

Stanford University

From the Selected Works of Robert R.M. Verchick

2004

Unique Property Annotated Bibliography

Nancy Levit

Robert R.M. Verchick, *Loyola University New Orleans*



Available at: https://works.bepress.com/robert_verchick/21/

C

Journal of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers
2003

Bibliography

***589** UNIQUE PROPERTY: AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Nancy Levit [FNa1]

Robert R.M. Verchick [FNaa1]

Copyright (c) 2004 American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers; Nancy Levit; Robert R.M. Verchick

This bibliography covers law review articles and supplemental A.L.R. entries published after 1997. We also include a handful of especially interesting pieces published in or before 1997, which we believe are just too good to pass up. A.L.R. entries, whose titles are usually self-explanatory, are cited, but not annotated. Similarly, articles that concern only a single case or a single state are cited, but not annotated.

Index

Art, Heirlooms, and Jewels	590
Businesses	590
Career Assets	590
Educational and Professional Degrees	595
Farm	597
Gifts	597
Income	599
Insurance Benefits	599
Intellectual Property	600

Lottery Winnings	601
Miscellaneous	602
Oil, Gas, and Mineral Interests	604
Pets and Animal Companions	605
Reproductive Material	609
Student Loans	617
Tort Damages, Workers' Compensation, and Disability Benefits	617
Trusts	619

***590** Art, Heirlooms, and Jewels (see also Gifts)

Babette Cohen, [Trash or Treasure: Valuing Personal Property--Art, Antiques, Jewelry, and Collectibles](#), 17 *Fam. Advoc.* 34 (Spring 1995) (suggesting methods to contact appraisers and ways to evaluate their credentials).

Vanessa Gamponia Ellermann, [An Attorney's Guide to the Valuation of Art and Antiques](#), 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 275 (1997) (delineating briefly ways to ascertain fair market value and how to find an appraiser).

Ralph E. Lerner, [Valuing Works of Art for Tax Purposes](#), 28 *Real Prop. Prob. & Trust J.* 593 (1993) (presenting federal valuation requirements which, if followed, should diminish the disputes that often arise with the Internal Revenue Service concerning art appraisals).

[Interest in Family Trust Is Marital Property; Interspousal Gifts May Not Be Marital](#), 19 *Matrim. Strategist* 8 (July 2001) (Colorado).

Paul J. Mastrangel, [The Family Jewels](#), 73 *Mich. B.J.* 552 (June 1994) (Michigan).

Businesses (see also Career Assets)

Terry O'Neill, [Reasonable Expectations in Families, Business, and Family Businesses: A Comment on Rollock](#), 73 *Ind. L.J.* 589 (1998) (briefly critiquing the “communitarian” and “contractualist” models for representing family businesses and advocating instead a family-specific “reasonable-expectations” approach).

Charlotte K. Goldberg, [Value and Volatility: The New Economy and Valuing Businesses at Di-](#)

orce, 35 Fam. L.Q. 451 (2001) (California).

Career Assets

Megan Berry, Comment, [Limited Classification of Human Capital as Marital Property](#), 11 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 881 (2001) *591 (analyzing three representative approaches to valuing human capital upon divorce from the perspectives of classical liberal theory and critical race feminism).

Neil Caulkins, [A Fiduciary's Duties When a Celebrity Persona Is the Asset](#), 24 Colum.-VLA J.L. & Arts 235 (2001) (presenting, principally in the context of estate matters, law on a celebrity persona as community property).

Laurence J. Cutler & Robin C. Bogan, [The Nature of the Beast from Horses to Hedge Funds: Celebrity Goodwill](#), 25 Fam. Advoc. 20 (Winter 2003) (briefly surveying case law on valuing celebrity goodwill).

Joyce Davis, [Enhanced Earning Capacity/Human Capital: The Reluctance to Call It Property](#), 17 Women's Rts. L. Rep. 109 (1996) (tracing courts' refusals to consider one spouse's investment in the other's career--human capital--as property and the theories under which some courts have permitted compensation at dissolution for the investing spouse, including reimbursement, equitable restitution, quasi-contract, support, maintenance, alimony, rehabilitative alimony, and maintenance that acknowledges future earning capacity; offering theoretical and practical reasons why enhanced earning capacity should be considered property).

Melissa B. Jacoby & Diane Leenheer Zimmerman, [Foreclosing on Fame: Exploring the Uncharted Boundaries of the Right of Publicity](#), 77 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1322 (2002) (proposing that property rights in personal publicity be attachable under debtor-creditor laws).

Michael W. Kalheim, [Expert Testimony and Valuing Goodwill at Divorce](#), 88 Ill. B.J. 652 (Nov. 2000) (distinguishing between personal and enterprise goodwill, reviewing cases regarding the qualification of valuation experts, and explaining the market, income, asset, and capitalization of excess earnings approaches to valuation of goodwill).

Alicia Brokars Kelly, [The Marital Partnership Pretense and Career Assets: The Ascendancy of Self Over the Marital Community](#), 81 B.U. L. Rev. 59 (2001) (criticizing current practice of shielding *592 career assets from division upon divorce, and ascribing this practice to an overly individualist theory of marriage).

Alicia Brokars Kelly, [Sharing a Piece of the Future Post-Divorce: Toward a More Equitable Distribution of Professional Goodwill](#), 51 Rutgers L. Rev. 569 (1999) (suggesting that courts have been mistakenly using the concept of saleable or business goodwill in the dissolution context, and instead should recognize that in the divorce context, personal goodwill represents one spouse's investment in the other's career, which should result in the award of "a percentage ownership interest in the future income stream of the business" that the goodwill has generated).

Shari Lutz, [Valuing Goodwill: Factors to Consider and Sources of Information](#), 27 Colo. Law. 45 (Dec. 1998) (surveying briefly factors considered in cases and IRS rulings regarding calculations of

the value of goodwill, such as customer base, customer relations, earning power, nature, duration, and financial condition of the business, and patterns and sources of referrals; and recommending a source of information about goodwill in medical and dental practices, The Goodwill Registry).

Raj Rajan, [The Characterization of the Celebrity's Career in Divorce](#), 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 251 (2000) (discussing the two general theories used to characterize a celebrity's career as marital property: the theory of celebrity status and the theory of celebrity goodwill).

Martin M. Shenkman, [When Should Professional Goodwill Be Valued?](#), 15 *Matrim. Strategist* 1 (Mar. 1997) (arguing that cases indicate that only if goodwill is transferable from the professional spouse as a distinct business asset should it be divided as part of the marital estate).

Brett R. Turner, [Classifying and Valuing the Goodwill of a Franchise Business in a Divorce Case](#), 11 *Divorce Litig.* 157 (Aug. 1999) (suggesting that while franchise business goodwill (if it is realizable) is divisible in most states, it poses particular classification and valuation issues; discussing the factors that typically influence valuation, such as control over operations, control over advertising, business location, and relative earnings).

*593 Peter M. Walzer & Edward Poll, [Goodwill Hunting: The Valuation of a Law Firm in a Divorce Proceeding Should Be Measured by Fair Market Value](#), 23 *L.A. Law.* 46 (Sep. 2000) (surveying case law on disposition of a lawyer's goodwill upon divorce).

Sebastian Weiss, Note, [Preventing Inequities in Divorce and Education: The Equitable Distribution of a Career Absent an Advanced Degree or License](#), 9 *Cardozo Women's L.J.* 133 (2002) (examining judicial and legislative solutions toward the equitable distribution of enhanced earning capacity).

Helga White, Comment, [Professional Goodwill: Is It a Settled Question or Is There "Value" in Discussing It?](#), 15 *J. Am. Acad. Matrim. Law.* 495 (1998) (reviewing case law on identifying and valuing professional goodwill).

