


Trigger Warning: the “Safe Harbor” at Section 420

by Russ Willis



In 2014, the Missouri legislature enacted a statute enabling a trust beneficiary to test the water before committing to a petition or motion that might trigger an *in terrorem* clause, forfeiting their interest in the trust.

The statute, Section 456.4-420.1, RSMo., says an "interested person" may petition the court for an "interlocutory determination" whether the proposed or alternative pleading would trigger a forfeiture "that is enforceable under applicable law and public policy."² Further subsections provide:

- (a) that the petition is to be verified, and that the court is to consider no evidence apart from the verified allegations, the text of the trust instrument, and such extrinsic evidence as might be necessary to clarify any ambiguity in the clause itself,
- (b) that the petitioner could bring this as a separate action, but if she joins with it her substantive claims, the court is to take up this question first, separately,
- (c) that the order determining whether the clause would be triggered -- and whether the forfeiture would be enforceable -- may then be separately appealed, subject to the usual rules as to interlocutory appeals, and
- (d) that proceedings on the substantive claims may or may not be stayed, but if the order determining

the "applicability" of the *in terrorem* clause is vacated or reversed on appeal, "no interested person shall be prejudiced" by having relied on it in the interim.³

Subsection 7 gives a nonexclusive list of situations in which an *in terrorem* clause is "not enforceable." These do not expressly include a petition to remove or surcharge the trustee for breach of trust.⁴

Subsection 8 confirms the court's authority under section 456.10-1004, RSMo., to award costs, expenses, and lawyers' fees as equity might require.⁵

Why is This Necessary?

Absent this statute, beneficiaries might have sought to plead their case in the alternative, asking the court first to rule on the question whether counts two and three, etc., or a proposed amended petition, would trigger the clause, and if so whether the clause was enforceable, and then take up the substantive counts only after favorable rulings on these questions, from the trial court or on an interlocutory appeal.⁶

But this strategy is not without risk, and the statute was designed to alleviate that risk.

In particular, the drafting committee was concerned⁷ that an *in terrorem* clause might purport to trigger a forfeiture if a beneficiary sought to enforce mandatory provisions of the

Russ Willis is a consultant to licensed professionals on a variety of tax and nontax issues relating to private wealth transfers, with a particular focus on charitable gift planning. He has an B.A. in English literature from Indiana University and an M.A. in English from the University of Chicago. He earned his J.D. at St. Louis University and his LL.M. in taxation at Washington University.

trust code, notably the trustee's duty "to act in good faith and in accordance with the purposes of the trust,"⁸ and the duty to keep "qualified" beneficiaries "reasonably informed about the administration of the trust and of the material facts necessary for them to protect their interests."⁹

Eight years have passed, and this statute has been addressed by Missouri appellate courts five times. The following discussion is somewhat out of chronological sequence, reserving the March 2020 opinion of the *Missouri Supreme Court in Knopik v. Shelby Investments, LLC*¹⁰ for last.

Finkle-Rowlett Trust

The petitioner in *Finkle-Rowlett Trust v. Steins*¹¹ sought an interlocutory judgment that the second and third counts of his petition would not trigger the *in terrorem* clause at issue.¹² The Nodaway County probate court ruled adversely on the question, but did not certify that ruling for an interlocutory appeal.¹³

The petitioner nonetheless moved for summary judgment on the remaining counts, for a declaratory judgment that the deceased settlor had lacked capacity to execute the second amendment to her revocable trust, and for a temporary restraining order to prevent distribution of the trust until that matter had been resolved.¹⁴

But the probate court ruled that the fact that the settlor had been adjudicated incapacitated shortly after executing the trust amendment did not foreclose the possibility that she had capacity to execute the instrument at the time, and denied the summary judgment motion.¹⁵

The court then granted the trustee's motion to dismiss the second and third counts of the petition on the ground that these violated the *in terrorem* clause, causing the petitioner to forfeit his interest in the trust and leaving him without standing to pursue those claims.¹⁶

The Missouri Court of Appeals, Western District, reversed, saying this result assumed without actually finding that the clause was enforceable, and remanded for a determination on that question.¹⁷

