HOW TO NOT LOSE YOUR MIND WHEN YOUR CLIENT IS LOSING HIS: OPERATING IN THE GRAY ZONE OF DIMINISHED CAPACITY

Presented by:
KRISTI N. ELSOM
Fizer Beck
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1750
Houston, Texas 77057
www.fizerbeck.com

Written by:
MATT G. LUEDERS
Fizer Beck
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1750
Houston, Texas 77057
www.fizerbeck.com

HOUSTON BUSINESS & ESTATE PLANNING COUNCIL
February 20, 2020

Kristi N. Elsom
Fizer, Beck, Webster, Bentley & Scroggins, P.C.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1750
Houston, Texas 77057
713.840.7710
kelsom@fizerbeck.com

PROFESSIONAL:

- Board Certified in Estate Planning and Probate by the State of Texas
- Fellow of the American College of Trust and Estate Counsel (ACTEC)
- Council Member of the Real Estate, Probate and Trust Law Section of State Bar of Texas (2011-2015)
- American Bar Association, State Bar of Texas and Houston Bar Association
- College of State Bar of Texas
- Houston Estate and Financial Forum – Board of Directors (2011-present)
- Houston Business and Estate Planning Council

EDUCATION:

- Juris Doctor, Southern Methodist University, Dedman School of Law
- Bachelor of Business Administration, Magna Cum Laude, Southern Methodist University, Cox School of Business

CAREER HISTORY:

- Fizer, Beck, Webster, Bentley & Scroggins, Houston, Texas – 2002-present – Shareholder
- Stubbeman, McRae, Sealy, Laughlin, & Browder, Inc., Midland, Texas – 1983-2002– Shareholder

REPRESENTATIVE SPEAKING EVENTS:

- CPE by the Sea, Houston CPA Society - Speaker
- State Bar of Texas, Estate Planning & Probate Drafting Courses – Speaker and Director
- State Bar of Texas, Advanced Estate Planning and Probate Courses – Speaker and Director
- UT – Stanley M. Johanson Estate Planning Workshop
- State Bar of Texas, Webcasts
- South Texas of College of Law, Wills & Probate Institute
- Brazosport College Foundation – Estate Planning Seminar
- Midland Business and Estate Council
- Southern Arizona Estate Planning Council
- Council for Resource Development, National Conference, Washington, D.C.
- Texas Association of Community College Foundations, Symposium, Austin, TX

CURRENT COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

- Junior League of Houston, Inc.: Sustainer
- Member of Second Baptist Church, Houston, Texas

Matt G. Lueders
Fizer, Beck, Webster, Bentley & Scroggins, P.C.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1750
Houston, Texas 77057
713.840.7710
mlueders@fizerbeck.com

Matt Lueders is an associate attorney with Fizer Beck, practicing in the areas of estate planning, estate administration, tax-exempt organizations, and charitable giving. Matt advises clients with developing simple to complex estate and gift plans, including the preparation of wills, trust agreements, and incapacity planning documents. Matt also represents fiduciaries in connection with probate procedures, trust and estate administration, trust modifications, and the preparation of federal gift and estate tax returns. Matt is licensed to practice law in the State of Texas and is a member of the State Bar of Texas (Real Estate, Probate, and Trust Section), the Houston Bar Association (Probate, Trust, and Estate Section), the American Bar Association (Real Property, Trust, and Estate Law Section), and the Houston Estate and Financial Forum. He received his B.S. from Texas A&M University in 2013 and his J.D. from Baylor Law School in 2016. Matt joined Fizer Beck after graduating from law school.

EDUCATION:

Baylor Law School, Waco, Texas
J.D., 2016

Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas
B.S. in Economics and Political Science, *cum laude*, 2013

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

Fizer, Beck, Webster, Bentley & Scroggins, P.C., Houston, Texas
Associate Attorney, 2016-present

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Member: State Bar of Texas (Real Estate, Probate, and Trust Law Section), Houston Bar Association (Probate, Trust, and Estate Section), Houston Estate and Financial Forum, American Bar Association (Real Property, Trust, and Estate Law Section)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. AWARENESS OF DIMINISHED CAPACITY AND INCAPACITY 1
- A. Initial Steps to Take 1
  - 1. Basic Estate Planning Documents 1
  - 2. Education 2
  - 3. Indicators of Diminishing Capacity and Resources 2

III. STANDARDS OF CAPACITY 3
- A. Testamentary Capacity 3
  - 1. Statutory Provision 3
  - 2. Judicial Development of the "Sound Mind" Requirement 3
- B. Contractual Capacity 5
  - 1. In General 5
  - 2. Testamentary Capacity and Contractual Capacity Compared 5
- C. Capacity to Execute a Trust 6
- D. Capacity to Execute Powers of Attorney 6
- E. Capacity to Exercise Powers of Appointment 6
- F. Capacity for Declaration of Appointment of Guardian 6
- G. Adjudicated Incapacity 7
  - 1. Prior Law 7
  - 2. Current Law 7

IV. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING DIMINISHED CAPACITY 7
- A. Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct 7
  - 1. Rule 1.02(g) 7
  - 2. Proposed Rule 1.16 8
  - 3. Rule 1.05 10
- B. Section 1102.001 of the Texas Estates Code 11

V. UNDUE INFLUENCE 11
- A. Undue Influence in Texas 11
  - 1. Background and Definition 11
  - 2. Factors 12
- B. Vulnerable Clients and Financial Elder Abuse 13
- C. Digital Era 13

VI. EVALUATING CAPACITY, UNDUE INFLUENCE, AND ADDITIONAL PRACTICAL STEPS FOR THE ATTORNEY TO TAKE 14
- A. Attorney's Response to Undue Influence 14
- B. Initial Steps to Take 15
  - 1. Be Aware 15
  - 2. Meetings and Confidences 15
  - 3. Corporate Fiduciaries 15
- C. Establishing Mental Capacity and Free Agency 15
  - 1. Testing by a Medical Professional 16
  - 2. Videotaping 16
  - 3. Witness Credibility and Questions 16
  - 4. Prior Wills and Consistency 17
  - 5. No Contest Clauses 17
- D. Additional Tools to Evaluate and Handle Incapacity 17
  - 1. Setting of Meetings and Regular Follow-Up 17
  - 2. American Bar Association Resources 18
  - 3. Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination in Guardianship Referral 18
  - 4. SAGE and Other Tests for Cognitive Impairment 18

5. Defining Incapacity in Estate Planning Documents 19
6. Occupational Living Will 19
7. Family Driving Agreement 19
8. Medical and HIPAA Concerns 20
9. Financial Exploitation and Trusted Contact Authorization 20
E. Creation of a Guardianship 20

VII. CONCLUSION 22

APPENDIX A 23

APPENDIX B 24

HOW TO NOT LOSE YOUR MIND WHEN YOUR CLIENT IS LOSING HIS: OPERATING IN THE GRAY ZONE OF DIMINISHED CAPACITY

I. INTRODUCTION[1]

As our population ages, it is increasingly important for estate planning professionals not only to assist clients with planning for eventual death, but also to aid clients with developing a plan to deal with potential diminished capacity and incapacity. The increasing frequency of incapacity in our society has caused many issues for the estate planning attorney and the manner in which estate planners counsel and represent their clients. Both the planner and the client must be aware of the possibility of client incapacity, and the planner must also know the options for determining and then dealing with a client's diminished capacity and incapacity.

Of course, the estate planning attorney must understand substantive tax techniques, distribution mechanisms, and probate laws that accompany an estate planning and administration practice; however, the attorney cannot stop there. He or she must also embrace the human side of estate planning—the side involving a client's emotions, mental and psychological state, and relationships with family members and friends. This Article will discuss the awareness surrounding applicable legal standards of capacity, the legal and ethical rules important to estate planning attorneys with respect to capacity and undue influence, and the practical steps that an estate planning attorney can undertake when representing a client with diminished capacity or incapacity. This Article will not spend a great deal of time discussing drafting for incapacity. For detailed discussion in that regard, the reader is encouraged to see Wesley L. Bowers' article "Mind the Gap: Advanced Planning Techniques for Incapacity" presented to the State Bar of Texas 2016 Estate Planning & Probate Drafting Course.

II. AWARENESS OF DIMINISHED CAPACITY AND INCAPACITY

The author had a colleague in the past who had a colloquial definition of incapacity: "When your client can hide his own Easter eggs, it is probably too late." Although witty, there is a stark bit of truth in this definition—estate planning attorneys are often not consulted until it is too late. In those cases, there is usually little substantive help that the attorney can offer (without court intervention) to the client and his family and friends, largely because the client lacks the capability to communicate his wishes to the attorney and execute the corresponding legal documents.

On the other hand, situations may arise where the attorney has had a loyal client for many years. The client, once sharp and spry, may now be experiencing a decline in physical and/or mental health as he ages. In the case of a long-term attorney-client relationship where the attorney is present during the client's gradual decline, there are opportunities and steps that the attorney can take to ensure the client is cared for and protected.

A. Initial Steps to Take

1. <u>Basic Estate Planning Documents</u>

The obvious first step, prior to any hint of diminished capacity or incapacity, is for the attorney to consider whether the client has the appropriate testamentary and incapacity planning documents in place, including the following:

- (i) a will and/or revocable (i.e., management/living) trust that appropriately coordinates disposition of the client's probate assets (along with proper beneficiary designations for non-probate assets);
- (ii) a Statutory Durable (i.e., business and financial) Power of Attorney naming a primary and alternate agent(s) to act for the client with respect to business and financial matters;
- (iii) a Medical Power of Attorney naming a primary and alternate agent(s) to make medical treatment decisions for the client if he is unable to communicate with his physicians;
- (iv) a Specific Power of Attorney for HIPAA permitting the client's medical agent(s) to have access to what would otherwise be protected health information;
- (v) a Directive to Physicians evidencing the client's intention to have medical procedures withheld in the event of a terminal condition and/or irreversible condition wherein medical procedures are being administered only to postpone the client's moment of death by artificial means;
- (vi) a Declaration of Guardian in the Event of Later Incapacity or Need of Guardian, designating a guardian of the client's person and estate in the event a guardianship was ever needed (very unlikely if the above-described documents are in place);

[1] The author wishes to thank Kristi N. Elsom (Houston, Texas) and Rhonda H. Brink (Austin, Texas) for their significant contributions to this Article.

(vii) a Declaration of Appointment of Guardian for Minor Children in the Event of Death or Incapacity, designating a guardian of the person and estate for any minor children if the client is unable to care for his children (due to death or incapacity); and

(viii) a Declaration for Mental Health Treatment under Chapter 137 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, declaring the client's preferences or instructions regarding mental health treatment.

Of course and often unfortunately, these documents may not always be available for execution depending on the extent of a client's diminishing capacity. See Section III below for more in depth discussion in this regard.

2. Education

When executing the appropriate documents, the second natural step for the attorney to consider, however uncomfortable, is education—tactfully broaching the reality with clients that death is inevitable and diminished capacity is quite possible. Although this seems obvious given the very nature of estate planning, the author has had numerous friends or family members of clients call after the fact, with no idea what to do now that their loved one has become incapacitated or passed away. Many times, the family member or friend will call based on an attorney business card or letterhead that just happened to be found, with very little idea of where the client's relevant documents might be or what they might dictate. Such a scenario is most often the result of a lack of communication between the client and his or her loved ones regarding the client's estate planning intentions. Encouraging clients to have simple (albeit admittedly difficult) conversations with their family members, fiduciaries (agents, executors, trustees, etc.), and/or beneficiaries (as appropriate) about their testamentary and incapacity planning documents and wishes can save heartache and confusion when the client is no longer able to communicate his desires.