Randall B. Wilhite, [The Effect of Goodwill in Determining the Value of a Business in a Divorce](#), 35 *Fam. L.Q.* 351 (2001) (exploring various definitions of goodwill (including a business's reputation, excess earnings, or liquidation value), sampling several states' (Arizona, California, Colorado, Illinois, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin) approaches to the consideration of business goodwill as marital property, and suggesting that one of the most important features of accurately assessing goodwill is selecting an appropriate capitalization rate).

Allen M. Parkman, [Human Capital as Property in Celebrity Divorces](#), 29 *Fam. L.Q.* 141 (1995) (evaluating celebrity status and enhanced earning capacity as marital property).

Jon D. Brooks, Note, [Personal Goodwill in Illinois: Duplication of Section 503\(D\) of the IMDMA](#), 21 *S. Ill. U. L.J.* 335 (1997) (Illinois).

Thomas B. Egan, [Professional and Enterprise Goodwill Can Be Valued](#), 16 *Fair Share* 7 (May 1996) (Illinois).

Martin J. McMahon, [Divorce and Separation: Goodwill in Accounting Practice as Property Sub-](#)

ject to Distribution on Dissolution of Marriage, 77 A.L.R. 4th 649 (1989, Supp. 2004).

***594** Martin J. McMahon, [Divorce and Separation: Goodwill in Law Practice as Property Subject to Distribution on Dissolution of Marriage](#), 79 A.L.R. 4th 171 (1990, Supp. 2004).

Martin J. McMahon, [Divorce and Separation: Goodwill in Medical or Dental Practice as Property Subject to Distribution on Dissolution of Marriage](#), 76 A.L.R. 4th 1025 (1989, Supp. 2004).

Martin J. McMahon, [Valuation of Goodwill in Accounting Practice for Purposes of Divorce Court's Property Distribution](#), 77 A.L.R. 4th 609 (1989, Supp. 2004).

Martin J. McMahon, [Valuation of Goodwill in Medical or Dental Practice for Purposes of Divorce Court's Property Distribution](#), 78 A.L.R. 4th 853 (1990, Supp. 2004).

S. David Rosenson, [Celebrity Goodwill--Is It Time?](#), 32 Beverly Hills B.A. J. 46 (Summer/Fall 1997) (California).

Robert C. Schlegel & Monty Woolsey, [Court Reverses Notion of Personal Goodwill as a Divisible Asset](#), 17 Matrim. Strategist 1 (Aug. 1999) (Indiana).

Scott Singley, Comment, [Professional Goodwill: How Mississippi Produces an "Inequitable" Distribution of Property Pursuant to Divorce by Excluding Professional Goodwill](#), 68 Miss. L.J. 1053 (1999) (Mississippi).

Catherine T. Smith, [Professional Goodwill: Two Community Property States Differ on its Characterization and Division](#), 11 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 246 (2000) (California and Texas).

[Sole Professional Practices--Goodwill](#), 15 Equitable Distribution J. 10 (Jan. 1998) (Indiana).

Andrew Z. Soshnick, [Valuing Business Goodwill in Marital Dissolution Actions: Boldly or Blindly Striving to Grab the Brass Ring from the Blue Sky?](#), 39 Res Gestae 16 (1995) (Indiana).

Todd Wight, [Determination of Goodwill in Dissolution Proceedings: A Hypothetical](#), 11 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 298 (2000)(California).

***595** Educational and Professional Degrees

Richard E. Kaye & David A. Slavin, ["Increased Earning Power" of a Professional Degree or License as an Asset to Be Equitably Distributed in Divorce Proceedings](#), 60 Am. Jur. Trials 391 (2003) (summarizing the case law and proposed solutions to the problem of valuing professional degrees upon divorce).

Susan Etta Keller, [The Rhetoric of Marriage, Achievement, and Power: An Analysis of Judicial Opinions Considering the Treatment of Professional Degrees as Marital Property](#), 21 Vt. L. Rev. 409 (1996)(offering a highly theoretical, but intriguing, deconstruction of the rhetorical devices in cases considering whether advanced degrees should be marital property).

Eric E. Lewis & Jeffrey W. Lippitt, [Valuing Intellectual Assets](#), 9 J. Legal Econ. 31

([Spring-Summer 1999](#)) (comparing methods of assessing the value of educational degrees, including comparing earnings streams with and without a degree, cost restitution of contributions toward the education itself, and costs to reproduce the degree or license).

Katherine Wells Meighan, [For Better or for Worse: A Corporate Finance Approach to Valuing Educational Degrees at Divorce](#), 5 *Geo. Mason L. Rev.* 193 (1997) (urging that the supporting spouse's contributions toward the other spouse's degree be viewed as a financial investment, analyzed not under matrimonial or tort principles, but under principles of corporate finance, with both debt and equity types of payments).

Raj Rajan, [Medical Degree in Divorce: New York Versus California](#), 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 240 (2000) (comparing the treatment of a spouse's medical degree on divorce in California and in New York).

Richard Raymond, [Valuing Intellectual Assets](#), 11 *J. Legal Econ.* 89 (Fall 2001) (criticizing the "reproduction cost approach" of valuing intellectual assets proposed by economists Eric Lewis and Jeffrey Lippett).

Whitney L. White, Note, [*596Diploma Dilemma: The Possibility of Double Recovery From Multiple Awards of the Licensed Spouse's Future Earning Capacity](#), 35 *U. Louisville J. Fam. L.* 393 (1996- 97) (focusing on the concern that the non-licensed spouse's contributions will be recompensed as double (or triple) recovery under the rubric of maintenance, a specific interest in the license, goodwill, and increased earning capacity).

Erik V. Wicks, Note, [Professional Degree Divorces: Of Equity Positions, Equitable Distributions, and Clean Breaks](#), 45 *Wayne L. Rev.* 1975 (2000) (urging reimbursement for investments in the other spouse's professional degree based on the parties' expectations, covering several different valuation methods, and recommending a valuation method based on the market interest rate for debts).

Katherine M. Willis, Comment, [The True Value of an Education: The Texas Approach to Characterizing and Valuing a Professional Degree upon the Dissolution of Marriage](#), 31 *Tex. Tech. L. Rev.* 1117 (2000) (comparing the Texas approach to valuing professional degrees upon divorce to the approaches of other states, including California's new statutory approach).

Caroline B. Blitzer, Note, [McConathy v. McConathy: A Diploma, a Divorce, and a Dilemma](#), 55 *La. L. Rev.* 973 (1995) (Louisiana).

[Medical Degree Earned During Marriage](#), 15 *Equitable Distribution J.* 79 (July 1998) (Connecticut).

W. Greg Merritt, Note, [The Diploma Dilemma: An Inequitable Result Under North Carolina's Equitable Distribution Statute--Kuder v. Schroeder](#), 17 *Campbell L. Rev.* 361 (1995) (North Carolina).

[Professional Degrees](#), 16 *Equitable Distribution J.* 94 (Aug. 1999) (Mississippi).

[Reimbursement for Contributions to Education](#), 15 *Equitable Distribution J.* 130 (Nov. 1998) (Kentucky).

David Swartz, *Advanced Degrees Do Not Constitute Marital Property Subject to Equitable Distribution upon Divorce--Becker v. Perkins-Becker*, 669 A.2d 524 (R.I. 1996), 30 *Suffolk U. L. Rev.* 589 (1997) (Rhode Island).

*597 *Value of Law Degree Is a Factor in Division of Assets*, 20 *Matrim. Strategist* 10 (June 2002) (Nebraska).

Michael G. Walsh, *Spouse's Professional Degree or License as Marital Property for Purposes of Alimony, Support, or Property Settlement*, 4 *A.L.R. 4th* 1294 (1981, Supp. 2000).