The trustee had filed a motion to dismiss the appeal as untimely, arguing that the proper time to an appeal was when the lower court ruled adversely on the threshold question. But the Court of Appeals said that order was not final and appealable until the trial court certified it as such, which it did only on the petitioner's later motion.¹⁸

On remand, the case was assigned to a different judge, who confirmed that the case could not be resolved by a motion for summary judgment, and there would have to be a trial on the question of the settlor's capacity at the time she executed the second amendment.¹⁹

The petitioner was unable to persuade the court to release a \$30,000 bond the first judge had ordered him to post against the possibility that all this expensive lawyering might not deliver his anticipated result.²⁰

His counsel withdrew, with the court's leave. Two months later, after some skirmishing over discovery, the parties announced a settlement, which the court approved. At least some portion of the petitioner's bond was released to him.²¹

Thomas v. H'Doubler

The Southern District ruled twice in the case of *Thomas v. H'Doubler*, first in December 2020²² and again in June 2021.²³

The first appeal was from an interlocutory order of the Probate Court of Greene County that mistakenly referred to a second amended petition, rather than to the third, which had been filed with leave in the face of a motion for summary judgment on the second, omitting the offending paragraphs.²⁴

Ultimately the Court of Appeals court dismissed this appeal as premature,²⁵ but in the meantime the lower court had entered summary judgment against the petitioner on the substantive claims, again as pleaded in the second amended petition, not the third, and in a separate order directed him to pay almost \$50,000 toward the trustee's lawyers' fees. The petitioner appealed both these orders as well.²⁶

The Southern District, after rejecting the trustee's motion to dismiss on grounds of *res judicata*, since nothing was actually decided on the first appeal,²⁷ determined

- (a) that the probate court had erred by granting summary judgment on the second amended petition, as it had been abandoned by the filing of the third, and the petitioner's inaction for several months in the interim could not be construed as "proceeding further" with the second amended complaint within the meaning of section 456.4-420.2, RSMo.²⁸ And,
- (b) that the fee award, which was premised on the summary judgment, could not stand.²⁹

On remand, the probate court entered an interlocutory judgment on the exploratory count of the third amended petition, determining that the substantive counts, for an accounting and to remove the trustee for breach of trust, as repleaded, did not violate the *in terrorem* clause.³⁰

Hull v. Hull (In re Wooldridge)

In *Hull v. Hull*,³¹ the Southern District ruled that the trustee, in his capacity as such, did not have standing to appeal an interlocutory order that the petitioner would not violate the *in terrorem* clause by pursuing her substantive

claims.³²

The trustee had also appealed in his individual capacity as a beneficiary of the trust, but he had allowed that appeal to be dismissed for failure to prosecute. The appeals court said the trustee was not, in that capacity, aggrieved by the order, and he could not assert standing as a fiduciary on behalf of other beneficiaries, as he had a conflicting interest, being himself a beneficiary.³³

On remand, the case was settled on the third day of a bench trial.³⁴

In re Goldstein Trust

On cross appeals in *In re Goldstein Trust*,³⁵ the Eastern District affirmed the trial court's rulings that the proposed amended petition would violate the *in terrorem* clause at issue, but that the mere filing of the exploratory petition did not.

Unfortunately, we learn nothing from the one paragraph per *curiam* order³⁶ as to the scope of the subject clause or the allegations of the proposed amended petition.

The judgment from which the appeal was taken³⁷ says the proposed amended petition "seeks to impose liability on the Defendants for actions [already] taken in their roles as Trustees," and thereby "to invalidate or annul provisions of the Trust which set forth the duties of the Trustees" – evidently some kind of exculpatory language – but "fails to allege any gross neglect or fraudulent misconduct by the Defendants," nor to allege that the defendants "were dishonest, engaged in self-dealing[,] or misappropriated trust assets."³⁸

While the appeal was pending, the trial court entered an order chastising the individual parties on both sides and requiring them to pay substantial portions of each other's lawyers' fees.³⁹

On remand, apparently the petitioner decided not to press the matter further. But two of his lawyers turned up on opposite sides of a case filed a year later in Jackson County, which ended up in front of the Missouri Supreme Court and was, in my view, decided incorrectly there.