3. Indicators of Diminishing Capacity and Resources

Perhaps a third step that the estate planning attorney can take with respect to a client's decline in mental health centers on the attorney's role as counselor (as opposed to legal expert or tax technician). Some estate planning engagements are one-off arrangements where the attorney prepares documents for a client who then goes on his way and the attorney never hears from the client again. Still, other engagements are long-standing relationships wherein the client and attorney maintain interaction on a regular (e.g., monthly or yearly) basis. In such a case, the attorney has the opportunity to get to know the client on a more personal level and is able to stay abreast of the client's current family dynamics and financial situation. During this long-term relationship, the attorney can become someone who is a confidant to the client and in a unique position to assess the client's potential decline in mental faculties.

Admittedly, assessing a client's capacity or lack of capacity may not be a determination that many attorneys desire to do or feel equipped to make. Still, it is inherent in the role of the estate planner to confirm that the client has the requisite capacity to make decisions and sign documents. Thankfully, there are resources to help attorneys recognize the signs of diminishing capacity. For instance, the Alzheimer's Association has provided 10 early signs of dementia that may merit a visit to a doctor for further testing:

(i) memory loss that disrupts daily life;
(ii) challenges in planning or solving problems;
(iii) difficulty completing familiar tasks at home, at work, or at leisure;
(iv) confusion with time or place;
(v) trouble understanding visual images and spatial relationships;
(vi) new problems with words in speaking or writing;
(vii) misplacing things and losing the ability to retrace steps;
(viii) decreased or poor judgment;
(ix) withdrawal from work or social activities; and/or
(x) changes in mood and personality.

See "10 Early Signs and Symptoms of Alzheimer's" at https://www.alz.org/alzheimers-dementia/10_signs. Although incapacity is a medical condition often involving medical professionals, the ultimate determination of incapacity is a legal determination—not a medical determination. For this reason, the attorney must, at the very least, be cognizant of certain indicators of client diminishing capacity and incapacity.

If it appears that the client's mental capabilities are, in fact, slipping, the attorney must also be willing, under appropriate circumstances, to gently counsel the client as to his best options and resources. Additional options, resources, and practical steps that an attorney can consider taking with respect to client capacity are discussed below in Sections IV, V, and VI.

III. STANDARDS OF CAPACITY[2]

In an estate planning practice, perhaps more than any other area of specialty, understanding the various standards of capacity is critical to acting in the client's best interest and ensuring that the client's intentions are carried out. It is not enough to vaguely remember (possibly from one's law school or bar exam days) that there is a minimum standard of mental competency required to engage in different legal transactions. Rather, the estate planner should regularly familiarize herself with the various standards and have best practices in place to ensure that each client meets the applicable standard.

All too often the initial meeting between the attorney and the client takes place at a time when the client's mental facilities have become impaired; or, the attorney never even meets the actual client but, rather, is contacted by the concerned spouse, child, or other relative who informs the attorney that the client will not be joining them. The excuse offered by the client's relative may be that the client is not well enough to come to the office or that the client is not even conscious. In these situations, it is critically important for the estate planning attorney to consider whether the client has capacity to execute the documents at issue.

Whether or not a person has legal capacity to execute a document depends largely on the type of document in question. Technically, almost every conscious adult has some degree of legal capacity. The relevant question, then, is whether the specific degree of capacity possessed by the individual at any particular time equals or exceeds the degree required for the act in question. Texas law speaks of two general types of capacity—contractual and testamentary—yet there is significant overlap between the two, particularly as to contractual endeavors, such as the execution of a beneficiary designation or a revocable trust, acts which have very little lifetime impact on the individual (similar to the execution of a will).

It is important to note here that, for all of the acts listed below, the law requires that the person be "capable" of making rational decisions. However, the law does not require a person to actually make rational decisions. Every competent person has the right to make seemingly foolish or unreasonable decisions (and all of us have likely done so at some point). Thus, for clients who are experiencing mental decline, it can sometimes be difficult for outsiders to distinguish between their decisions and actions that stem from diminishing capacity compared to mere foolishness or stubbornness.

When seeking to determine if a person has capacity, one must consider the act in question and whether the person possesses the minimum degree of capacity required for that particular act. Texas law provides a different standard of capacity for the various testamentary and lifetime acts described below.

A. Testamentary Capacity

1. Statutory Provision

Section 251.001 of the Texas Estates Code sets forth a two part test for testamentary capacity. The first component is a status and age requirement: In order to have testamentary capacity, the individual must: (i) have attained eighteen years of age; (ii) be or have been lawfully married; or (iii) be a member of the armed forces of the United States or of the auxiliaries thereof or of the maritime service at the time the Will is made. Whether a particular individual satisfies this objective test is rarely a topic of much controversy.

The second requirement of § 251.001 is that the testator be "of sound mind." This subjective component of the testamentary capacity test is the inquiry relevant to this Article and is a frequent object of controversy. Often, the reporting cases simply reference the question of the testator's sound mind as one of "testamentary capacity," without mention of the status and age component.

2. Judicial Development of the "Sound Mind" Requirement

a. *Five Part Test—Current Rule*

In order for an individual to be of sound mind, the evidence must support a *jury finding* that the individual possesses the following characteristics:

- (i) Sufficient ability to understand the business in which he is engaged;
- (ii) Sufficient ability to understand the effect of his act in making the will;
- (iii) The capacity to know the objects of his bounty;
- (iv) The capacity to understand the general nature and extent of his property; and
- (v) "memory sufficient to collect in his mind the elements of the business to be transacted, and to hold them long enough to perceive, at least their obvious relation to each other, and to be able to form a reasonable judgment as to them."

Prather v. McClelland, 76 Tex. 574, 13 S.W. 543 (Tex. 1890).

[2] Portions of this section are excerpted with permission from "Mind the Gap: Advanced Planning Techniques for Incapacity," Wesley L. Bowers, presented to the State Bar of Texas 2016 Estate Planning & Probate Drafting Course.

b. *Old Four Part Test—No Longer the Law*

Other court decisions have approved a short form definition of testamentary capacity that ignores the fifth "memory requirement." *See, e.g., Gayle v. Dixon*, 583 S.W.2d 648, 650 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.). However, the prudent practitioner should not attempt to rely on these cases because, as one commentator has suggested, the memory requirement is essential and if the testator is not able to realize that a relationship exists between the separate elements, he "is probably not competent to make a will." Marschall, Will Contests, TEXAS EST. ADMINISTRATION 204 (1975). Failure to use the long form, at the very least, presents an argument for appeal. *See Gayle v. Dixon*, 583 S.W.2d 648 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.). E. BAILEY, TEXAS PRACTICE - TEXAS LAW OF WILLS § 172, at 41 (Supp. 1982) ("the safer case would be to use the long form, where it is requested by either party at trial, or where either party objects to omission of the final element").

The more recent cases consistently use the long form. *Bracewell v. Bracewell*, 20 S.W.3d 14, 19 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2000, no pet.); *Campbell v. Groves*, 774 S.W.2d 717, 718 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1989, writ den'd); *Alldridge v. Spell*, 774 S.W.2d 707, 774 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1989, no writ); *Broach v. Bradley*, 800 S.W.2d 677, 680-81 (Tex. App.—Eastland 1990, writ denied); *Kenney v. Estate of Kenney*, 829 S.W.2d 888, 890 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1992, no writ); *but see Hoffman v. Texas Commerce Bank*, 846 S.W.2d 336, 340 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1992, writ denied) (short form definition of testamentary capacity used).

c. *Lucid Intervals*

Testamentary capacity on *the day the will was executed* is all that is required. *Croucher v. Croucher*, 660 S.W.2d 55 (Tex. 1983) (medical evidence of incompetency could be considered regarding lack of capacity where the evidence was probative of testator's lack of testamentary capacity on the date of execution of the will). Evidence of incapacity at other times is generally relevant, *Lee v. Lee*, 424 S.W.2d 609, 611 (Tex. 1968) (evidence of incompetency at other times is admissible only if it demonstrates that the condition persists and has some probability of being the same condition which obtained at the time of the will's making); *Lowery v. Saunders*, 666 S.W.2d 226, 236 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *Kenney v. Estate of Kenney*, 829 S.W.2d 888, 890 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1992, no writ). *Compare Alldridge v. Spell*, 774 S.W.2d 707, 710 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1989, no writ) (evidence of incapacity at other times supported jury finding of lack of testamentary capacity notwithstanding direct evidence of capacity on the day the will was executed).

d. *Lay Opinion Testimony Admissible*

Lay opinion testimony of witnesses' observations of the testator's conduct, either prior or subsequent to the execution of the will, is admissible to show incompetency. *Kenney v. Estate of Kenney*, 829 S.W.2d 888, 890 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1992, no writ), citing *Campbell*, above, 774 S.W.2d at 719.

e. *Prior Adjudication of Insanity—Presumption of Continued Insanity*

A prior adjudication of insanity generally raises a presumption of continued insanity until the status of the individual has been changed by a subsequent judgment of the county court in a proceeding authorized for that purpose. *Bogel v. White*, 168 S.W.2d 309, 311 (Tex. Civ. App.—Galveston 1942, writ ref'd w.o.m.). A prior adjudication of insanity is admissible, but not conclusive, and the presumption of continuing insanity may be rebutted. Further, a prior adjudication of mental illness is also admissible, but not conclusive. *See Haile v. Holtzclaw*, 414 S.W.2d 916 (Tex. 1967). In *Haile*, fifteen days before he executed his will, the testator was determined to be mentally ill. He was committed to a mental hospital, and the court appointed a temporary guardian for him. Nevertheless, the testator was found to have testamentary capacity. *Haile* was decided under TEX. REV. CIV. STAT. ANN. art. 5547-83, Acts 1957, p. 505, ch. 243, § 83, the predecessor to Health and Safety Code § 576.002. The current statute, unlike the statute applicable in *Haile*, specifically provides that the provision of mental health services does not limit the patient's mental capacity. The revised statutory language follows the rule of admissibility in *Haile*.

f. *Subsequent Adjudication of Insanity—Not Admissible*

According to the Texas Supreme Court, an adjudication of insanity subsequent to the time of the execution of a will is not admissible. *See Carr v. Radkey*, 393 S.W.2d 806 (Tex. 1965) (appointment of guardian twenty-one days subsequent to execution of will inadmissable). *Compare Stephen v. Coleman*, 533 S.W.2d 444 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1976, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In *Stephen*, the trial court admitted evidence that, three days after the date he signed his will, the testator was adjudged incompetent to handle his affairs. The appellate court did not discuss whether this evidence was properly admissible, but simply noted that this subsequent adjudication did not raise a presumption of incapacity on the date the will was signed. The court upheld the trial court's finding that the testator had testamentary capacity. *See also* 9 LEOPOLD & BEYER, TEXAS LAW OF WILLS § 16.5 (Texas Practice 1992).

g. *Insane Delusion*

Even though the general requirements of testamentary capacity described above are satisfied, a will or an affected portion of a will may be held invalid on the basis of an "insane delusion" if (i) the testator was laboring under the belief of a state of supposed facts that did not exist, and (ii) which no rational person could believe. While there is some authority that the second requirement may be satisfied only by showing that an organic brain defect or a functional disorder of the mind existed, *Spillman v. Spillman's Estate*, 587 S.W.2d 170 (Tex. Civ. App.—Dallas 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.), there is also authority to the contrary, *Oechsner v. Ameritrust*, 840 S.W.2d 131, 134, (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (court embraced Texas' 100 year old two-pronged definition of insane delusion, declining to adopt more detailed definition from other jurisdictions incorporating reference to, *inter alia*, organic brain defect and function disorder of the mind).