Farms

Steven C. Bahls, *Judicial Approaches to Resolving Dissension Among Owners of the Family Farm*, 73 *Neb. L. Rev.* 14 (1994) (proposing a judicial framework for resolving disputes involving family farms).

Roger A. McEowen, *Recent Developments in Estate Planning Impacting Farmers and Ranchers*, 5 *Drake J. Agric. L.* 57 (2000) (offering a general survey of legal issues involving estate planning in an agricultural context).

Susan A. Schnieder, *Who Owns the Family Farm? The Struggle to Determine the Property Rights of Farm Wives*, 14 *N. Ill. U. L. Rev.* 689 (1994) (considering the application of various states' property allocation systems to family farms).

Robert E. Wells, Jr., *Valuing Farms*, 25 *Fam. Advoc.* 26 (Winter 2003) (suggesting appropriate credentials for experts who value farms and sources for finding farm appraisers).

Roger A. McEowen, *Current Legal Issues Impacting Farm and Ranch Organizational Planning*, 28 *U. Tol. L. Rev.* 697 (1997).

Gifts

Brooke Ann Blecher, *Broken Engagements: Who Is Entitled to the Engagement Ring?*, 34 *Fam. L.Q.* 579 (2000) (reviewing case law on the disposition of engagement rings where the anticipated marriage does not occur).

David M. Cotter, *This Diamond Ring Doesn't Shine for Me Anymore: Who Is Entitled to Possession of Engagement Presents when No Marriage Occurs*, 8 *Divorce Litig.* 148 (2002) (exploring the conditional nature of engagement presents and rings).

*598 Melvin Aron Eisenberg, *The World of Contract and the World of Gift*, 85 *Calif. L. Rev.* 821 (1997) (defending the law's refusal to enforce gratuitous promises on the grounds that gifts based on love or friendship are different from contractual promises and that in such cases donative promises are morally obliged to release repenting promisors).

Barbara Frazier, *"But I Can't Marry You": Who Is Entitled to the Engagement Ring when the Conditional Performance Falls Short of the Altar?*, 17 *J. Am. Acad. Matrim. Law.* 419 (2001)

(reviewing case law on the disposition of engagement rings where the anticipated marriage does not occur).

Eric A. Posner, [Altruism, Status, and Trust in the Law of Gifts and Gratuitous Promises](#), 1997 *Wis. L. Rev.* 567 (defending the law's refusal to enforce gratuitous promises on the grounds that much gift-giving is less socially valuable than commercial exchanges and that regulating it would diminish the social value that it does have).

Brett R. Turner, [The Effect of Interspousal Transfers Upon Classification of Separate Property: A 2003 Update](#), 15 *Divorce Litig.* 61 (Apr. 2003) (surveying state laws on questions related to interspousal transfers).

Rebecca Tushnet, Note, [Rules of Engagement](#), 107 *Yale L.J.* 2583 (1998) (arguing that “premarital law” is unfair toward women by contrasting mandatory ring-return rules, which favor men, with the general refusal to grant women restitution based on their prenuptial expenditures; a possible legislative solution is examined).

Joanne Ross Wilder, [Fault or No-Fault: If the Engagement Is Broken, Who Gets the Ring?](#), 13 *Matrim. Strategist* 1 (May 2000) (reviewing case law on the disposition of engagement rings where the anticipated marriage does not occur).

David S. Dolowitz, [The Conundrum of Gifted, Inherited, and Premarital Property in Divorce](#), 11 *Utah B.J.* 16 (Apr. 1998) (Utah).

[Interest in Family Trust Is Marital Property; Interspousal Gifts May Not Be Marital](#), 19 *Matrim. Strategist* 8 (July 2001) (Colorado).

[*599 Interspousal Gifts](#), 16 *Equitable Distribution J.* 142 (Dec. 1999) (Mississippi).

[Interspousal Gifts and Enhancement of Value](#), 17 *Equitable Distribution J.* 33 (Mar. 2000) (Oklahoma).

[Interspousal Gifts--Revocable Living Trust](#), 16 *Equitable Distribution J.* 76 (July 1999) (Virginia).

[Interspousal Gifts--Revocable Living Trust](#), 16 *Equitable Distribution J.* 48 (Apr. 1999) (Colorado).

Income

William E. Mullin & Alyn Bedford, [What Is Invisible Income?](#), 26 *Fam. Advoc.* 12 (Fall 2003) (briefly describing examples of deliberately or inadvertently hidden income or assets of interest to divorce lawyers).

David N. Hofstein & Maris J. Weiner, [Show Me the Money](#), 26 *Fam. Advoc.* 17 (Fall 2003) (offering brief advice on how to uncover a spouse's hidden assets in a divorce dispute).

Insurance Benefits

Kelvin H. Dickinson, [Divorce and Life Insurance: Post Mortem Remedies for Breach of a Duty to Maintain a Policy for a Designated Beneficiary](#), 61 Mo. L. Rev. 533 (1996) (examining applicable legal and equitable remedies after the death of an insured who was subject to a life insurance mandate but failed to comply fully with its terms).

Domenico Zaino, Jr., [The Practical Effect of Extending Revocation by Divorce Statutes to Life Insurance](#), 2 Conn. Ins. L.J. 213 (1996) (examining with approval the provision of the revised Uniform Probate Code that extends the doctrine of revocation by divorce to life insurance policies).

Gregory A. Richards, Jr. & Philip S. Wartenberg, [Health Insurance and Other Health Related Expenses in Family Law: An Overview](#), 72 Fla. B.J. 65 (Apr. 1998) (Florida).

*600 Jay M. Zitter, [Divorce and Separation: Method of Valuation of Life Insurance Policies in Connection with Trial Court's Division of Property](#), 54 A.L.R. 4th 1203 (1987, Supp. 1999).

Intellectual Property

Ann Bartow, [Intellectual Property and Domestic Relations: Issues to Consider When There Is an Artist, Author, Inventor, or Celebrity in the Family](#), 35 Fam. L.Q. 383 (2001) (offering introductory material on the components of patents, copyrights, and trademarks, the basic elements of patent, copyright and trademark infringement and trademark dilution, the treatment of patents as personal property and copyrights as community property, and the valuation of both copyrights and patents).

Dane S. Ciolino, [Why Copyrights Are Not Community Property](#), 60 La. L. Rev. 127 (1999) (arguing that, according to federal statutory and constitutional law, copyright interests must be considered separate property under state community property laws).

Miranda Oshige McGowan, [Property's Portrait of a Lady](#), 85 Minn. L. Rev. 1037 (2001) (employing the contrasting property theories of Locke and Hegel, and the social observations of novelist Henry James, to examine a series of property issues, including the treatment of federal copyright interests as community property).

Lydia Nayo, [Revisiting Worth: The Copyright as Community Property Problem](#), 30 U.S.F. L. Rev. 153 (1995) (evaluating arguments by family law scholars and intellectual-property scholars concerning California rule that that allows federal copyright interests to be treated as community property).

Amanda Trefethen, [Review: Copyright as Community Property](#), 11 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 256 (1999) (supporting the California rule that allows federal copyright interests to be treated as community property).

Brett R. Turner, [Division of Intellectual Property Interests upon Divorce](#), 12 Divorce Litig. 17 (2000) (briefly surveying cases involving the disposition of intellectual property interests on divorce, with special attention paid to community-property jurisdictions).

*601 Brett R. Turner, [Intellectual Property Interests](#), 20 *Equitable Distribution J.* 1 (Jan. 2003) (briefly surveying cases involving the disposition of intellectual property interests on divorce).