Knopik v. Shelby Investments, LLC

The trust instrument at issue in *Knopik* required distribution to the petitioner of \$100 per month for a term of four years, after which the corpus was to revert to the settlor, a single-member LLC created just before the trust was funded.⁴⁰

The trustee, itself an LLC created about a week before the trust was funded, had made exactly one payment and then told the petitioner it would make no further distributions. This was an obvious breach of trust, as the trustee readily admitted in its answer to the beneficiary's petition to remove it.⁴¹

Apparently none of this struck the trial court as contrived. The trustee counterclaimed that by filing this petition the beneficiary had triggered an *in terrorem* clause, thereby forfeiting his interest in the trust and stripping him of standing to pursue the claim.⁴²

The clause at issue specifically forbade the beneficiary [to] make a claim against a trustee for maladministration or breach of trust[, or to] attempt to remove a trustee for any reason, with or without cause[,]⁴³ as though maybe the settlor had anticipated this very scenario.

The petitioner chose not to seek the protection of the statute, nor to plead in the alternative, but to proceed directly on the substantive claims.

Possibly the idea was to force the question of whether a clause that purports to relieve the trustee entirely of its fiduciary responsibilities is unenforceable as against public policy. But neither the trial court,⁴⁴ nor the Western District,⁴⁵ nor the Supreme Court⁴⁶ took up that question on its merits.

The trial court ignored the question altogether, and both the Western District and the Supreme Court said the petitioner "should have" availed himself of the statutory "safe harbor," and that because he did not they need not consider whether the *in terrorem* clause might be unenforceable as a matter of public policy.⁴⁷

In effect, the court held the clause operated as a condition subsequent to the beneficiary's interest in the trust, regardless of the merits of the claim. The result is that no one would have standing to question the trustee's actions.

In a concurring opinion, Judge Wilson said the court might dismiss an appeal on the ground that the case was "fictitious or collusive," but "only if the record before the court demonstrates this is so," which he said it did not here, adding that the court "decline[d] to inquire of the parties and their counsel further on this issue."⁴⁸

Legislative Maneuvering

While *Knopik* was still pending in the trial court, someone brought a legislative proposal to the chair of the Missouri

advisor to the advisor
<https://www.plannedgiftdesign.com>

Russell A. Willis III, J.D., LL.M
 consulting services

- ♦ expert advice on tax and nontax issues affecting wealth transfers
- ♦ qualified appraisals of charitable split-interest trusts
- ♦ preparation of 1041s, 5227s, 990PFs, and other returns
- ♦ legal research and brief writing

rawillis3@plannedgiftdesign.com 314.566.3386

House Judiciary Committee to add exceptions to the "laundry list" in subsection 7 of section 456.4-420 for any petition, motion, or other pleading for relief from a breach of trust, apparently regardless of merit.

The draft language was added on the House floor⁴⁹ to a bill that had already cleared committee, but it did not survive review by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The organized bar had intervened with a counterproposal⁵⁰ that would have carved out situations in which the alleged conduct could be permitted by the trust instrument consistently with section 456.10-1008, RSMo.,⁵¹ or had been ratified by the beneficiary per section 456.10-1009, RSMo. Apparently the parties were unable to agree on a compromise, and the language was simply stripped from the Senate substitute for the House bill.

Concluding Commentary

In the author's view, *Knopik* was decided incorrectly.

Analytically, the *in terrorem* clause is an affirmative defense to the petition to remove. Here it was also raised as a counterclaim for declaratory judgment. In either of these procedural contexts the question of whether the clause is unenforceable should be fair game. The question does not simply disappear because the legislature has created an alternative mechanism for resolving it.

Something like the 2018 legislative effort may yet be required. 

Portions of this article appeared in a slightly different form in the author's newsletter, the Jack Straw Fortnightly, volume 3, number 4 (May 05, 2020). Back issues of the newsletter are archived at <https://www.plannedgiftdesign.com/jack-straw-fortnightly.html>

¹ The provisions under discussion here were included in H.B. 1231, merged with S.B. 500, merged with S.B. 621, enacted in the second regular session of the 97th General Assembly.

² The bill also included a parallel provision, codified at section 474.395 RSMo., but largely cross-referencing section 456.4-420, allowing an "interested person" to seek similar relief with respect to an in terrorem clause under a decedent's will.