Examples of insane delusions are described by the court in *Lindley v. Lindley*, 384 S.W.2d 676, 679 (Tex. 1964):

> The testator believed, in spite of the fact that all of the evidence was to the contrary, that his son had been to the planet Mars and had conspired against the United States and should therefore be disinherited; or that his wife was plotting to kill him; or that his daughter had murdered his father; or that he was hated by his brothers and sisters who were bent on persecuting him.

However, the clearly deluded client does not necessarily lack testamentary capacity. Rather, the delusion must affect the provisions in the will in order for the will to be invalidated based on insane delusion. *Bauer v. Estate of Bauer*, 687 S.W.2d 410, 411-12 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1985, writ ref'd n.r.e.). The mere appearance of a delusion does not in and of itself prohibit a finding of testamentary capacity. *Campbell v. Groves*, 774 S.W.2d 717, 719 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1989, writ denied) (a person could appear bizarre or absurd with reference to some matters and still possess the assimilated and rational capacities to know the objects of his bounty, the nature of the transaction in which he was engaged, and the nature and extent of his estate on a given date).

B. Contractual Capacity

1. In General

Sections 41 and 42, *Contracts*, Texas Jurisprudence provides a concise summary of contractual capacity:

> To establish mental capacity to contract, the evidence must show that, at the time of contracting, the person appreciated the effect of what the person was doing and understood the nature and consequences of his or her acts and the business he or she was transacting. Mere mental weakness is not in itself sufficient to incapacitate a person; and mere nervous tension, anxiety, or personal problems do not amount to mental incapacity to enter into contracts. The fact that one has a firm belief in spiritualism is not sufficient to incapacitate a person, especially where the belief is founded on reading and other evidence deemed by the person to be sufficient.
>
> The provision of court-ordered, emergency, or voluntary mental health services to a person is not a determination or adjudication of mental incompetency, and does not limit the person's rights as a citizen, or the person's property rights or legal capacity. A person is presumed to be mentally competent, unless a judicial finding to the contrary is made. Absent proof and determination of mental incapacity, a person who signs a contract is presumed to have read and understood the document, unless the person was prevented from doing so by trick or artifice. In other words, it is presumed by law that every party to a valid contract had sufficient mental capacity to understand one's legal rights with respect to the transaction. The burden of proof with regard to overcoming this presumption rests on the person who asserts the contrary.
>
> Elderly persons are not presumptively incompetent. On the contrary, the disposition of property and the conduct of business affairs will be upheld where a grantor, though old and infirmed physically and mentally, nevertheless, responds to tests that are applicable generally to people in the ordinary experiences of life.

14 TEX. JUR. 3rd *Contracts* § 41-42 (April 2016).

2. Testamentary Capacity and Contractual Capacity Compared

Less mental capacity is required for making a will than for entering into a contract. *Vance v. Upson*, 1 S.W. 179 (Tex. 1886); *Hamill v. Brashear*, 513 S.W.2d 602, 607 (Tex. Civ. App.—Amarillo 1974, writ ref'd n.r.e.). This statement of the general wisdom is certainly accurate, but it seems an oversimplification of

the rule inasmuch as it implies that contractual capacity and testamentary capacity are substantively different.

A review and comparison of the respective authorities supports the view that the difference between contractual capacity and testamentary capacity is purely quantitative, not qualitative. Fundamentally, both tests look to the capacity of the individual to appreciate what he is doing and to understand the nature and effect of what he is doing. It is because of the differing nature and effect of contracts and wills that the requisites of this singular concept are different in the two circumstances.

Because a will has no legal effect until death and remains revocable during life, its execution does not have any effect on the testator's own circumstances. The testator, therefore, need not have the capacity to understand the effect that signing a will has on his own circumstances (as there isn't any) in order to have the capacity to understand the effect of his act of making a will. On the other hand, the testator does need the capacity to know the objects of his bounty and the nature and extent of his property if he is to appreciate the nature and consequence of his making a disposition of his property at his death.

C. Capacity to Execute a Trust

Viewing contractual and testamentary capacity as two points on the same continuum of legal capacity not only helps put into perspective the level of capacity required to execute a trust, but is consistent with Texas Trust Code § 112.007, which provides that "[a] person has the same capacity to create a trust by declaration, inter vivos or testamentary transfer, or appointment that the person has to transfer, will, or appoint free of trust." It is the underlying effect of the trust that determines the requisite capacity to create the trust, which may be more analogous to the execution of a contract (e.g., the execution of an irrevocable gift trust) or a will (e.g., the execution of a nominally funded revocable trust which, by its very nature, and until it is genuinely funded, has no more effect of the individual's property than a will). *See generally* Gibbs and Hanson, *Degree of Capacity Required to Create an Inter Vivos Trust*, TRUSTS AND ESTATES, December, 1993, p. 14; Bogert, Trusts & Trustees, 2nd Ed. Revised § 44 (1984); Fratcher, Scott on Trusts, 4th Ed. §§ 18 *et. seq* (1987).

Section 112.007 is not entirely clear on the standard for capacity to create a trust; however, it appears to say that the capacity to create an inter vivos trust is the same as the capacity to transfer; that the capacity to create a trust by testamentary transfer is the same as creating a will; and that the capacity to create a trust by appointment is the same as the capacity to appoint free of trust.

The capacity to transfer property is contractual capacity, thus the capacity to transfer property to a trust (e.g., an inter vivos trust) is arguably contractual capacity. The capacity to execute a will is testamentary capacity, therefore, the capacity to create a trust by will is testamentary capacity.

There is discrepancy among commenters and case law as to the requisite capacity for creating a trust (either inter vivos or testamentary). However, recent Texas case law seems to follow the trend that contractual capacity (as opposed to mere testamentary capacity) is needed to create a trust. *See Harrell v. Hochderffer*, 345 S.W.3d 652 (Tex. App—Austin 2011).

D. Capacity to Execute Powers of Attorney

Although not entirely clear under Texas law (even the Uniform Power of Attorney Act does not require the principal to have any particular level of capacity at the time of execution), an individual's capacity to properly execute a power of attorney is akin to the standard for contractual capacity. This is because a power of attorney creates an agency relationship similar to the relationship created in a contract. Therefore, the best practice under a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney is to ensure that the principal (i) understands that he is authorizing another person to handle his business and financial affairs without court supervision or approval and (ii) knows to whom (i.e., the agent) this authority is being granted. In the same way, under a Medical Power of Attorney, the principal must understand that he is giving a particular person or persons the authority to make health care decisions for the principal when the principal is unable to make those health care decisions for himself.

E. Capacity to Exercise Powers of Appointment

The donee of a power of appointment must have capacity to exercise such power. The donee has capacity to exercise the power if the donee has capacity to make a similar transfer of owned property. Restatement (Third) of Property: Wills & Other Donative Transfers § 19.8.

F. Capacity for Declaration of Appointment of Guardian

Tex. Estates Code § 1104.204 requires the witnesses of a Declaration of Guardian to attest that the declarant "appeared to them to be of sound mind," in the self-proving affidavit. Texas courts have defined "sound mind" to mean "testamentary capacity." *Bracewell v. Bracewell*, 20 S.W.3d 14, 19 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 2000, no pet.); *Tieken v. Midwestern State Univ.,* 912 S.W.2d 878, 882 (Tex.App.—Fort Worth 1995, no writ). Thus, it can be inferred that the capacity required to execute a declaration of appointment of guardian is testamentary capacity.

G. Adjudicated Incapacity

1. Prior Law

As indicated above, an existing adjudication of insanity generally raises a presumption of continued insanity. However, even under prior law, the fact that an individual had been adjudicated insane or that a guardian of his person or estate had been appointed did not necessarily mean that the individual was incapacitated for all purposes. Rather, the adjudication was simply evidence, albeit highly probative evidence, of incapacity.

2. Current Law

Effective September 1, 1993, the Texas statutes concerning guardianships were substantially modified. *See* Acts 1993, 73rd Leg., ch. 957, § 1. The underlying policy and purpose of the guardianship law now requires that the court grant authority to the guardian "only as necessary to promote and protect the well-being of the person." TEX. EST. CODE ANN. § 1001.001. An application for the appointment of a guardian must state "the nature and degree of the alleged incapacity, the specific areas of protection and assistance requested, and the limitation of rights requested to be included in the court's order of appointment." TEX. EST. CODE ANN. § 1001.001. When a guardian is appointed, the ward "retains all legal and civil rights except those designated by court order as legal disabilities by virtue of having been specifically granted to the guardian." TEX. EST. CODE ANN. § 1151.001.

It appears that the effect of an adjudication entered after September 1, 1993, but before the execution of the will (or other instrument) is dependent upon the content of the court's order. For instance, if the order specifically takes away the right to make a will and the right to execute a trust or beneficiary designation (as unlikely as this may be), then it seems that a strong presumption of incapacity would exist. On the other hand, if the order's enumeration of disabilities is silent as to testamentary capacity, there should be no resulting presumption of incapacity. Rather, the fact that the individual's mental capacity was before the court, yet the court declined to take away his or her right to make a will, could even help to support the opposite conclusion. Where the order simply recites that the guardian has full authority, the general rules applicable prior to September 1, 1993 should still apply.

IV. ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING DIMINISHED CAPACITY

The remainder of this Article will focus largely on a client's diminished capacity (rather than incapacity) and the attorney's available options and resources. As such, a working definition of diminished capacity (as distinguished from incapacity and full capacity) is helpful. The author is not aware of a Texas definition of "diminished capacity" in the context of estate planning, although there is such a definition in the context of criminal law. *See Jackson v. State*, 160 S.W.3d 568 (Tex. Crim. App. 2005); *see also Ruffin v. State*, 270 S.W.3d 586, 596-97 (Tex. Crim. App. 2008).

Accordingly, whereas a client's incapacity—or failing to meet the requisite mental capacity (as described in Section III above) when entering into a particular legal arrangement—generally results in the corresponding legal arrangement and/or documents being considered void and unenforceable, a client's diminished capacity presents significant uncertainty for both the client and the estate planning attorney regarding what can and should be done. For purposes of this Article, the author will use the following definition of *diminished capacity*: an impaired mental state that may [or may not] result in a person's inability to understand the nature and effect of his acts (*see generally* Black's Law Dictionary, Abridged Ninth Edition, 2010).

A. Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct

1. Rule 1.02(g)

The Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct (the "Rules") are rules of reason intended to define proper conduct for Texas attorneys for purposes of professional discipline. Rule 1.02(g) imposes a duty on attorneys to seek assistance for clients they believe to have impaired faculties. In addition, the comments to the rule bring into question whether an attorney who represents an impaired individual does in fact have an attorney client relationship with that individual. As previously discussed, the capacity to contract requires that the client appreciates the effect of what he is doing and understands the nature and consequences of his acts and the business he is transacting. If it is not clear that the client has capacity to contract, then other arrangements may need to be made, including having a court appoint the lawyer or another person, such as a guardian, to represent the client's interests.

Rule 1.02(g) specifically states the following:

> A lawyer *shall* take reasonable action to secure the appointment of a guardian or other legal representative for, or seek other protective orders with respect to, a client whenever the lawyer reasonably believes that the client lacks legal competence and that such action should be taken to protect the client (emphasis added).

Thus, the lawyer must take action to protect the client if: (i) the lawyer reasonably believes the client lacks

legal competence, and (ii) the lawyer reasonably believes action should be taken to protect the client.