Peter J. Wong, [Asserting the Spouse's Community Property Rights in Copyright](#), 31 *Idaho L. Rev.* 1087 (1995) (arguing that despite the federal copyright statute, copyright interests should be considered separate property under state community property laws).

Garth R. Backe, Note, [Community Property and the Copyright Act: Rodrigue's Recognition of a Community Interest in Economic Benefits](#), 61 *La. L. Rev.* 655 (2001).

Dane S. Ciolino, [How Copyrights Became Community Property \(Sort Of\): Through the Rodrigue v. Rodrigue Looking Glass](#), 47 *Loy. L. Rev.* 631 (2001).

Denise M. Lang, [Rodrigue v. Rodrigue: The Fifth Circuit Holds That Copyright and Community Property Law Can Peacefully Coexist](#), 76 *Tul. L. Rev.* 541 (2001).

Ishaq Kundawala, [Rodrigue v. Rodrigue: The Fifth Circuit Aligns with Worth --Accepting Copyright as Community Property](#), 3 *Tul. J. Tech. & Intell. Prop.* 165 (2001).

Joseph P. Reid, Comment, [Rodrigue v. Rodrigue: Another Copyright and Community Property Case Worth-y of Controversy](#), 75 *Notre Dame L. Rev.* 1183 (2000).

Frank J. Wozniak, [Copyright, Patent, or Other Intellectual Property as Marital Property for Purposes of Alimony, Support, or Divorce Settlement](#), 80 *A.L.R. 5th* 497 (2000).

Lottery Winnings

[Equitable Distribution of Lottery Winnings](#), 16 *Equitable Distribution J.* 133 (Dec. 1999) (examining the distribution of lottery winnings on divorce where lottery tickets are purchased before the marriage, during the marriage and before separation, or during the marriage and after separation).

Jennifer L. Reas, Note, [His, Hers, and Ours: Determining How Courts Will Characterize Lottery Winnings Won Prior to Marriage](#),*602 7 *Brandeis L.J.* 843 (1998-99) (examining how lottery winnings acquired before or during marriage are treated on divorce in community-property and common-law property jurisdictions).

Case Notes, 13 *Divorce Litig.* 117 (June 2001) (California).

Miscellaneous

John E. Barrett, Jr., [Putting a Price Tag on Perks](#), 23 *Fam. Advoc.* 27 (Winter 2001) (briefly examining interests in a spouse's benefits package on divorce).

Kimberle Bruckno Moore & Richard Pollard, [Present Solutions for Future Benefits in Divorce](#), 223 *N.J. Law.* 37 (Aug. 2003) (examining the disposition on divorce of future employment benefits such as non-vested stock option plans, restricted stock plans, and other incentives).

Jeremy A. Matz, Note, [We're All Winners: Game Theory, the Adjusted Winner Procedure, and Property Division at Divorce](#), 66 *Brooklyn L. Rev.* 1339 (2001) (reviewing a procedure, called Adjusted Winner, developed by Professors Steven J. Brams and Alan D. Taylor, which is intended to facilitate negotiations between divorcing spouses and result in an envy-free property distribution).

Donna A. Scheiter, Note, [Attorneys' Divorces: Are Their Pending Contingency Fee Cases Marital Assets or Not?](#), 37 *Brandeis L.J.* 829 (1999) (examining recent case law involving the disposition of a lawyer's pending contingency fee cases on divorce).

Sonja A. Soehnel, [Divorce Property Distribution: Treatment and Method of Valuation of Future Interest in Real Estate or Trust Property Not Realized During Marriage](#), 62 *A.L.R. 4th* 107 (1988, Supp. 2004) (reviewing state and federal divorce cases involving valuation of real estate or trust property in which one spouse has an unrealized future interest).

Sonja A. Soehnel, [Divorce: Propriety of Property Distribution Leaving Both Parties with Substantial Ownership Interest in Same Business](#), 56 *A.L.R. 4th* 862 (1987, Supp. 2004) (reviewing state *603 and federal divorce cases involving property distributions in which spouses are each left an interest in the same business).

Brett R. Turner, [Distinguishing Between Active and Passive Appreciation in Separate Property](#), 13 *Divorce Litig.* 73 (May 2001) (surveying the law on classification of appreciation for separate property).

Brett R. Turner, [Division of Frequent Flyer Benefits in Divorce Cases](#), 11 *Divorce Litig.* 148 (July 1999) (reviewing the developing case law on the treatment of frequent flyer benefits in divorce cases).

Brett R. Turner, [Property Division Triage: Identifying Unusual Types of Divisible Property](#), 12 *Divorce Litig.* 193 (Oct. 2001) (briefly surveying unusual types of divisible property, including security deposits, airplanes, stock options, vacation time, patents, and tax deductions).

Laura Weinrib, Note, [Reconstructing Family: Constructive Trust at Relational Dissolution](#), 37 *Harv. C.R.-C.L. L. Rev.* 207 (2002) (advocating a doctrine of constructive trust over one of contractual distribution for resolving property disputes on dissolution of intimate relationships).

Bradley L. Adams, Comment, [The Doctrine of Fraud on the Community](#), 49 *Baylor L. Rev.* 445 (1997) (Texas).

Bret Bartolotta, [Transmutation of Property and the California Family Code](#), 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 209 (2000) (California).

Howard S. Erlanger, [Wisconsin's New Deferred Marital Property Election](#), 72 *Wis. Law.* 14 (Apr. 1999) (Wisconsin).

Leslie Joan Harris, [A "Just and Proper Division": Property Distribution at Divorce in Oregon](#), 78 *Or. L. Rev.* 735 (1999) (Oregon).

Mary Charles McRae, Comment, [Contribution or Transmutation? The Conflicting Provisions of](#)

Sections 852 and 2640 of the California Family Code, 49 UCLA L. Rev. 1187 (2002) (California).

*604 David Melton, *Establishing Separate Property Through Asset Tracing After Burford*, 28 Colo. Law. 55 (Jan. 1999) (Colorado).

Kathleen M. O'Connor, *Marital Property Reform in Massachusetts: A Choice for the New Millennium*, 34 New Eng. L. Rev. 261 (1999) (Massachusetts).

Calvin G.C. Pang, *Slow-Baked, Flash-Fried, Not To Be Devoured: Development of the Partnership Model of Property Division in Hawai'i and Beyond*, 25 U. Haw. L. Rev. 1 (1998) (Hawaii).

John C. Peck, *Some Issues Concerning the Property of Married Persons in Kansas*, 68 J. Kan. B.A. 18 (Sep. 1999) (Kansas).

Sally Burnett Sharp, *Step by Step: The Distributive Consequences of Divorce in North Carolina*, 76 N.C. L. Rev. 2017 (1998) (North Carolina).

Value of Property--Burden of Persuasion, 17 Equitable Distribution J. 4 (Jan. 2000) (West Virginia).

Elizabeth Zarek Jorgenson, Comment, *Forcing the Heir to Share: The Effect of Cash Inheritance on Child Support Obligations*, 105 Dick. L. Rev. 289 (2001) (Pennsylvania).

Oil, Gas, and Mineral Interests

Community Property--Partition Subject to Lesion, 18 Equitable Distribution J. 31 (Mar. 2001) (Louisiana).

Jay E. Fishman & William J. Morrison, *Minority Discount in Family Business (Oil and Gas Company)*, 18 Fair\$hare 11 (Sep. 1998) (North Dakota).

Dorothy J. Glancy, *Breaking Up Can Be Hard to Do: Partitioning Jointly Owned Oil and Gas and Other Mineral Interests in Texas*, 33 Tulsa L.J. 705 (1998) (Texas).

L. Melaine Martin, Comment, *HECI v. Neel: Application of the Discovery Rule to Damages Arising Out of Oil and Gas Leases*, 33 St. Mary's L.J. 199 (2001).

