

August 15, 2011



## Trust & Estate Litigation

Case law relating to trusts and estates is constantly evolving. To keep you updated, this newsletter reports on new decisions of note. I hope you and your clients find it helpful.

Here's the latest from the Massachusetts courts:

In *McGeoghean v. McGeoghean*, Case No. 10-P-407, 2011 Mass. App. Unpub. LEXIS 936 (Aug. 3, 2011), a decision issued pursuant to Rule 1:28, the Appeals Court affirmed the superior court's judgment in all respects. The complicated facts of this case are not fully apparent from the decision, but the Court held that the superior court's findings of fact and conclusions of law were not clearly erroneous. Two issues in particular bear noting.

First, the Appeals Court affirmed the superior court's finding that the plaintiff John McGeoghean was entitled to *quantum meruit* damages in compensation for his actions in reliance on the oral promise of his mother, the decedent, to give him certain property and her interest in a business. The superior court did not specify whether the oral promise was one to make an *inter vivos* gift or a bequest in her will. Consequently, the Court held that the superior court, in awarding *quantum meruit* damages, had not impermissibly remade the dispositions in the will. Although a promise to include a bequest in a will is not enforceable under the Statute of Frauds, *quantum meruit* is an available remedy under these circumstances, and the superior court properly found that the plaintiff had rendered valuable services in reliance on his mother's oral promise.

Second, the defendant argued that the plaintiff is judicially estopped from arguing promissory estoppel (i.e., reliance on the mother's oral promise) because of a "Vaughan" affidavit filed by the mother in the plaintiff's divorce action. In that affidavit, the mother had not mentioned a bequest of the property and her interest in the business to the plaintiff. Because the superior court had not found that the mother's oral promise was one to make a bequest, however, judicial estoppel was not implicated. Moreover, even if the superior court had found that the oral promise was one to make a bequest, the Court held that the superior court would have been within its discretion in not applying judicial estoppel.

If you have a T&E litigation question or issue you'd like to discuss, I'd like to hear from you. Please e-mail or call me. Also, please feel free to forward this to others who might be interested.

**Mark E. Swirbalus**

Attorney at Law  
Probate Controversies

**Day Pitney LLP**

One International Place  
Boston MA 02110  
t (617) 345 4753  
f (617) 206 9359  
c (617) 763 9912

[meswirbalus@daypitney.com](mailto:meswirbalus@daypitney.com)

[www.daypitney.com](http://www.daypitney.com)

Mark is a partner in the Boston office of Day Pitney LLP and a trial lawyer in the firm's Probate Controversies practice group. To learn more about Mark and his practice, [click here](#).

---

This communication is provided for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed as legal advice. This communication may be deemed advertising under applicable state laws. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

If you have any questions regarding this communication, please contact Day Pitney LLP at One International Place, Boston, MA 02110, (617) 345 4600.