The official comments to the rule state the following:

> 12. . . . The usual attorney-client relationship is established and maintained by consenting adults who possess the legal capacity to agree to the relationship. Sometimes the relationship can be established only by a legally effective appointment of the lawyer to represent a person. *Unless the lawyer is legally authorized to act for a person under a disability, an attorney-client relationship does not exist for the purpose of this rule* (emphasis added).
>
> 13. *If a legal representative has already been appointed for the client, the lawyer should ordinarily look to the representative for decisions on behalf of the client. If a legal representative has not been appointed, paragraph (g) requires a lawyer in some situations to take protective steps, such as initiating the appointment of a guardian.* The lawyer should see to such appointment or take other protective steps when it reasonably appears advisable to do so in order to serve the client's best interests (emphasis added).

The argument can be made that the purpose of including subsection (g) of Rule 1.02 was to deal with the problem of what happens when a client loses contractual capacity and the attorney-client relationship ceases to exist. The rule does not create a "bridge" relationship whereby an attorney can continue to represent an incapacitated former client; rather, it imposes a duty on the lawyer to take whatever action is necessary to see that a legal representative is appointed for the former client when there is no such legal representative. Nowhere does the rule state that the attorney can or should apply to become the legal representative of the former client.

The comments to Rule 1.02(g) also appear to raise serious questions about the advisability of preparing estate plans for individuals who are already the subject of a guardianship. Certainly the attorney should carefully weigh her abilities and those of her client.

2. <u>Proposed Rule 1.16</u>

Notwithstanding the foregoing discussion, as of May 2019, the Committee on Disciplinary Rules and Referenda of Proposed Rules (the "Committee") initiated a rule change proposal pertaining to Rule 1.02(g). The Committee voted to recommend deletion of Rule 1.02(g), dealing with a lawyer's duties to a client who may lack competency. The Committee also voted to recommend that Rule 1.02(g) be replaced with a new Rule 1.16, dealing with a lawyer's duties to a client with diminished capacity. Proposed Rule 1.16 is designed to give more guidance and flexibility to lawyers than current Rule 1.02(g), and to be more detailed in what actions a lawyer is permitted to take when a client's mental capacity is significantly diminished.

During the comment and public hearing process, the Committee received a variety of responses relating to the proposed changes. Among the comments pertaining to Proposed Rule 1.16 [and current Rule 1.02(g)] included concerns: (i) that the term "diminished capacity" needed to be defined; (ii) about the disclosure of confidential client information; (iii) about the use of the permissive term "may" in Proposed Rule 1.16(b) and (c); (iv) about the differing standards for and of action between current Rule 1.02(g) and Proposed Rule 1.16; (v) that Proposed Rule 1.16(b) should include additional actions a lawyer may take when applicable; (vi) that changes should generally follow the American Bar Association Model Rules insofar as possible; and (vii) that more explanation of proposed rule changes should be provided.

These proposed changes were submitted to the State Bar of Texas Board of Directors in early 2019 and approved by the Board of Directors on April 26, 2019. In accordance with Section 81.0878 of the Texas Government Code, the Board of Directors will (at some point) submit the proposed changes to the Texas Supreme Court and petition the Texas Supreme Court to order a referendum on the proposed rules. However, the Committee indicated to the author that because it is relatively expensive to hold a referendum, the Board of Directors and the Texas Supreme Court might prefer to wait for approval of additional proposed rules so that a package of several proposed rules can be included in the referendum. This process could take a number of months or even multiple years depending on when the Board of Directors petitions and when the Texas Supreme Court thereafter orders the referendum.

Interestingly, Proposed Rule 1.16 is nearly identical to the proposed version previously rejected by Texas lawyers in the 2011 referendum (which does not itself make Proposed Rule 1.16 ill-advised, but suggests that a new referendum-election strategy may be needed in order to gain support for the proposed changes this time around). Given the current uncertain status surrounding Rule 1.02(g) and Proposed Rule 1.16 and the possibility of further changes prior to future adoption, if at all, this Article will provide a brief discussion on Proposed Rule 1.16. Proposed Rule 1.16 reads as follows:

> Proposed Rule 1.16: Clients with Diminished Capacity
>
> (a) When a client's capacity to make adequately considered decisions in connection with a representation is diminished, whether because of minority, mental impairment, or for another reason, the lawyer shall, as far as reasonably possible, maintain a normal client-lawyer relationship with the client.
>
> (b) When the lawyer reasonably believes that the client has diminished capacity, is at risk of substantial physical, financial, or other harm unless action is taken, and cannot adequately act in the client's own interest, the lawyer may take reasonably necessary protective action. Such action may include, but is not limited to, consulting with individuals or entities that have the ability to take action to protect the client and, in appropriate cases, seeking the appointment of a guardian ad litem, attorney ad litem, amicus attorney, or conservator, or submitting an information letter to a court with jurisdiction to initiate guardianship proceedings for the client.
>
> (c) When taking protective action pursuant to (b), the lawyer may disclose the client's confidential information to the extent the lawyer reasonably believes is necessary to protect the client's interests.

Proposed Rule 1.16 generally follows American Bar Association Model Rule 1.14 except for adaptations to account for variations in Texas laws. Notably, Proposed Rule 1.16 adds options in section (b) concerning appointment of an attorney ad litem or amicus attorney and submission of an information letter. Proposed Rule 1.16 also deviates slightly from Model Rule 1.14 in section (c) by utilizing a different standard for the extent of disclosure authorized when a lawyer takes protective action on behalf of a client with diminished capacity. The following (selected) Proposed Comments to Proposed Rule 1.16 (which also generally correspond to the Comments for Model Rule 1.14) would offer additional guidance to Texas attorneys:

> 1. The normal client-lawyer relationship is based on the assumption that the client, when properly advised and assisted, is capable of making decisions about important matters. However, maintaining the ordinary client-lawyer relationship may not be possible when the client suffers from a mental impairment, is a minor, or for some other reason has a diminished capacity to make adequately considered decisions regarding representation. In particular, a severely incapacitated person may have no power to make legally binding decisions. *Nevertheless, a client with diminished capacity often can understand, deliberate on, and reach conclusions about matters affecting the client's own well-being. For example, some people of advanced age are capable of handling routine financial matters but need special legal protection concerning major transactions*. Also, some children are regarded as having opinions entitled to weight in legal proceedings concerning their custody (emphasis added).
>
> 2. *In determining the extent of the client's diminished capacity, the lawyer should consider and balance such factors as the client's ability to articulate reasoning leading to a decision, variability of state of mind, and ability to appreciate consequences of a decision; the substantive fairness of a decision; and the consistency of a decision with the lawyer's knowledge of the client's long-term commitments and values* (emphasis added).
>
> 3. *The fact that a client suffers from diminished capacity does not diminish the lawyer's obligation to treat the client with attention and respect. Even if the client has a guardian or other legal representative, the lawyer should, as far as possible, accord the client the normal status of a client, particularly in maintaining communication…* (emphasis added).
>
> 4. *The client may wish to have family members or other persons participate in discussions with the lawyer; however, paragraph (a) requires the lawyer to keep the client's interests foremost and, except when taking protective action authorized by paragraph (b), to look to the client, not the family members or other persons, to make decisions on the client's behalf…* (emphasis added).
>
> 5. Paragraph (b) contains a non-exhaustive list of actions a lawyer may take in certain circumstances to protect a client who does not have a guardian or other legal representative. *Such actions could include*

> *consulting with family members, using a reconsideration period to permit clarification or improvement of circumstances, using voluntary surrogate decision-making tools such as existing durable powers of attorney, or consulting with support groups, professional services, adult protective agencies, or other individuals or entities that have the ability to protect the client. In taking any protective action, the lawyer should be guided by such factors as the client's wishes and values to the extent known, the client's best interests, and the goals of intruding into the client's decision making autonomy to the least extent feasible, maximizing client capacities, and respecting the client's family and social connections* (emphasis added).

For additional analysis on Proposed Rule 1.16 and to read all of the Proposed Comments, see State Bar of Texas, Committee on Disciplinary Rules and Referenda, Docketed Requests, Diminished Capacity at https://www.texasbar.com/AM/Template.cfm?Section=cdrr&Template=/cdrr/vendor/Requests.cfm. The American College of Trust and Estate Counsel ("ACTEC") also provides comments to Model Rule 1.14 which can be useful to an attorney seeking guidance on a broad range of issues concerning representation of clients with diminished capacity [although the practitioner should remember that Rule 1.02(g) still defines proper conduct for Texas attorneys unless and until Proposed Rule 1.16 is adopted]. *See* ACTEC Commentaries on the Model Rules of Professional Conduct (Fifth Edition 2016) at http://www.actec.org/assets/1/6/ACTEC_Commentaries_5th.pdf.

3. Rule 1.05

If the individual is already a client, the attorney must also be mindful of her duties of confidentiality. Rule 1.05 covers the ethics rules regarding client confidentiality. "Confidential information" includes both "privileged client information" (communications protected by the attorney-client privilege of Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, of Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Criminal Evidence, or by the principles of attorney-client privilege governed by Rule 501 of the Federal Rules of Evidence for United States Courts and Magistrates) and "unprivileged client information" (all non-privileged information relating to or furnished by the client that is acquired by the lawyer during the course or by reason of the representation of the client). The attorney-client privilege, as set forth in Texas Rules of Evidence 503, protects from disclosure of confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client.

Rule 1.05 provides that a lawyer is prohibited from knowingly revealing confidential information of a client or former client to (i) a person the client has instructed is not to receive the information or (ii) anyone else, other than the client, the client's representatives, or the members, associates or employees of the lawyer's law firm. Additionally, the lawyer cannot use confidential information to the disadvantage of the client unless the client consents after consultation. The attorney cannot use confidential information of a former client to the disadvantage of the former client after the termination of representation unless the former client consents after consultation or the confidential information has become generally known. Finally, the attorney cannot use privileged information of the client for the advantage of the lawyer or of a third person, unless the client consents after consultation.

However, a lawyer can reveal confidential information:

(1) When the lawyer is expressly authorized to do so to carry out the representation;
(2) When the client consents after consultation;
(3) To the client, the client's representatives, or the members, associates, and employees of the lawyer's firm, except when otherwise instructed by the client;
(4) When the lawyer has reason to believe it is necessary to do so to comply with a court order, a Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct, or other law;
(5) To the extent reasonably necessary to enforce a claim or establish a defense on behalf of the lawyer in a controversy between the lawyer and the client;
(6) To establish a defense to a criminal charge, civil claim or disciplinary complaint against the lawyer or the lawyer's associates based upon conduct involving the client or the representation of the client;
(7) When the lawyer has reason to believe it is necessary to do so in order to prevent the client from committing a criminal or fraudulent act;
(8) To the extent revelation reasonably appears necessary to rectify the consequences of a client's criminal or fraudulent act in the commission of which the lawyer's services had been used; and
(9) To secure legal advice about the lawyer's compliance with the rules of professional conduct [this item (9) is an additional exception recently proposed by the

Committee and also currently under consideration for adoption].

Rule 1.05(c).

A lawyer may reveal *unprivileged* client information in several circumstances, including when impliedly authorized to do so to carry out the representation or when the lawyer has reason to believe it is necessary to do so in order to carry out the representation effectively. Rule 1.05(d).

Before communicating with any family member, doctor, or other professional advisor, the attorney must determine whether the information he seeks to disclose is "privileged" or "unprivileged" information.

Privileged information includes confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Unprivileged information is all other information relating to a client or furnished by the client that was acquired by the lawyer during the course of representing the client.