Martin J. McMahon, *Oil and Gas Royalty as Real or Personal Property*, 56 A.L.R. 4th 539 (1987, Supp. 2004).

*605 J. Lindsey Short, Jr., *The Nature of the Beast: Oil and Gas*, 25 Fam. Advoc. 34 (Winter 2003) (Texas).

Pets and Companion Animals

Gerry Beyer, *Pet Animals: What Happens When Their Humans Die?*, 40 Santa Clara L. Rev. 617 (2000) (chronicling the evolution of enforcing after-death gifts for the benefit of pet animals and re-

commending steps owners can take to maximize the chances of enforcement).

Elaine T. Byszewski, Comment, [Valuing Companion Animals in Wrongful Death Cases: A Survey of Current Court and Legislative Action and a Suggestion for Valuing Pecuniary Loss of Companionship](#), 9 *Animal L.* 215 (2003) (recommending an “investment approach” to estimate the minimum pecuniary value, including companionship value, that human guardians place on their companion animals).

Susan Crowell, Comment, [Animal Cruelty as It Relates to Child Abuse: Shedding Light on a “Hidden” Problem](#), 20 *J. Juv. L.* 38 (1999) (discussing the relationship between animal cruelty and child abuse and arguing for more legal intervention in instances of animal abuse).

Geordie Duckler, [The Economic Value of Companion Animals: A Legal and Anthropological Argument for Special Valuation](#), 8 *Animal L.* 199 (2002) (arguing that monetary value should be assigned to pet animals according to their special relationship to their owners rather than according to their often lower conventional market value).

Lynn A. Epstein, [Resolving Confusion in Pet Owner Tort Cases: Recognizing Pets' Anthropomorphic Qualities Under a Property Classification](#), 26 *S. Ill. U. L.J.* 31 (2001) (advocating a uniform standard for valuing an owner's pet-loss claim, based on a “flexible value analysis” that would include an option of punitive damages).

David Favre, [Equitable Self-Ownership for Animals](#), 50 *Duke L.J.* 473 (2000) (arguing for a new understanding of pet ownership in which legal and equitable title of the animal are split between the human companion and the non-human pet, making the *606 human companion a “trustee,” who is then bound to act in the best interest of the pet).

Dianna J. Gentry, [Including Companion Animals in Protective Orders: Curtailing the Reach of Domestic Violence](#), 13 *Yale J. L. & Feminism* 97 (2001) (examining animal abuse within the context of domestic violence and suggesting a “best interest of the animal” test for resolving animal custody disputes).

Rebecca J. Huss, [Separation, Custody and Estate Planning Issues Relating to Companion Animals](#), 74 *U. Colo. L. Rev.* 181 (2003) (examining several property-related issues pertaining to companion animals, including custody and support disputes arising out of the owners' divorce).

Rebecca J. Huss, [Valuing Man's and Woman's Best Friend: The Moral and Legal Status of Companion Animals](#), 86 *Marq. L. Rev.* 47 (2002) (arguing for broader assessment of damages in claims involving a pet's injury or death based on the special relationship between the owner and the animal).

Lisa Kirk, Comment, [Recognizing Man's Best Friend: An Evaluation of Damages Awarded When a Companion Pet Is Wrongfully Killed](#), 25 *Whittier L. Rev.* 115 (2003) (examining damage awards for claims involving the wrongful death of a pet and advocating improvements that would more fully recognize the emotional relationship between a pet and its owner).

Charlotte A. Lacroix, [Another Weapon for Combating Family Violence: Prevention of Animal Abuse](#), 4 *Animal L.* 1 (1998) (arguing that acts of cruelty against family pets are a form of family vi-

olence and should be treated as such).

Beth Ann Madeline, Comment, [Cruelty to Animals: Recognizing Violence Against Nonhuman Victims](#), 23 U. Haw. L. Rev. 307 (2000) (arguing that violent cruelty to nonhuman animals constitutes “violent crime” and should be punished accordingly).

Eithne Mills & Keith Akers, [“Who Gets the Cats . . . You or Me?” Analyzing Contact and Residence Issues Regarding Pets Upon Divorce or Separation](#), 36 Fam. L.Q. 283 (2002) (describing and evaluating criteria used by courts in resolving custody disputes over pets).

*607 Laura W. Morgan, [Who Gets Fluffy? Division of Pets in Divorce Cases](#), 11 Divorce Litig. 113 (1999) (examining factors important to pet custody disputes, including title, past caretaking, and emotional attachment).

Barbara Newell, [Animal Custody Disputes: A Growing Crack in the ‘Legal Thinghood’ of Non-human Animals](#), 6 Animal L. 179 (2000) (examining case law, state legislation, local ordinances, and scientific support for considering a pet's interests when resolving custody disputes).

Elizabeth Paek, [Fido Seeks Full Membership in the Family: Dismantling the Property Classification of Companion Animals by Statute](#), 25 U. Haw. L. Rev. 481 (2003) (advocating stronger legal protections for pets, including a “best interests of the pet” standard in disputes over custody and visitation).

William C. Root, Note, [“Man's Best Friend”: Property or Family Member? An Examination of the Legal Classification of Companion Animals and Its Impact on Damages Recoverable for Their Wrongful Death or Injury](#), 47 Vill. L. Rev. 423 (2002) (examining the damages recoverable for the wrongful injury to or death of a companion animal and advocating an expansion of such damages).

Jared Squires, [The Link Between Animal Cruelty and Human Violence: Children Caught in the Middle](#), 8 Ky. Children's Rts. J 2 (Winter 2000) (reviewing the link between animal cruelty and violence against humans, the importance of this link to child advocates, and innovative therapies now used to address this issue).

Cass R. Sunstein, [The Rights of Animals](#), 70 U. Chi. L. Rev. 387 (2003) (examining the range of positions favoring animal rights and advocating a utilitarian view that emphasizes the issues of suffering and well-being).

Jennifer R. Taylor, [A “Pet” Project for State Legislatures: The Movement Toward Enforceable Pet Trusts in the Twenty-First Century](#), 13 Quinipiac Prob. L.J. 419 (1999) (examining the legal trend, now part of the Uniform Probate Code, toward validating testamentary trusts for the benefit of nonhuman animals).

Sonia S. Waisman & Barbara R. Newell, *608 [Recovery of Non-Economic Damages for Wrongful Killing or Injury of Companion Animals: A Judicial and Legislative Trend](#), 7 Animal L. 45 (2001) (advocating legislation to allow recovery for such non-economic injuries as emotional distress and loss of companionship in cases where animal companions have been wrongfully injured or killed).

Steven M. Wise, [Hardly a Revolution--The Eligibility of Nonhuman Animals for Dignity-Rights](#)

in a Liberal Democracy, 22 Vt. L. Rev. 793 (1998) (developing an argument based in history, philosophy, and American common law, for the recognition of “legal personhood” in qualified nonhuman animals).

Steven M. Wise, The Legal Thinghood of Non Human Animals, 23 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 471 (1996) (reviewing the legal history, beginning in ancient times, of regarding nonhuman animals as objects rather than beings with their own legal interests).

Steven M. Wise, Recovery of Common Law Damages for Emotional Distress, Loss of Society, and Loss of Companionship for the Wrongful Death of a Companion Animal, 4 Animal L. 33 (1998) (arguing that plaintiffs whose companion animals are wrongfully killed should at least be entitled to the same kind, though not necessarily the same magnitude, of common law damages-- including noneconomic damages--as are parents of young children wrongfully killed).

Andrew Boxberger, The Missing Link in the Evolution of Law: Michigan's Failure to Reflect Society's Value of Companion Animals, 5 Thomas M. Cooley J. Prac. & Clin. L. 139 (2002) (Michigan).

