefited the trust. Appropriate grounds include: (1) whether the trustee acted in bad faith in incurring the expense; (2) whether the trustee knew that the expense was inappropriate; (3) whether the trustee reasonably believed the expense was necessary for the preservation of the trust estate; (4) whether the expense has resulted in a benefit; and (5) whether indemnity can be allowed without defeating or impairing the purposes of the trust. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 245 cmt. g (1959).</p> <p>Subsection (b) implements Section 802(h)(5), which creates an exception to the duty of loyalty for advances by the trustee for the protection of the trust if the transaction is fair to the beneficiaries.</p> <p>Reimbursement under this section may include attorney’s fees and expenses incurred by the</p> | <p>by trustee) and 62-7-816(15) (trustee to pay expenses of administration from trust).</p> <p>Subsection (a)(1) clarifies that a trustee is entitled to reimbursement from the trust for incurring expenses within the trustee’s authority. The trustee may also withhold appropriate reimbursement for expenses before making distributions to the beneficiaries. See Restatement (Third) of Trusts Section 38 cmt. b (Tentative Draft No. 2, approved 1999); Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 244 cmt. b (1959). A trustee is ordinarily not entitled to reimbursement for incurring unauthorized expenses. Such expenses are normally the personal responsibility of the trustee.</p> <p>As provided in subsection (a)(2), a trustee is entitled to reimbursement for unauthorized expenses only if the unauthorized expenditures benefited the trust. The purpose of this provision, which is derived from Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 245 (1959), is not to ratify the unauthorized conduct of the trustee, but to prevent unjust enrichment of the trust. Given this purpose, a court, on appropriate grounds, may delay or even deny reimbursement for expenses which benefited the trust. Appropriate grounds include: (1) whether the trustee acted in bad faith in incurring the expense; (2) whether the trustee knew that the expense was inappropriate; (3) whether the trustee reasonably believed the expense was necessary for the preservation of the trust estate; (4) whether the expense has resulted in a benefit; and (5) whether indemnity can be allowed without defeating or impairing the purposes of the trust. See Restatement (Second) of Trusts Section 245 cmt. g (1959).</p> <p>Subsection (b) implements Section 62-7-802(h)(5), which creates an exception to the duty of loyalty for advances by the trustee for the protection of the trust if the transaction is fair to the beneficiaries. Former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-704(18) empowered the trustee “to advance money for the protection of the trust, and for all expenses,</p> |
|--|---|

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>trustee in defending an action. However, a trustee is not ordinarily entitled to attorney’s fees and expenses if it is determined that the trustee breached the trust. See 3A Austin W. Scott & William F. Fratcher, <i>The Law of Trusts</i> Section 245 (4th ed. 1988).</p> <p>SOUTH CAROLINA COMMENT Former South Carolina Probate Code Section 62-7-704(18) empowered the trustee “to advance money for the protection of the trust, and for all expenses, losses, and liability sustained in the administration of the trust or because of the holding or ownership of any trust assets, for which advances with any interest the trustee has a lien on the trust assets as against the beneficiary”</p> | <p>losses, and liability sustained in the administration of the trust or because of the holding or ownership of any trust assets, for which advances with any interest the trustee has a lien on the trust assets as against the beneficiary”</p> <p>Reimbursement under this section may include attorney’s fees and expenses incurred by the trustee in defending an action. However, a trustee is not ordinarily entitled to attorney’s fees and expenses if it is determined that the trustee breached the trust. See 3A Austin W. Scott & William F. Fratcher, <i>The Law of Trusts</i> Section 245 (4th ed. 1988).</p> |
|---|--|