If the information is unprivileged, then the attorney is impliedly authorized to reveal such information in order to carry out the representation or when the lawyer believes it is necessary to do so in order to carry out the representation effectively. Tex. Rules 1.05(d)(1) and 1.05(d)(2)(i).

If the information is privileged information, then the lawyer may reveal the information without the client's consent when the lawyer has reason to believe it is necessary to do so to comply with a Texas Disciplinary Rule of Professional Conduct, or other law (or if any of the enumerated instances above are applicable).

If the lawyer is having difficulty communicating with a client regarding the scope and objectives of the representation (Rule 1.02) because of a client's potential diminished capacity, then the lawyer may be required to take action to protect such person. Rule 1.02(g).

B. Section 1102.001 of the Texas Estates Code

In line with the Rules, Section 1102.001 of the Texas Estates Code provides that if a court has probable cause to believe a person is incapacitated, the court *shall* appoint a guardian ad litem or court investigator to investigate the person's condition and circumstances to determine whether the person is an incapacitated person and if a guardianship is necessary. Probable cause can be established by an informational letter pursuant to Section 1102.003 written by an interested person, or through a written letter or certificate from a physician pursuant to Section 1102.002.

V. UNDUE INFLUENCE

The diminished capacity or incapacity of clients (with estates both large and small) can create difficult challenges to the ability of an attorney to comply with her professional ethical obligations. In an attorney's role as counselor, an implicit responsibility of the attorney is to protect the client from manipulation and exploitation. This often means that the estate planner must be watchful with respect to abuse of particularly vulnerable clients, and the attorney must also be knowledgeable of and willing to take the appropriate steps to protect the client from such abuse.

A common ethical issue that arises when representing clients with diminished capacity involves situations where the client is brought in by a third party, which in many cases is a family member or close friend. In such cases, the lawyer should be careful to guard against any undue influence by the family member or friend (which many times is intentional, but the practitioner should also be cognizant of any unintentional undue influence). The attorney should always: (i) remember who she is representing; (ii) make a point to speak with the client in person and alone (without others—particularly beneficiaries—in the room) for an extended period of time; (iii) ask open-ended (as opposed to leading) questions and engage in discussion designed to gain the client's confidence and at the same time reveal the client's capacity; and (iv) be reasonably alert to indications that the client is incompetent or subject to undue influence.

The existence of undue influence, much like the determination of capacity, is often a central issue in cases of possible financial elder abuse. The legal definition of undue influence varies by state, but it generally refers to the improper use of power or trust in a way that deprives a person of free will and substitutes another's objective (*see* Black's Law Dictionary, Abridged Ninth Edition, 2010). While the below discussion focuses on undue influence in the context of wills, the estate planning attorney must appreciate that undue influence can be found to apply to almost any type of transaction intended to take effect during life or upon death, including: the creation of revocable and irrevocable trusts; gifts; deeds; beneficiary designations for life insurance and retirement assets; creation of joint, right of survivorship, or pay on death accounts; powers of attorney; medical or advanced directives; informed consent for medical procedures; and contracts.

A. Undue Influence in Texas

1. Background and Definition

Although the estate planning professional should care about both the dispositive provisions and the technical (state and federal tax, fiduciary, and estate administration) provisions of a client's estate plan, most clients care primarily about *who is in charge and*

who gets what. Along those lines, fundamental to our modern American system of property and inheritance laws is the concept that a testator has free will (i.e., freedom of testation—a person can "opt-out" of the default system of intestacy by executing a will). It is the law of Texas that a citizen of this state may by his will dispose of his property without regard to the ties of nature and relationship, and may do so in defiance of the rules of justice or the dictates of reason. *See Estate of Good*, 274 S.W.2d 900 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1955, writ ref'd n.r.e). Stated differently, a person is free to leave his property to anyone in any manner he pleases as long as he possesses the mental capacity and free agency required at the time of the act. It is not for courts, juries, relatives, or friends to say how property should be passed by will, or to rewrite a will for a testator because they do not believe he made a wise or fair distribution of his property. *See Farmer v. Dodson*, 326 S.W.2d 57 (Tex. Civ. App.—Dallas 1959, no writ). Therefore, undue influence poses a threat to a testator's free will and free agency by replacing the testator's desires for those of another.

Courts in Texas have held that undue influence is a species of legal fraud and has been defined as compelling the testator to do that which is against his will from fear, the desire of peace, or some feeling which he is unable to resist. *See Curry v. Curry*, 270 S.W.2d 208, 214 (Tex. 1954*); see also Long v. Long*, 125 S.W.2d 1034, 1035 (Tex. 1939). Although a finding of undue influence implies the existence of a sound mind, it does not require the existence of a sound mind. *Estate of Lynch*, 350 S.W.3d (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2011, writ denied). Testamentary incapacity and undue influence are not necessarily mutually exclusive; one may be a factor in the existence of the other and, thus, it is plausible that a person may both lack testamentary capacity and be unduly influenced. *Id.*

The burden of proving undue influence is on the contestant, who must introduce tangible and satisfactory proof of each of the following elements: (i) the existence and exertion of an influence; (ii) the effective operation of such influence so as to subvert or overpower the mind of the testator at the time of the execution of the testament; and (iii) the execution of a testament which the maker thereof would not have executed but for such influence. *Rothermel v. Duncan*, 369 S.W.2d 917, 922 (Tex. 1963). Not all influence is undue; influence is only undue if the free agency of the testator was destroyed and a testament produced that expresses the will of the one exerting the influence. *Id.* A person may request, importune, or entreat the testator to execute a favorable dispositive instrument, but unless these advances are shown to be so excessive as to subvert the will of the testator, they will not taint the validity of the instrument with undue influence. *Id.*

2. Factors

Not surprisingly, it is often the case that a beneficiary under a will occupies a close family or friend relationship with the testator. Likewise, in the context of undue influence, there also frequently exists a fiduciary or a close family relationship between the influencer-beneficiary and the testator. However, such a confidential or fiduciary relationship is not in itself proof of undue influence, although such a relationship may certainly be a factor to consider. *See Dailey v. Wheat*, 681 S.W.2d 747 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Estate of Willenbrock*, 603 S.W.2d 348, 351 (Tex. Civ. App.—Eastland 1980, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Moreover, evidence that merely shows the opportunity to exert influence, the testator's susceptibility to influence due to age and physical condition, and an unnatural disposition, do not establish that the testator's mind was in fact subverted or overpowered. *Rothermel v. Duncan*, 369 S.W.2d 917, 922 (Tex. 1963).

The Texas Supreme Court has recognized that it is impossible to propagate hard and fast rules on exactly what constitutes undue influence (particularly since there are many forms and degrees of undue influence). Establishing the existence of undue influence generally involves inquiry into factors such as:

(i) the circumstances surrounding execution of the instrument;
(ii) the relationship between the testator and the beneficiary and any others who might be expected recipients of the testator's bounty;
(iii) the motive, character, and conduct of the persons benefitted by the instrument;
(iv) the participation by the beneficiary in the preparation or execution of the instrument;
(v) the words and acts of the parties;
(vi) the interest in and opportunity for the exercise of undue influence;
(vii) the physical and mental condition of the testator at the time of the will's execution, including the extent to which he was dependent upon and subject to the control of the beneficiary; and
(viii) the improvidence of the transaction by reason of unjust, unreasonable, or unnatural disposition of the property.

Mackie v. McKenzie, 900 S.W.2d 445, 449 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1995, writ denied). Undue influence need not be accomplished forcibly and directly, as to the point of a gun. It is more often exercised by subtle and devious means, such as deceit and fraud, which may occur consistently over a long period of time or briefly and immediately prior to the execution of the instrument in question. *See Olsson's Estate*, 344 S.W.2d 171 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso, writ ref'd

n.r.e.); *see also Holcomb v. Holcomb*; 803 S.W.2d 411 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1991, writ denied).

In any event, an inquiry into undue influence is largely circumstantial in nature, fact dependent, and rests ultimately on a finding that the testator's mind was undermined and overpowered by the influencer at the time the will was executed, taking into consideration the various factors listed above. Perhaps the biggest takeaway for the estate planning attorney is to be cognizant that clients with diminished capacity are particularly vulnerable to undue influence and financial abuse. For additional discussion on undue influence in Texas, see Stanley M. Johanson, Johanson's Texas Estates Code Ann., Texas Estates Code § 55.001 commentary (2017 ed.).

B. Vulnerable Clients and Financial Elder Abuse

Our population is aging, which brings the unfortunate increased opportunity for elder and financial abuse. The National Center for Elder Abuse defines elder abuse as "any knowing, intended, or careless act that causes harm or serious risk of harm to an older person—physically, mentally, emotionally, or financially." Financial elder abuse includes a variety of circumstances where a disabled or aged person is vulnerable to manipulation and/or exploitation by others (e.g., relatives, friends, professionals, employees, caregivers, and/or strangers). Many times, the vulnerable person is at risk because of any number of factors, such as: age; impaired mental and/or physical condition (dementia, depression, anxiety, delirium, mood, sleep deprivation, and/or substance abuse); dependency; isolation; and/or loneliness. Since the attorney has a duty to employ all appropriate legal means to protect and advance her client's legitimate rights and interests, the attorney must be familiar with common tactics often used in this manipulation or exploitation of vulnerable individuals.

In *Undue Influence: The Gap Between Current Law and Scientific Approaches to Decision-Making and Persuasion*, the authors identify and explain six basic principles used in persuasion (which can potentially lead to exploitation):

(1) *Reciprocation*, where people often feel inclined to repay, in kind, what another person has provided to them;

(2) *Consistency*, where people have a nearly obsessive desire to be (and to appear) consistent with a choice or action previously taken and to respond in ways that justify an earlier decision;

(3) *Social Proof*, where people view behavior as more correct in a given situation to the degree they see others performing it (i.e., the greater the number of people who find an idea correct, the more correct the idea will be; similar to peer pressure);

(4) *Liking*, where people most prefer to say yes to the requests of someone who they know, like, and perceive as similar to themselves;

(5) *Authority*, where people have a natural tendency to believe and follow those with the outer appearance of authority, even to the extent of abandoning critical reasoning and placing total trust in the authority-influencer to make correct decisions; and

(6) *Scarcity*, where something that, on its own merits, might hold little appeal becomes decidedly more attractive simply because it would soon become unavailable (i.e., opportunities seem more valuable when their availability is limited).

See Undue Influence: The Gap Between Current Law and Scientific Approaches to Decision-Making and Persuasion, Dominic Campisi, Evan Winet, and Jake Calvert (43 ACTEC L.J. 359, 2018). These six principles used in persuasion, though not an exhaustive list, account for many of the tactics used by influencers in manipulating or exploiting vulnerable individuals. Certainly, the mere existence of persuasion by a third party over a vulnerable person in a given transaction does not alone rise to the level of undue influence. In fact, decisions are made daily by all of us that might be construed as the product of persuasion, but at the same time we often receive legitimate benefits from those decisions. Nevertheless, the estate planner would do well to understand the mental and emotional processes that go into a person's decision-making and the reality that vulnerable clients are particularly susceptible to undue persuasion and influence.

C. Digital Era

In this digital age in which we live and with every year that passes, more and more of our daily activities and interactions are conducted online. As our activities and communication habits (both business and personal) continue to occur through electronic means (and thus, these transactions become more routine and widely-accepted), it can make watching for undue influence particularly difficult.