Christine Cava, Comment, Trusts: Monkeying Around with Our Pets' Futures: Why Oklahoma Should Adopt a Pet-Trust Statute, 55 Okla. L. Rev. 627 (2002) (Oklahoma).

Denee A. DiLuigi, Note, In the Line of Fire: Brown v. Muhlenberg Township and the Reality of Police Seizures of Companion Animals, 9 Animal L. 267 (2003) (Third Circuit).

Geordie L. Duckler & Dana M. Campbell, Nature of the Beast: Is Animal Law Nipping at Your Heels?, 61 Or. St. B. Bull. 15 (June 2001).

*609 Paula J. Frasso, Note, The Massachusetts Anti-Cruelty Statute: A Real Dog--A Proposal for a Re-Draft of the Current Law, 35 New Eng. L. Rev. 1003 (2001) (Massachusetts).

David L. Herman, California Law and Ferrets: Are They Truly “Wild Weasels” ?, 23 Environs 37 (Spring 2000) (California).

Corwin R. Kruse, Comment, Baby Steps: Minnesota Raises Certain Forms of Animal Cruelty to Felony Status, 28 Wm. Mitchell L. Rev. 1649 (2002) (Minnesota).

Robin Cheryl Miller, Damages for Killing or Injuring Dog, 61 A.L.R. 5th 635 (1998).

Mark J. Parmenter, Note, Does Iowa's Anti-Cruelty to Animals Statute Have Enough Bite?, 51 Drake L. Rev. 817 (2003) (Iowa).

Janice M. Pintar, Comment, Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress and the Fair Market Value Approach in Wisconsin: The Case for Extending Tort Protection to Companion Animals and Their Owners, 2002 Wis. L. Rev. 735 (Wisconsin).

Debra Squires-Lee, Note, In Defense of Floyd: Appropriately Valuing Companion Animals in Tort, 70 N.Y.U. L. Rev. 1059 (1995).

Fiona M. St. John-Parsons, [Four Legs Good, Two Legs Bad: The Issue of Standing in Animal Legal Defense Fund, Inc. v. Glickman and its Implications for the Animal Rights Movement](#), 65 *Brook. L. Rev.* 895 (1999).

Heather D. Winters, Comment, [Updating Ohio's Animal Cruelty Statute: How Human Interests Are Advanced](#), 29 *Capital U. L. Rev.* 857 (2002) (Ohio).

Jay M. Zitter, [Recovery of Damages for Emotional Distress Due to Treatment of Pets and Animals](#), 91 *A.L.R. 5th* 545 (2001).

Jay M. Zitter, [Measure, Elements, and Amount of Damages for Killing or Injuring Cat](#), 8 *A.L.R. 4th* 1287 (1981, Supp. 2004).

Reproductive Material

Thomas D. Arado, Comment, [*610Frozen Embryos and Divorce: Technological Marvel Meets the Human Condition](#), 21 *N. Ill. U.L. Rev.* 241 (2001) (surveying case law involving the disposition of frozen embryos and advocating adoption of the Model Assisted Reproductive Technologies Act).

James E. Bailey, [An Analytical Framework for Resolving the Issues Raised by the Interaction Between Reproductive Technology and the Law of Inheritance](#), 47 *DePaul L. Rev.* 743 (1998) (examining whether gametes, zygotes, pre-embryos, and embryos should be subject to bequest and, if so, how such bequests would be affected by filiation, pretermission, the rules of succession, and the Rule Against Perpetuities).

Janet J. Berry, [Life After Death: Preservation of the Immortal Seed](#), 72 *Tul. L. Rev.* 231 (1997) (examining legal, moral, and ethical issues surrounding post-mortem artificial insemination).

Barry Brown, [Reconciling Property Law with Advances in Reproductive Science](#), 6 *Stan. L. & Pol'y Rev.* 73 (1995) (advocating for a system of proprietary rights to resolve disputes over gametic and embryonic tissues).

Naomi Cahn, [Parenthood, Genes, and Gametes: The Family Law and Trusts and Estates Perspective](#), 32 *U. Memphis L. Rev.* 563 (2002) (arguing that disputes over preserved eggs, sperm, or pre-embryos be governed by pre-existing contract unless such contract would work a “substantial hardship” on one of the partners, with the understanding that having one's genetic children exist without a legal obligation to support them is not a “substantial hardship”).

Carl H. Coleman, [Procreative Liberty and Contemporaneous Choice: An Inalienable Rights Approach to Frozen Embryo Disputes](#), 84 *Minn. L. Rev.* 55 (1999) (criticizing the widespread view that a partner's interest in a frozen embryo may be waived by private contract, and instead advocating an “inalienable right to mutual consent” over decisions involving such embryos, which may not be waived by pre-existing contract).

Ruth Colker, [Pregnant Men Revisited or Sperm Is Cheap, Eggs Are Not](#), 47 *Hastings L.J.* 1063 (1996) (arguing that in resolving disputes over frozen embryos, courts should generally side with the woman where she desires to use the frozen embryo to further her reproductive capacity).

*611 Judith F. Daar, [Frozen Embryo Disputes: A Trilogy of Procreation-Avoidance Approaches](#), 29 *J.L. Med. & Ethics* 197 (2001) (surveying case law involving the disposition of frozen embryos).

Philippe Ducor, [The Legal Status of Human Materials](#), 44 *Drake L. Rev.* 195 (1996) (proposing legal categories for various “human materials,” including ova, sperm, fetal tissue, embryos, and fetuses).

Jeremy L. Fetty, Comment, [A “Fertile” Question: Are Contracts Regarding the Disposition of Frozen Preembryos Worth the Paper Upon Which They Are Written?](#), 2001 *L. Rev. Mich. St. U. Det. C.L.* 1001 (examining case law involving the disposition of frozen preembryos and considering statutory solutions to such disputes)

Judith D. Fischer, [Walling Claims In or Out: Misappropriation of Human Gametic Material and the Tort of Conversion](#), 8 *Tex. J. Women & L.* 143 (1999) (arguing that the tort of conversion should apply in cases involving the misappropriation of human eggs or embryos, but not in cases involving the misappropriation of human sperm).

Noel A. Fleming, Comment, [Navigating the Slippery Slope of Frozen Embryo Disputes: The Case for a Contractual Approach](#), 75 *Temp. L. Rev.* 345 (2002) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a contractual framework for resolving such issues).

Marsha Garrison, [Law Making for Baby Making: An Interpretive Approach to the Determination of Legal Parentage](#), 113 *Harv. L. Rev.* 835 (2000) (proposing an “interpretive,” norm-based model for analyzing legal issues arising from technological conception and using it to develop rules to govern the legal parentage of technologically conceived children).

Mark C. Haut, Note, [Divorce and the Disposition of Frozen Embryos](#), 28 *Hofstra L. Rev.* 493 (1999) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a contractual framework for resolving such issues in the future).

Donna Katz, [My Egg, Your Sperm, Whose Preembryo? A Proposal for Deciding Which Party Receives Custody of Frozen Preembryos](#), 5 *Va. J. Soc. Pol'y & L.* 623 (1998) (examining case law *612 on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a framework for resolving such issues based on “fertility status”).

Gail A. Katz, [Protecting Intent in Reproductive Technology](#), 11 *Harv. J.L. & Tech.* 683 (1998) (examining the standards of intent used in resolving disputes over preserved sperm or embryos and advocating a framework in which sperm and embryos hold an intermediate status between property and “actual life”).

Susan Kerr, [Post-Mortem Sperm Procurement: Is It Legal?](#) 3 *DePaul J. Health Care L.* 39 (1999) (examining legal questions surrounding the disposition of post-mortem sperm).