³ § 456.4-420, RSMo.

⁴ § 456.4-420.7, RSMo.

⁵ § 456.4-420.8, RSMo.

⁶ See, e.g., *Hunter v. Hunter*, 838 S.E.2d 721 (Va. 2020).

⁷ E-mail dated April 22, 2013 to members of the state bar probate and trust law committee from David English, then chair of the committee, forwarding a copy of the drafting committee's report authored by Robert Selsor. Copy in author's possession.

⁸ § 456.1-105.2(2), RSMo.

⁹ § 456.8-813.1, RSMo.

¹⁰ 597 S.W.3d 189 (Mo. banc 2020).

¹¹ 558 S.W.3d 95 (Mo.App. W.D. 2018).

¹² *Id.* at 97-98.

¹³ *Id.* at 98.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.* at 98-99.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 100.

¹⁸ *Id.* at 99 n. 6.

¹⁹ Nodaway County Circuit Court Cause No. 17ND-PR00021, available at www.courts.mo.gov/casenet.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Thomas v. H'Doubler* (Thomas I), 613 S.W.3d 905 (Mo.App.S.D. 2020).

²³ *Thomas v. H'Doubler* (Thomas II), 627 S.W.3d 449 (Mo.App.S.D. 2021).

²⁴ *Thomas I*, *supra* note 22, at 906.

²⁵ *Id.* at 908.

²⁶ *Thomas II*, *supra* note 23, at 453.

²⁷ *Id.* at 454.

²⁸ *Id.* at 456-57.

²⁹ *Id.* at 457-58.

³⁰ Greene County Circuit Court Cause No. 1631-PR00030, available at www.courts.mo.gov/casenet.

³¹ *In re Romona Wooldridge Durable Power of Attorney*, 604 S.W.3d 364 (Mo.App.S.D. 2020).

³² *Id.* at 372.

³³ *Id.* at 371-72.

³⁴ Greene County Circuit Court Cause No. 1831-PR01039, available at www.courts.mo.gov/casenet.

³⁵ *Goldstein v. Bank of America N.A.*, 495 S.W.3d 199 (Mo.App. E.D. 2016).

³⁶ A memorandum opinion setting forth the court's reasoning was circulated only to counsel for the parties, per Missouri Supreme Court Rule 84.16(b).

³⁷ Order entered May 14, 2015, in Circuit Court of the City of St. Louis Cause no. 1322-PR00895, available at www.courts.mo.gov/casenet.

³⁸ It is unclear whether these criteria are meant to track § 456.10-1008, RSMo., which says language in a trust instrument purporting to relieve the trustee of liability for a breach of trust "committed in bad faith or with reckless indifference to the purposes of the trust or the interests of the beneficiaries" is unenforceable.

³⁹ Order entered October 16, 2016, in Cause no. 1322-PR00895, *supra* note 37.

⁴⁰ *Knopik*, *supra* note 10, at 190-91.

⁴¹ *Id.* at 191.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ Jackson County Circuit Court Cause No. 17P8-PR01016, available at www.courts.mo.gov/casenet.

⁴⁵ *Knopik v. Shelby Investments*, No. WD81931 (Mo.App.W.D. May 14, 2019).

⁴⁶ *Knopik*, *supra* note 10, at 189.

⁴⁷ *Id.* at 192-93.

In a footnote, the Court of Appeals made a point of saying it did not reach the question whether a challenge to the applicability and enforceability of the in terrorem clause, if properly made under section 456.4-420, would have been successful. *Knopik*, *supra* note 45, at p. 10 n.4.

That footnote, and similar text from the Supreme Court's opinion (*Knopik*, *supra* note 10, at 192-93), treats the statutory "safe harbor" mechanism as mandatory rather than discretionary with the petitioner.

⁴⁸ *Knopik*, *supra* note 10, at 195 (Wilson, J., concurring).

⁴⁹ House Amendment 1 to H.B. 1250, offered by Rep. Canejo on February 28, 2018, House Journal pages 928 ff., second regular session, 99th General Assembly.

⁵⁰ Copies of relevant e-mail correspondence are in the author's possession.

⁵¹ See footnote 37, *supra*, and accompanying text.