Over the past two decades, federal and state laws have been passed in order to streamline and regulate electronic commerce and communications. Estate planning laws, of course, have lagged behind, but some states have gradually adopted laws intended to address electronic estate planning documents, electronic signing practices, and remote notarization. Nevada and Indiana already have electronic will statutes in effect, and electronic will legislation has been considered in Arizona, Florida, New Hampshire, Virginia, and the District of Columbia. In recognition of constant

advances in technology and the digitalization of routine business and personal transactions, the Uniform Law Commission has formed an electronic wills committee to develop a sample electronic wills law for states to consider adopting. At the time of writing this article, the author is not aware of pending electronic wills legislation in Texas, but such legislation should not be surprising if and when it comes up for consideration.

As every estate planner knows, in order for a court to enforce a testator's will, the will must meet certain requirements, which concern the document itself and the testator's mental capacity. These modern requirements or formalities required in the will (developed over the course of hundreds of years dating back to the English Statute of Frauds in 1677) serve four primary functions:

(1) *Evidentiary function*, ensuring the existence of permanent reliable evidence of a testator's intent;
(2) *Channeling function*, ensuring that the testator's intent is expressed in a way that is understood by those who need to interpret it (courts, personal representatives, beneficiaries, government and tax authorities, etc.);
(3) *Ritual function*, ensuring that the testator's intent to dispose of property is serious and purposeful; and
(4) *Protective function*, ensuring that the testator is protected from his own lack of capacity and from undue influence.

See Gary, Borison, Cahn & Monopoli, *Contemporary Approaches to Trusts and Estates* 446-447 (2011). Given the spirit and intention behind these will requirements, a key concern for electronic wills legislation is the protective function—to protect the testator from undue influence by maintaining the traditional formalities required in a will.

No doubt, when an attorney is involved in drafting and executing estate planning documents, the attorney can aid in the protective function by interacting with the client, assessing the client's capacity, and making a determination of the client's free agency and susceptibility to undue influences. Attorney involvement in the client's estate plan does not in itself protect the client from undue influence; however, it can certainly help if the attorney is watchful on behalf of her client.

The takeaway for estate planning attorneys in this digital age is to not rely too heavily on electronic communications, particularly email. The author has had numerous clients who, due to normal aging or communication preferences, allow a trusted relative, friend, or assistant to access or operate their email accounts and cell phones on their behalf. As the attorney, it is crucial to be aware of this reality and understand that you may not actually be communicating directly with the intended person—the client. Perhaps the best piece of advice the author has received is this simple action: *go meet the client, or at least pick up the phone and call.* Regardless of advances in technology, a face-to-face meeting (followed by a phone call) is the best way to communicate with clients to confirm mutual understanding and detect undue influence.

VI. EVALUATING CAPACITY, UNDUE INFLUENCE, AND ADDITIONAL PRACTICAL STEPS FOR THE ATTORNEY TO TAKE

A. Attorney's Response to Undue Influence

Aside from meeting with the client alone and in person (preferably on more than one occasion) and engaging in conversation to confirm the client's capacity and free agency, what else can the attorney do to protect her client from potential undue influence?

To start simply, the attorney must understand the difference between incapacity and undue influence. Most attorneys know (unsatisfyingly) that they should decline to prepare an estate plan if they reasonably believe that the testator lacks requisite capacity, even if this means that the testator will visit another attorney who will comply. In such a case, the first attorney risks spending time and effort meeting with the client and drafting documents that will not get signed and for which she will not be paid.

For instance, on one particular occasion, the author had a client who appeared alert and competent during the initial visit, albeit with signs of diminishing capacity. After proceeding with instructions and completing drafts of the estate plan, it came time for the execution meeting, where it became apparent that the client did not know his property or recognize his family members (the objects of his bounty). In that particular case, the appropriate (although difficult) response for the author was to gently decline to allow the client to execute the documents on that day. The client was free to try again on a "good day" or to visit with another attorney, but the client (or rather, the client's spouse and relatives) left that day frustrated and upset. (Needless to say, the author did not get paid for that engagement.) Nevertheless, the estate planning attorney would do well to understand the following ACTEC commentary with respect to Model Rule 1.14 and testamentary capacity:

> *If the testamentary capacity of a client is uncertain, the lawyer should exercise particular caution in assisting the client to modify his or her estate plan. The lawyer generally should not prepare a will, trust agreement or other dispositive instrument for*

a client whom the lawyer reasonably believes lacks the requisite capacity. On the other hand, because of the importance of testamentary freedom, the lawyer may properly assist clients whose testamentary capacity appears to be borderline. In any such case the lawyer should take steps to preserve evidence regarding the client's testamentary capacity.

Even more problematic for the attorney than a client bordering on incapacity, however, is a client who is potentially subject to undue influence (especially since a skilled influencer does not necessarily need to be present in order to influence the testator). In a case where the attorney suspects undue influence, it may not be enough for the attorney to simply decline representation or prevent execution of the documents. In such a case, the influencer would most certainly help the testator find another attorney to assist or otherwise develop other means to carry out the undue influence. Instead, the attorney should consider conducting a more robust client interview and investigation to determine the extent of the suspected undue influence and how to best protect the client from abuse.

B. Initial Steps to Take

Following are some additional practical steps, in line with the Texas Disciplinary Rules of Professional Conduct, that the attorney should consider.

1. Be Aware

The attorney should be attentive to and document assessments related to issues of a client's capacity, vulnerabilities, and suspicious circumstances that may be present (e.g., *chaperoning*, where the vulnerable person is constantly accompanied by another). It may also be appropriate for the attorney to gently ask about any current or future health concerns of the client. The attorney should keep contemporaneous notes of her observations and thought processes, understanding that she very well may be called as a witness in the event of future litigation. In all events, the attorney should exercise independent judgment with respect to the client's capacity and susceptibility to undue influences. Make it a practice to send drafts of documents to the client for review in advance of execution and question the client regarding his rationale for major changes to his plan.

2. Meetings and Confidences

Meet outside the presence of others—which certainly includes beneficiaries and may also include financial advisors, accountants, caregivers, and agents/executors/trustees/other fiduciaries. The attorney should listen to the client's wishes and take instructions directly from the client and not from an intermediary who purports to act on the client's behalf. On the issue of confidences and keeping others out of the room, the client must understand from the outset that the attorney represents the client and not the client's family members or advisors. Inevitably, the client will want a family member or financial advisor in the room—which may be appropriate in many circumstances—but likely not in the case of suspected undue influence. When it is necessary to exclude others from the meeting and/or execution ceremony (in order to meet alone with the client), the attorney may need to play the "bad guy" (or lady) and blame it on firm policy or the attorney-client privilege.

If the client insists on having a relative, friend, or advisor in the room, the attorney's notes should reflect who was present and that the client has waived confidences with respect to that person. Keep in mind that allowing others to participate in the meeting or telephone call between the client and attorney may jeopardize the attorney-client privilege for those matters or engagements. In the event the client requests the presence or involvement of others, the attorney should document her file regarding the client's instructions and confirm this in writing to the client, perhaps in the engagement letter or in a separate written Authorization to Communicate and Waiver of Confidentiality signed by the client (see the attached Appendix A for an example).

3. Corporate Fiduciaries

Discuss the possibility of including a corporate or independent fiduciary or a trust protector in the client's planning documents, which may help the client withstand future influences and ensure that a neutral third party is always acting.

C. Establishing Mental Capacity and Free Agency

If the attorney feels that a client's capacity is diminishing or that the client is otherwise vulnerable to undue influence or abuse, additional precautions may be taken to protect the client and to defend against a possible challenge to the client's plan. When the validity of a client's estate plan is at issue, whether from lack of testamentary capacity or undue influence, the client will, of course, not be available to testify regarding his competency and free agency. Accordingly, the attorney must (i) ensure that the client possesses the mental capacity and free will necessary to execute his estate planning documents and (ii) preserve evidence of the client's capacity and free will.

Particularly in an estate planning engagement where there is a risk of future litigation, regardless of whether the estate planning attorney personally feels comfortable that the client is competent and acting of his own accord, it is important to independently establish and memorialize the client's mental

competency and free will. In such a scenario, the attorney will likely be called on at some point to testify regarding the client's competence and behavior. The credibility of the attorney's testimony may largely depend on how well the attorney knew the client (i.e., was it a close, long-term attorney-client relationship or a one-off engagement where the attorney only met the client one or two times). In any event, however, the attorney's testimony may be questioned due to the attorney's natural interest in protecting the integrity of her work product and the attorney's relative inexperience in the fields of psychology and mental competency issues. For these reasons, the attorney's testimony may not always be the ideal evidence to establish the testator's capacity and free agency, and it may be beneficial to have an independent evaluation from a medical professional or a trusted friend, advisor, or relative of the testator who is not a beneficiary under the testator's estate plan.

1. Testing by a Medical Professional

Especially in cases where a challenge of undue influence or lack of mental capacity is anticipated, the attorney should consider recommending that the client be examined by a mental health professional contemporaneously with execution of the estate planning documents. Such an examination is unrealistic and unnecessary in most instances (given the time, privacy intrusion, and financial costs involved), but the supporting testimony of a mental health professional may be the best evidence of a client's capacity and free agency (assuming, of course, that the examination does not reveal any impairments or suspicious influences) at the time of execution.

If a mental health examination is appropriate for a client, a professional psychiatrist or neuropsychologist (or other medical professional trained to identify and assess cognitive functions and deficits) should perform the examination with a focus on the client's alertness and concentration; attention; memory issues; ability to reason, understand, and communicate with others; and orientation to time, place, and situation. The examination should also address the factors or requirements and the medical professional's ultimate opinion regarding whether or not the client possesses the minimum degree of capacity required for the particular act (e.g., testamentary capacity).

Ideally, the examination should occur on the same day that the documents are signed in order to establish the client's testamentary capacity on *the day the will was executed*. The examination report should address the client's medical history and discuss the effect of any of the client's medications on the client's capacity. The report should also be addressed to the attorney and include confidentiality and HIPAA waivers to allow the report to be provided to certain necessary parties as needed after the client's death.

2. Videotaping

It may be advisable for the attorney to arrange for videotaping of the will execution ceremony, as evidence of the client's mental state, independence and free agency, and appearance at the time of execution. In cases where videotaping is appropriate, a professional taping service should be used to ensure proper lighting and sound. However, whether to videotape or not should be carefully considered, as videotaping can also demonstrate the client's lack of capacity and/or susceptibility to influences. In addition, if the attorney does not videotape all client execution ceremonies, the fact of videotaping itself could raise questions about the client's capacity.

As with a mental health examination, videotaping is not appropriate in most cases. In the event that videotaping is preferred, the attorney and client should be confident in the client's capacity and ability to perform well in front of a camera. In any event, rehearsals and re-takes should not be done, in order to avoid claims of coaching the client or doctoring the video in the event of future litigation.

3. Witness Credibility and Questions

The witnesses to a will execution should be carefully chosen and the number of witnesses may need to be increased. Many attorneys use professional witnesses (i.e., other attorneys, paralegals, or legal assistants) from their office because of convenience, but this may not always be appropriate. Younger witnesses may be more capable of recalling specific details, while older witnesses may appear more credible. In cases with the potential for litigation, people who have known the client for numerous years and who are aware of the client's background and personality may be better witnesses than professional witnesses. However, professional witnesses may be more independent and better trained to testify concerning proper execution and mental capacity.

During the execution ceremony, the attorney should speak with the client in the presence of the witnesses regarding the client's intentions and the content of the documents. The attorney should ask questions of her client to establish that the client understands his family and beneficiary relationships, business or profession, and the extent of his property (which questions do not need to be structured and interrogation-like, but which can come up in the normal course of conversation). The will or other document should be reviewed with the client and witnesses to confirm testamentary intent and understanding of the document. Avoid using leading questions or questions that call for a "yes" or "no" answer, since many clients with diminished capacity tend to simply answer "yes" to any question. Instead, ask open-ended questions to allow the client to explain his thoughts and desires.