Kellie LaGatta, Comment, [The Frozen Embryo Debate Heats Up: A Call for Federal Regulation and Legislation](#), 4 *Fla. Coastal L.J.* 99 (2002) (examining state and federal law on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a new legislative solution).

Christina C. Lawrence, Note, [Procreative Liberty and the Preembryo Problem: Developing a](#)

[Medical and Legal Framework to Settle the Disposition of Frozen Preembryos](#), 52 Case W. Res. L. Rev. 721 (2002) (examining law on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a new legislative solution).

Kate W. Lyon, Note, [Babies on Ice: The Legal Status of Frozen Embryos Involved in Custody Disputes During Divorce](#), 21 Whittier L. Rev. 695 (2000) (examining law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Jill Madden Melchoir, Comment, [Cryogenically Preserved Embryos in Dispositional Disputes and the Supreme Court: Breaking Impossible Ties](#), 68 U. Cin. L. Rev. 921 (2000) (examining law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Tracey S. Pachman, [Disputes Over Preembryos and the “Right Not to Be a Parent,”](#) 12 Colum. J. Gender & L. 128 (2003) (examining law on the disposition of frozen embryos and concluding that a “right” against procreation would effectively discriminate against women).

Sara D. Petersen, Comment, [Dealing with Cryopreserved Embryos Upon Divorce: A Contractual Approach Aimed at Preserving Party Expectations](#), 50 UCLA L. Rev. 1065 (2003) *613 (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos and proposing a contractual framework for resolving such issues).

Paul C. Redman II & Lauren Fielder Redman, [Seeking a Better Solution for the Disposition of Frozen Embryos: Is Embryo Adoption the Answer?](#), 35 Tulsa L.J. 583 (2000) (examining ethical and legal issues raised by unneeded or abandoned embryos and proposing “embryo adoption” as a response).

John A. Robertson, [Precommitment Strategies for Disposition of Frozen Embryos](#), 50 Emory L.J. 989 (2001) (advocating the general enforcement of advance agreements that allocate rearing rights and duties in children born from frozen embryos).

Kermit Roosevelt III, [The Newest Property: Reproductive Technologies and the Concept of Parenthood](#), 39 Santa Clara L. Rev. 79 (1998) (proposing a new framework for parental rights based on property theory).

Marysol Rosado, Note, [Sign on the Dotted Line: Enforceability of Signed Agreements, Upon Divorce of the Married Couple, Concerning the Disposition of Their Frozen Embryos](#), 36 New Eng. L. Rev. 1041 (2002) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Jamie Rowsell, [Stayin' Alive: Postmortem Reproduction and Inheritance Rights](#), 41 Fam. Ct. Rev. 400 (2003) (analyzing the rapidly changing face of postmortem reproductive technology and supporting the right of posthumously conceived children to inherit from their deceased parent when certain criteria have been met).

Esther M. Schonfeld, [“To Be or Not to Be a Parent?”: The Search for a Solution to Custody Disputes Over Frozen Embryos](#), 15 Touro L. Rev. 305 (1998) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Mary Lyndon Shanley, [Collaboration and Commodification in Assisted Procreation: Reflections](#)

on an Open Market and Anonymous Donation in Human Sperm and Eggs, 36 *Law & Soc'y Rev.* 257 (2002) (addressing whether persons created with third-party gametes should be able to learn the identity of their biological parent(s) and whether the sale of human eggs or sperm should be regulated).

*614 Robyn Shapiro, *Who Owns Your Frozen Embryo?*, 25 *Hum. Rts.* 12 (Spring 1998) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Helene S. Shapo, *Frozen Pre-embryos and the Right to Change One's Mind*, 12 *Duke J. Comp. & Int'l L.* 75 (2002) (examining law on the disposition of frozen embryos in the United States, Israel, and the United Kingdom).

Helene S. Shapo, *Matters of Life and Death: Inheritance Consequences of Reproductive Technologies*, 25 *Hofstra L. Rev.* 1091 (1997) (analyzing the inheritance consequences to children born of reproductive technologies, especially when one of the participating individuals dies intestate).

Donna M. Sheinbach, Comment, *Examining Disputes Over Ownership Rights to Frozen Embryos: Will Prior Consent Documents Survive if Challenged by State Law and/or Constitutional Principles?*, 48 *Cath. U. L. Rev.* 989 (1999) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

William A. Sieck, Comment, In *Vitro Fertilization and the Right to Procreate: The Right to No*, 147 *U. Pa. L. Rev.* 435 (1998) (arguing that contract analysis is inappropriate for resolving disputes over frozen embryos and that either donor-parent should have a right to veto implantation).

Lee M. Silver & Susan Remis Silver, *Confused Heritage and the Absurdity of Genetic Ownership*, 11 *Harv. J.L. & Tech.* 593 (1998) (proposing a framework for resolving disputes involving new or unconventional reproductive techniques, based on whether the embryo is ex utero, in utero, or on whether a live child has already been born as a result of the technique).

Andrea Stevens, *The Legal Status and Disposition of Cryopreserved Embryos: A Legal and Moral Conundrum*, 13 *J. Suffolk Acad. L.* 181 (1999) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

David L. Theyssen, *Balancing Interests in Frozen Embryo Disputes: Is Adoption Really a Reasonable Alternative?*, 74 *Ind. L.J.* 711 (1999) (evaluating adoption as a relevant factor in the "reasonable alternatives" test used in recent disputes over frozen embryos).

*615 Gregory A. Triber, *Growing Pains: Disputes Surrounding Human Reproductive Interests Stretch the Boundaries of Traditional Legal Concepts*, 23 *Seton Hall Legis. J.* 103 (1998) (examining existing laws surrounding the ownership rights in reproductive material).

Brett R. Turner, *Recent Case Law on Division of Frozen Embryos in Divorce Proceedings*, 15 *Divorce Litig.* 53 (Mar. 2003) (briefly surveying American cases involving the disposition of frozen embryos upon divorce).

Ellen A. Waldman, *Disputing Over Embryos: Of Contracts and Consents*, 32 *Ariz. St. L.J.* 897 (2000) (criticizing disposition agreements used by many fertility clinics as lacking sufficient evidence of informed consent).

Karissa Hostrup Windsor, Note, [Disposition of Cryopreserved Embryos After Divorce](#), 88 *Iowa L. Rev.* 1001 (2003) (examining case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Diane K. Yang, Comment, [What's Mine Is Mine, But What's Yours Should Also Be Mine: An Analysis of State Statutes That Mandate the Implementation of Frozen Preembryos](#), 10 *J. L. & Pol'y* 587 (2002) (examining statutory and case law on the disposition of frozen embryos).

Andrea Fischer, [Solomon and In Virto Fertilization: Characterization and Division of Embryos in the Case of Divorce](#), 11 *J. Contemp. Legal Issues* 262 (2000) (California).

David H. Fiestal, Note, [A Solomonic Decision: What Will Be the Fate of Preembryos?](#), 6 *Cardozo Women's L.J.* 103 (1999) (*Kass v. Kass*) (New York).

Avery W. Gardiner, [Reproductive Health: Massachusetts Court Holds Contracts Forcing Parenthood Violate Public Policy](#), 28 *J.L. Med. & Ethics* 198 (2000) (*A.Z. v. B.Z.*, 431 Mass. 150 (2000)).

Tracy Haslett, [J.B. v. M.B.: The Enforcement of Disposition Contracts and the Competing Interests of the Right to Procreate and the Right Not to Procreate Where Donors of Genetic Material Dispute the Disposition of Unused Preembryos](#), 20 *Temp. Envtl. L. & Tech. J.* 195 (2002) (New Jersey).