Also consider asking witnesses to sign an affidavit as to relevant facts (or otherwise preparing a "memo-to-the-file") to serve as a contemporaneous record of the questions the attorney asked, the client's responses, and why those questions and responses caused the witness to form the opinion that the client had mental capacity and free agency to execute the estate planning documents. For certain incapacity planning documents, it may also be beneficial for the client and witnesses to execute a self-proving affidavit even if not required by statute.

4. Prior Wills and Consistency

After executing the will, the attorney and client should consider executing one or more new wills and/or codicils, keeping the substance the same while demonstrating a consistent desired plan of distribution and testamentary intent. While not always realistic, such an approach makes potential challenges more difficult due to the necessity of overcoming multiple, consistent instruments evidencing the client's intentions, capacity, and free agency. However, this approach should be exercised carefully, since any inconsistencies between wills could give rise to questions. For instance, a prior will that required client initials on each page, followed by a new will that did not require initials, could suggest that the client was feeble and/or struggled to concentrate during execution of the new will.

5. No Contest Clauses

A no contest clause (also known as a forfeiture clause or an *in terrorem* clause) generally provides that an interested person's unsuccessful contest of a testamentary instrument results in forfeiture of the contesting person's interests under the instrument. Many lawyers feel that it is useful to include a no contest clause in the will since it causes a beneficiary to forfeit his bequest if he brings a challenge to the will. From a practical standpoint, of course, the beneficiary must receive something of value under the will in order for a no contest clause to be effective. A beneficiary who receives something under a will must do a cost-benefit analysis of what he stands to gain and lose if he brings a challenge (i.e., whether the risk of losing the gift under the will is worth taking the chance of receiving more by successfully challenging the will), whereas a beneficiary who has nothing to lose will bring a challenge despite the no contest clause.

No contest clauses are widely used in Texas, but they are not always effective. Section 254.005 of the Texas Estates Code (enacted in 2009) sets forth a "just cause and good faith" exception to enforcement of a no contest clause: if the contesting person establishes that just cause existed for bringing the contest and if the contest was brought and maintained in good faith, the no contest clause will not be enforced (meaning that the contesting person does not forfeit his interest). [Section 112.038 of the Texas Trust Code contains a similar no contest provision (to the one in Section 254.005 of the Texas Estates Code) but applied in the context of trust instruments.] Section 254.005 was intended to clarify what was already Texas law: no contest clauses will generally be enforced absent any pleading or proof that the contest was made in good faith and with just cause. *See Hammer v. Powers*, 819 S.W.2d 669 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 1991, no writ).

Nevertheless, there are numerous Texas cases in which no contest clauses have not been enforced by courts, and the attorney should be aware that no contest clauses are strictly construed in Texas since there is no such thing as the "probate police." No official government body or court investigates whether a testator's will is the product of incapacity or undue influence (except perhaps in the most egregious circumstances). Rather, our probate system relies on those who have an interest (or a purported interest) in a person's estate to prevent the admission to probate of defective instruments.

D. Additional Tools to Evaluate and Handle Incapacity

Determining whether a client has capacity can be very tricky, especially for an attorney who is not a licensed medical or healthcare professional (and again, it may not be a determination that many attorneys desire or feel equipped to make). Furthermore, the attorney must be cognizant that the client may be having a "good day" or a moment of clarity at the time of the consultation (which could call for follow-up meetings, possibly at varying times of the day, to help gauge true capacity). Following are additional steps, resources, and options for the attorney to consider when dealing with a client with potential diminished capacity or incapacity.

1. Setting of Meetings and Regular Follow-Up

It is important to remember that the time of day and overall setting of a client meeting could impact a person's performance or behavior, so the environment in which the attorney conducts her meetings should be accommodating to the client. The attorney should be mindful of temperature settings, loud background noises, proper lighting, ease of access to meeting locations, etc. For instance, a meeting location (e.g., certain office buildings) with difficult parking or security procedures for clients to navigate could potentially cause unnecessary stress and confusion for clients with borderline incapacity issues even before arriving to the actual meeting. Also, the attorney should remember to speak slowly and enunciate, talk directly to the client, gauge whether written communication or oral communication works best, consider having an extra pair of reading glasses

available, start with simple concepts and build at a slower pace, circle back to difficult material, and check periodically that the client is retaining and understanding key concepts.

Additionally, depending on the dynamic of the attorney-client relationship (i.e., with long-term clients or ongoing engagements), it may be prudent for the attorney to make it a practice to follow-up with a client with potential diminishing capacity on a regular basis (e.g., such as every 3 months, every 6 months, etc.) to check-in and evaluate if any new developments have occurred in the client's situation that might warrant proactive discussions with the client or protective action by the attorney.

2. American Bar Association Resources

The American Bar Association has a detailed publication titled "Assessment of Older Adults with Diminished Capacity: A Handbook for Lawyers" that is very helpful resource for attorneys to use as they work through various incapacity issues: https://www.apa.org/pi/aging/resources/guides/diminished-capacity.pdf.

The American Bar Association also publishes the "Judicial Determination of Capacity of Older Adults in Guardianship Proceedings", which provides a framework that judges may find useful in capacity determination (and which may also be instructive to the practicing attorney): https://www.apa.org/pi/aging/resources/guides/judges-diminished.pdf.

3. Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination in Guardianship Referral

The Harris County Probate Courts require a physician's mental status exam (called the Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination) of the proposed ward to accompany any guardianship referral form. This Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination is a detailed form designed to enable the court to determine whether the proposed ward is incapacitated according to the legal definition and whether the proposed ward should have a guardian appointed. For purposes of the Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination, an "incapacitated person" is defined as an adult who, because of a physical or mental condition, is substantially unable to: (a) provide food, clothing, or shelter for himself or herself; (b) care for the person's own physical health; or (c) manage the person's own financial affairs. *See* § 1002.017 of the Texas Estates Code.

Of course, the Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination is only applicable in the context of a guardianship referral and can only be completed by a licensed mental health professional, but the form can, nevertheless, be instructive to an attorney with a client experiencing diminished capacity. In particular, the form includes a list of possible deficits an incapacitated person may have, such as: short-term memory; long-term memory; immediate recall; understanding and communicating; recognizing familiar objects and persons; solving problems; and reasoning logically. In addition, the form lists decisions and actions that an incapacitated person might struggle with, including: managing a personal bank account; safely operating a motor vehicle; voting in a public election; making decisions regarding marriage; administering own medications; attending to basic activities of daily living without assistance (e.g., bathing, grooming, dressing, walking, and toileting); and attending to instrumental activities of daily living without assistance (e.g., shopping, cooking, traveling, and cleaning).

While not exhaustive, these lists (and the Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination form as a whole) can offer guidance to an attorney seeking to determine whether or not her client is incapacitated (or otherwise experiencing diminished capacity or susceptible to undue influence) for purposes of representation and execution of estate planning documents. *See* the Harris County Physician's Certificate of Medical Examination form at https://probate.harriscountytx.gov/Documents/Revised%20Guardianship%20Referral%20and%20Medical%20Exam%20Form.pdf.

4. SAGE and Other Tests for Cognitive Impairment

A Self-Administered Gerocognitive Examination ("SAGE") is a brief (10 to 15 minutes) self-administered cognitive screening instrument designed to detect early signs of cognitive, memory, or thinking impairments. SAGE evaluates a person's thinking abilities and helps physicians to know how well a person's brain is functioning. While SAGE does not diagnose any specific condition, the results can indicate whether or not a person has cognitive or brain dysfunction. It is normal for a person to experience some memory loss and take longer to recall events as the person ages, but SAGE can be a helpful tool to assess memory or thinking problems to determine if further evaluation (from a medical professional) is necessary.

See "SAGE: A Test to Detect Signs of Alzheimer's and Dementia" at https://wexnermedical.osu.edu/brain-spine-neuro/memory-disorders/sage for additional information and to take one or all four forms of the SAGE test.

Other tools and tests to assess a person's cognitive impairment include the "Mini-Mental State Examination (MMSE)" the "PARADISE-2 Protocol" (designed to be used by people who are not healthcare professionals), and "CLOX: Clock Drawing Executive Test."

5. Defining Incapacity in Estate Planning Documents

The author's experience is that most estate planning attorneys in Texas define incapacity based on the type of document in question and the identity of the incapacitated person. For instance, a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney is most often drafted to take effect immediately upon execution and to be unaffected by the principal's subsequent incapacity (hence the word "durable"). In some cases, however, the client may prefer a "springing" Power of Attorney, which "springs" into effect only upon the principal's incapacity, in which case incapacity must be defined in the document. One option in this situation is to define incapacity in a manner which requires a physician to certify in writing that, based on the physician's medical examination of the principal, the principal is mentally incapable of managing his own financial affairs (*see* Section 751.00201 of the Texas Estates Code). Another option (which should be used carefully and only in non-controversial client-family-beneficiary situations) is to define incapacity based on an agent's affidavit of incapacity, wherein the principal is deemed incapacitated upon the agent's execution of an affidavit stating that the principal is incapacitated.

Similarly, in a revocable (i.e., management/living) trust plan, the trustee may be given the power to determine that a beneficiary is incapacitated if, in the trustee's sole discretion, the beneficiary is substantially unable to manage his own financial affairs. The determination of incapacity with respect to a trustee, however, is a bit trickier. If a trustee should become incapacitated (i.e., unable to administer the trust because of a physical or mental condition), the remaining co-trustee or the successor trustee could be given the ability to make this judgment. If there is no co-trustee or successor trustee, though, then the beneficiary could be given the ability to initiate this judgment by obtaining a written determination of incapacity from, say, two licensed physicians. In any event, particularly if the beneficiary and trustee have a contentious relationship, the beneficiary should not have the ability himself to determine whether the trustee is incapacitated, as doing so could essentially allow the beneficiary to bypass any trusteeship restrictions placed on the beneficiary elsewhere in the trust agreement.

The trend toward allowing an agent or trustee (or perhaps even a designated relative or friend) to determine incapacity (rather than requiring a physician's certification of incapacity as a default) provides flexibility for the parties, streamlined decision-making, and avoids the time, expense, and privacy intrusion of obtaining a physician's certification or a judicial determination of incapacity. In addition, this approach also acknowledges the reality that the agent or trustee likely knows the client (who may be the principal in the Statutory Durable Power of Attorney and the grantor, beneficiary, and/or trustee under a revocable trust) and his situation and capabilities much better than a physician who merely spends a few hours examining the client. Nevertheless, if the fiduciary is given the ability to determine incapacity, the attorney should understand the potential for abuse in the extreme case where a fiduciary does not have the client's best interest in mind. In such a case, it may be prudent to require a written determination of incapacity from multiple licensed physicians.

6. Occupational Living Will

The attorney might consider suggesting that her client develop an "Occupational Living Will," of sorts. Just as a client might execute a Living Will (i.e., Directive to Physicians) to specify his preferences regarding end-of-life medical treatment, a client might also consider developing a formal plan (for himself, but with input from his colleagues and trusted advisors) for transition and conclusion of his professional career in the event of future cognitive impairment. While many professionals may have the opportunity, desire, and drive to work into their 70s and 80s, a lack of self-awareness can cause some to continue their careers when they otherwise should retire (for instance, in the case of evidence of deteriorating mental capacity—which can sometimes be difficult to detect in oneself but readily apparent to outsiders). Preparing an Occupational Living Will can be an important, though often overlooked, endeavor to hold oneself accountable if cognitive or functional decline should ever signify the need to stop working. *See* Daffner, Kirk R., *Reflections of a Dementia Specialist: I Want to Stop Working Before I Embarrass Myself*, The Washington Post (April 15, 2018).