*616 Fazila Issa, Note, [To Dispose or Not to Dispose: Questioning the Fate of Preembryos After a Divorce in J.B. v. M.B.](#), 39 *Hous. L. Rev.* 1549 (2003) (New Jersey).

Shana Kaplan, Note, [From A to Z: Analysis of Massachusetts' Approach to the Enforceability of Cryopreserved Pre-Embryo Dispositional Agreements](#), 81 *B.U. L. Rev.* 1093 (2001) (Massachusetts).

Lauren N. Makar, Note, [Fourteenth Amendment--Procreational Autonomy as a Fundamental Attribute of the Privacy Rights--Where the Right to Procreate and the Right Not to Procreate Are in Direct Conflict Over the Disposition of Frozen Embryos, Ordinarily, the Party Wishing to Avoid Procreation Should Prevail, J.B. v. M.B.](#), 12 *Seton Hall Const. L.J.* 681 (2002) (New Jersey).

Peter E. Malo, [Deciding Custody of Frozen Embryos: Many Eggs Are Frozen But Who Is Chosen?](#), 3 *DePaul J. Health Care L.* 307 (2000) (Illinois).

Jennifer L. Medenwald, Note, [A "Frozen Exception" for the Frozen Embryo: The Davis "Reasonable Alternatives Exception"](#), 76 *Ind. L.J.* 507 (2001) (Tennessee).

Robert J. Muller, [Davis v. Davis: The Applicability of Privacy and Property Rights to the Disposition of Frozen Preembryos in Intrafamilial Disputes](#), 24 *U. Tol. L. Rev.* 763 (1993) (Tennessee).

Milena D. O'Hara & Andrew W. Vorzimer, [In Re Marriage of Buzzanca: Charting a New Destiny](#), 26 *W. St. U.L. Rev.* 25 (1998-99) (California).

David A. Rameden, Note, [Frozen Semen as Property in Hecht v. Superior Court: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back](#), 62 *UMKC L. Rev.* 377 (1993) (California).

Renee H. Sekino, [Posthumous Conception: The Birth of a New Class, Woodward v. Commission-](#)

er of Social Security, 8 B.U. J. Sci. & Tech. L. 362 (2002) (Massachusetts).

Amanda J. Smith, *617J.B. v. M.B.: New Evidence That Contracts Need to Be Reevaluated as the Method of Choice for Resolving Frozen Embryo Disputes, 81 N.C. L. Rev. 878 (2003) (New Jersey).

Cindy L. Steeb, Note, A Child Conceived After His Father's Death? Posthumous Reproduction and Inheritance Rights, An Analysis of Ohio Statutes, 48 Clev. St. L. Rev. 137 (2000) (Ohio).

Kelly Summers, Note, Kass v. Kass: Blazing Legal Trails in the Field of Human Reproductive Technology, 48 Clev. St. L. Rev. 637 (2000) (New York).

Lynne M. Thomas, Abandoned Frozen Embryos and Texas Law of Abandoned Personal Property: Should There be a Connection?, 29 St. Mary's L.J. 255 (1997) (Texas).

Elizabeth A. Trainor, Right of Husband, Wife, or Other Party to Custody of Frozen Embryo, Pre-Embryo, or Pre-Zygote in Event of Divorce, Death, or Other Circumstances, 87 A.L.R. 5th 253 (2001).

Student Loans

Brett R. Turner, Division of Student Loans in Divorce Cases, 13 Divorce Litig. 52 (Mar. 2001) (discussing the classification and division of student loans on divorce).

Losses When Dividing Property, 18 Equitable Distribution J. 94 (Aug. 2001) (Washington).

Student Loans--Classification and Distribution, 15 Equitable Distribution J. 105 (Sep. 1998) (Colorado).

Tort Damages, Workers' Compensation, and Disability Benefits

Pamela E. George, Whose Injury? Whose Property? The Characterization of Personal Injury Settlements Upon Dissolution of Marriage in Community Property States, 32 Idaho L. Rev. 575 (1996) (reviewing the treatment of personal injury settlements on divorce in community property states).

*618 Kenneth Strauss, Characterization for Purposes of Divorce: Retirement Pension Benefits Vs. Disability Benefits, 11 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 234 (1999) (contrasting treatment of retirement benefits on divorce with treatment of disability benefits on divorce).

Annotation, Divorce and Separation: Workers' Compensation Benefits as Marital Property Subject to Distribution, 30 A.L.R. 5th 139 (1995 & Supp. 1999).

James T. Baldwin, Drake v. Drake: The Supreme Court of Pennsylvania Classifies Workers' Compensation Benefits as Marital Property Subject to Equitable Distribution Upon Divorce, 9 Widener J. Pub. L. 803 (2000) (Pennsylvania).

Linda A. Chapin, Are All Fringe Benefits Community Property?, 41 Orange County Law. 13 (Feb. 1999) (California).

[Disability Benefits--Classification, 16 Equitable Distribution J. 67 \(June 1999\) \(Kentucky, North Dakota, Washington\).](#)

[Lawrence A. Friedman, Preserving Disability Benefits When Settling Personal Injury, Divorce, and Worker Compensation Claims, 216 N.J. Law. 46 \(Aug. 2002\) \(New Jersey\).](#)

[Dale Joseph Gilsinger, Spouse's Cause of Action for Negligent Personal Injury, or Proceeds Therefrom, as Separate or Community Property, 80 A.L.R. 5th 533 \(2004\).](#)

[Kurtis A. Kemper, Divorce and Separation: Determination of Whether Proceeds from Personal Injury Settlement or Recovery Constitute Marital Property, 109 A.L.R. 5th 1 \(2004\).](#)

[Aloysius A. Leopold, "Loss of Earning Capacity" Benefits in the Community Property Jurisdiction--How Do You Figure?, 30 St. Mary's L.J. 367 \(1999\) \(Texas\).](#)

[Philip M. Mize, Comment, Family Law--Gragg v. Gragg: Tennessee Adopts the Analytical Standard that Classifies Private Disability Policies According to Parties' Intent, 32 U. Memphis L. Rev. 749 \(2002\) \(Tennessee\).](#)

[Ralph Ogden, Update on Colorado Appellate Decisions in Workers' Compensation Law, 29 Colo. Law. 97 \(Sep. 2000\) \(Colorado\).](#)

[*619 Private Insurance Disability Benefits--Classification and Distribution, 16 Equitable Distribution J. 31 \(Mar. 1999\) \(Washington\).](#)

[Kenneth Rigby, Matrimonial Regimes: Recent Developments, 59 La. L. Rev. 465 \(1999\) \(Louisiana\).](#)

Trusts

[Brett R. Turner, Division of Trusts in Divorce Cases, 15 Divorce Litig. 85 \(May 2003\) \(providing an introduction to trust terminology for matrimonial lawyers, and considering the differences between revocable and irrevocable trusts, as well as the treatment of income and remainder interests upon dissolution\).](#)

[David W. Kirch, Avoiding Appreciation in Trust Assets Being Treated as Marital Property, 27 Colo. Law. 57 \(Mar. 1998\) \(Colorado\).](#)

[Sonja A. Soehnel, Divorce Property Distribution: Real Estate or Trust Property in Which Interest Vested Before Marriage and Was Realized During Marriage, 60 A.L.R. 4th 217 \(1988, Supp. 2004\).](#)

[Sonja A. Soehnel, Divorce Property Distribution: Treatment and Method of Valuation of Future Interest in Real Estate or Trust Property Not Realized During Marriage, 62 A.L.R. 4th 107 \(1988, Supp. 2004\).](#)

[FN1]. Edward D. Ellison Professor of Law, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law.

[FNaa1]. Ruby M. Hulen Professor of Law, University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law.
18 J. Am. Acad. Matrim. Law. 589

END OF DOCUMENT