7. Family Driving Agreement

The Texas Department of Public Safety does not have different driver license standards due to age, but effective September, 1, 2007, Texas drivers aged 79 or older can no longer renew a driver license online or by mail, but must renew the license in-person at an authorized license renewal station. In addition, drivers aged 85 and older will now have to renew every two years, rather than every six years. *See* Texas Transportation Code § 521.2711. During the renewal, the person is required to pass a vision test and provide certain medical history information to determine if additional testing is required.

These requirements seem to recognize the reality that all licensed drivers should maintain good physical and mental health, which tends to decline with age. A person who potentially should not be driving due to diminished physical or mental health may be reported to the Department of Public Safety by a physician, a

family member, or even a stranger, if the person's driving capability is impaired.

Although not needed in many circumstances, the attorney should consider suggesting that her aging client or client with diminished capacity sign a "Family Driving Agreement," a type of advance directive for driving decisions. The driver agrees in writing to designate someone to advise him or her when it is time to "give up the keys." In order to avoid the potential for unnecessary conflict or embarrassment should a client's physical or mental health ever decline to the point where driving is no longer safe, a Family Driving Agreement may help facilitate this decision-making process for the client to drive with certain restrictions or discontinue driving altogether. For a sample Family Driving Agreement, see the attached Appendix B.

8. Medical and HIPAA Concerns

Execution of a Medical Power of Attorney is imperative to planning for a client's incapacity. An individual utilizes a medical power of attorney to designate who will make his medical treatment decisions in the event of his incapacity and inability to communicate with his doctors. A Medical Power of Attorney is only effective if the client is unable to make his own decisions and this fact is certified in writing by his attending physician (*see* Texas Health and Safety Code Section 166.152).

The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA") attempts to provide privacy of personal health information. From an estate planning and personal care-taking perspective, it is difficult for a client's family members to receive information from a doctor or hospital about a loved one's medical condition. One answer to this is a short HIPAA Power of Attorney that authorizes certain individuals (typically those also designated in a Medical Power of Attorney or a Statutory Durable Power of Attorney) to receive an individual's health care information if such agent requests it. The document would provide authorization by the individual to release medical information to certain individuals designated in the HIPAA Power of Attorney. The document would also be especially helpful to a family member assisting with medical insurance matters.

While it is often clear who the attorney is authorized to communicate with upon the client's incapacity or death (i.e., the client's designated agent, executor, and/or trustee), it is not always clear who the attorney can or should communicate with if the client's capacity is diminished or in question. As a best practice (similar to when a client requests the presence or involvement of others in a meeting), the attorney should consider obtaining a written Authorization to Communicate and Waiver of Confidentiality signed by the client, in order to give the attorney guidance concerning who the client wants the attorney to communicate with and provide documents to in the event of the client's incapacity. Again, see the attached Appendix A for an example.

9. Financial Exploitation and Trusted Contact Authorization

Chapter 280 of the Texas Finance Code addresses financial exploitation of vulnerable adults (i.e., persons 65 years or older and persons with disabilities) and imposes certain requirements on financial institutions to investigate and report suspected financial exploitation of vulnerable adults to the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. The financial institution is also permitted to notify a third party who is reasonably associated with the vulnerable adult (i.e., a trusted contact) about the suspected financial exploitation as long as the third party is not a suspected wrongdoer.

In addition, the Securities and Exchange Commission approved the adoption of FINRA Rule 2165 and amendments to FINRA Rule 4512 in February 2017 to address concerns of exploitation of senior investors. Brokers may now place temporary holds on disbursements when there is a reasonable belief an account holder is being exploited. Further, brokers are required to make efforts to secure the information of a "trusted contact" for senior account holders. By agreement, the account holder can permit the broker to contact the trusted contact if the broker has concerns about the account holder's "health or welfare due to potential diminished capacity, financial exploitation or abuse, endangerment, and/or neglect" (from actual form of National Financial Services LLC). The broker may reach out to the trusted contact if the broker "suspects that the account holder may be suffering from Alzheimer's disease, dementia, or other forms of diminished capacity" (*see* Question 4.1 of FAQ regarding FINRA Rules Relating to Financial Exploitation of Senior Investors).

The above authority (applicable to financial institutions and brokers) can be instructive to attorneys and their clients in the sense that it may be helpful in some cases for the client to name a trusted contact for the attorney and other advisors to notify in the event that the attorney or advisor suspects the client is being exploited or suffering from diminished capacity. The trusted contact could be designated by the client in a modified version of the Authorization to Communicate and Waiver of Confidentiality (*see* Appendix A).

E. Creation of a Guardianship

A guardianship can be an expensive and intrusive process. As part of the 1993 Texas legislation, there was a fundamental shift with respect to the philosophy on instituting a guardianship. Now, the central objective is to avoid placing a full guardianship over an

incapacitated person if a less intrusive guardianship can be employed. *See* Stanley M. Johanson, Johanson's Texas Estates Code Ann., Texas Estates Code § 1001.001 commentary (2017 ed.).

A court may appoint a guardian with either full or limited authority over an incapacitated person, as indicated by the incapacitated person's actual mental or physical limitations and only as necessary to promote and protect the well-being of the incapacitated person. Texas Estates Code § 1001.001.

Texas Estates Code § 1002.017 defines an "incapacitated person" for purposes of a guardianship proceeding to include an adult who, because of a physical or mental condition, is substantially unable to: (a) provide food, clothing, or shelter for himself or herself; (b) care for the person's own physical health; or (c) manage the person's own financial affairs. Additionally, under Texas Estates Code § 1001.003, a reference to any of the following means an incapacitated person:

(i) a person who is mentally, physically, or legally incompetent;
(ii) a person who is judicially declared incompetent;
(iii) an incompetent or an incompetent person;
(iv) a person of unsound mind; or
(v) a habitual drunkard.

Recent legislation in 2015 goes even further to expand the policy of avoiding a full guardianship if less intrusive options are available. One goal behind exploring alternatives to guardianships is to allow the proposed ward to receive help but maintain as much independence and freedom from court supervision as possible.

Before a guardianship proceeding is filed, the applicant must now certify to the court that alternatives to guardianship have been explored. The application must now state whether alternatives and supports and services were considered, and whether any such supports and services available to the proposed ward are feasible and would avoid the need for a guardianship. Texas Estates Code § 1101.001. In addition, in describing the alleged incapacity, the application should state whether the proposed ward's right to make personal decisions regarding a residence should be terminated. *Id*.

Before appointing a guardian, the court must find by clear and convincing evidence that alternatives and supports and services were considered but are not feasible. Texas Estates Code § 1101.101. A finding that the proposed ward lacks capacity to do some, but not all, necessary tasks requires the court to specifically state whether the proposed ward lacks the capacity, with or without supports and services, to make personal decisions regarding residence, voting, operating a motor vehicle, and marriage. *Id*. The order must include these findings and must state the specific rights and powers retained by the ward either with the need for supports and services, or without that need. *Id*.

Section 1002.0015 of the Texas Estates Code provides that alternatives to guardianship *include* the following:

(i) execution of a medical power of attorney;
(ii) appointment of an agent under a durable power of attorney;
(iii) execution of a declaration for mental health treatment;
(iv) appointment of a representative payee to manage public benefits;
(v) establishment of a joint bank account;
(vi) creation of a Chapter 1301 management trust;
(vii) creation of a special needs trust;
(viii) designation of a guardian before a need arises; and
(ix) establishment of alternate forms of decision-making based on person-centered planning.

Subtitle I of the Texas Estates Code (Chapters 1351 through 1356) also sets various special proceedings and alternatives to guardianship, which include:

- Sale of minor's interest in property without guardianship (Chapter 1351)
- Sale of ward's property without guardianship of the estate (Chapter 1351)
- Mortgage of minor's interest in residence homestead (Chapter 1352)
- Management and control of incapacitated spouse's property (Chapter 1353)
- Receivership for estates of certain incapacitated persons (Chapter 1354)
- Payment of certain claims without guardianship (Chapter 1355)

For more comprehensive discussion on the creation of a guardianship or options available to avoid a guardianship through other mechanisms, see Wes Bowers' article "Mind the Gap: Advanced Planning Techniques for Incapacity" presented to the State Bar of Texas 2016 Estate Planning & Probate Drafting Course and the *Guardianship of the Person and Estate Handbook: Protecting and Preserving What we Cherish* by the Harris County Probate Courts at https://probate.harriscountytx.gov/Documents/Newest%20Guardianship%20of%20the%20Person%20and%20Estate%20Handbook.pdf.

VII. CONCLUSION

As medical advances progress and as our population continues to age, developing a plan to deal with diminished capacity and incapacity will become ever-more important for estate planning attorneys and their clients. Awareness of the possibility of diminished capacity, along with understanding the vulnerabilities of elderly persons and those with diminished capacity, is a crucial first step for the attorney. However, the attorney must also know the available options and appropriate actions to take when dealing with a client's diminished capacity and incapacity.

Of course, there is no universal standard to follow since every client has unique circumstances, but an attorney would do well to know her client, understand the rules and exceptions, and recognize when to say "yes" to an engagement and when to say "no." Estate planning attorneys who appreciate the legal standards, ethical rules, and practical steps to take with respect to capacity and undue influence are able to offer diligent, competent, and valuable representation to their clients.

APPENDIX A

Authorization to Communicate and Waiver of Confidentiality*

I, ___________________________ [client], hereby authorize ___________________________ [attorney/law firm] (collectively referred to as "my attorney"), to take the following actions with respect to my estate planning matters:

(i) Communicate with and deliver copies of any of my estate planning documents to any or all of the persons designated in such documents as an agent or personal representative of mine and to any or all of the persons named below regarding my financial and medical affairs, personal objectives, and any other relevant issues to my estate planning matters.

(ii) My attorney may share any confidential information (that may have been gained in the course of representing me) with the persons designated in my estate planning documents as an agent or personal representative of mine and with the following named persons, and I understand and acknowledge that I hereby waive the attorney-client privilege regarding any such shared information and communications, to the extent that it is shared with such persons named or described in this Authorization.

Name 1: ____

Name 2: ____

Name 3: ____

This Authorization is intended to permit my attorney to deliver and discuss my estate planning documents with the persons named or described in this document to ensure that my estate plan is carried out. If I wish to revoke this Authorization at any time, I must notify my attorney in writing of such revocation; otherwise, my attorney will act in good faith under and in reliance on this Authorization.

Signed: _________________________________ Date: __________________________

*Provided by Rhonda H. Brink (Austin, Texas)

APPENDIX B

Family Driving Agreement

Dear Family:

As I continue through the aging process, I realize there may come a day when the advantages of my continuing to drive are outweighed by the safety risk I pose not only to myself, but also to other motorists.

I want to continue driving for as long as is safely possible, but when my driving is no longer safe, I will trust:

____

(name of trusted friend or relative)

when he/she tells me that I need to discontinue driving, or to continue driving with certain restrictions.

I will maintain my integrity by listening to and accepting this individual's driving-related recommendations, thereby ensuring not only my safety, but also the safety of the motoring public.

Signed: ________________________________ Date: __________________________

Witness: ________________________________ Date: __________________________

Keeping Us Safe
Providing practical, real-life solutions to older drivers and their families
www.keepingussafe.org
877-907-8841