

# *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*



**Pamela Wax-Semus, CFE**  
**WS Enterprises**

107 N. Reino Road, #402  
Newbury Park, California 91320  
Telephone: 805-499-3035  
Email: [pamela@tracingqueen.net](mailto:pamela@tracingqueen.net)  
[www.tracingqueen.net](http://www.tracingqueen.net)

## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

Some may be aware that I have devoted over 20 years of my professional career in the area of tracing, including related issues of allocation and reimbursement matters. The allocation of community and separate property interests in a family residence and other real property holdings is a constantly evolving area of family law. The body of knowledge as presented begins in 1980 with the ruling in *Marriage of Moore* and since that time has been expanded and better defined under additional rulings by the courts on a frequent basis.

*In re Marriage of Moore* (1980) 28 Cal.3d 366: Premarital appreciation was not an issue because there was little to no premarital appreciation.

*In re Marriage of Marsden* (1982) 130 Cal.App.3d 426: There was significant premarital appreciation.

The above two cases comprise the Moore/Marsden Rule, although the actual formula is defined in the Marsden case. When the property is purchased shortly before the marriage, then the premarital appreciation will be very negligible or even zero.

The Moore/Marsden Rule is not a rebuttable presumption but a rule to be applied to compute the community's pro tanto interest in property where community funds were used to reduce the principal mortgage balance for one spouse's separate property. The Moore/Marsden Rule has been extended to cases involving commercial properties under *Marriage of Frick* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 997, 1007-1008.

### Refinance



A refinance is a frequent occurrence during marriage and often drastically alters the results when applying the Moore/Marsden Rule. Both the *Aufmuth* and *Moore* cases focused on the intent of the lender to determine the character of the loan and which spouse ultimately received credit for that obligation in the formula. In both cases the determination was straightforward. In *Moore*, the wife received credit for her premarital obligation as a contribution towards the purchase price. In *Aufmuth*, the loan was obtained during marriage and thus treated as a community property contribution. In the event of a refinance, the balance remaining on the original separate property loan will be repaid using the loan proceeds of the new loan. The new loan taken out during marriage is a community obligation, unless the spouse who owned the residence before marriage can show that the loan was obtained relying solely on that spouse's separate property. This is often difficult to accomplish, absent a very wealthy spouse or a premarital agreement.



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

Home equity loans are excluded in applying the Moore/Marsden Rule to the extent that the proceeds were not used to acquire or improve the property. (See *Marriage of Nelson* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1546, 44 Cal.Rptr.3d 52)

Another common scenario is encountered when one spouse has substantially better credit than the other. In those instances, lower interest rates may be available by obtaining financing in the name of only one spouse. Seeking the best economic result may lead to unanticipated consequences regarding the character of property acquired under those conditions. Several recent court cases have addressed this issue and provide guidance in those circumstances. *In Marriage of Brooks & Robinson* (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 176, 86 Cal.Rptr.3d 624, the parties agreed to title the residence and the related indebtedness in wife's name alone to take advantage of wife's better credit. The Court found that husband had not overcome the presumption of title under Evidence Code § 662 despite payments by husband toward the mortgage indebtedness and the property was ruled to be the separate property of wife.



*In Marriage of Starr* (Published 10/15/10), the Court ruled that the residence acquired during marriage in husband's name only was community property despite wife executing a quitclaim deed after acquisition. Husband asserted that the property was acquired with his separate property funds as a source of downpayment and the parties intended the property to remain husband's separate property thereafter. Wife countered that she relied upon the representation of both husband and the mortgage lender to secure the best mortgage rate by relying solely on husband's superior credit. The Court agreed with Wife's position and in this instance, declined to give effect to Wife's quitclaim. Then, property titled to one spouse, with the full knowledge and consent between the parties, is likely to be respected.



I am frequently asked to explain why the community property receives credit for the principal repayment of the original loan upon refinance simply because a new loan was secured, quite often for the exact same loan amount but with a lower interest rate. My answer is simple; it's the law! If the lender looks to the new spouse's community earnings during marriage as the source for repayment of the loan, then the resulting loan is a community contribution regardless of whether the loan is secured using only separate property. (See *In re Marriage of Grinius* (1985) 166 Cal.App.3d 1179, 212 Cal.Rptr. 803 [lender must rely solely on spouse's separate property for loan proceeds to be considered separate property]). Another reason to support the community characterization of the refinanced loan proceeds is to look



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

beyond what the lender's customary practice might be, but focus on what the lender has a legal right to do. If the lender may look to other community assets for satisfaction of debt rather than from the subject property only, the community is potentially liable for repayment. Then, the character of loans under those terms is community.

A further analysis of the loan proceeds may be necessary in applying *Marriage of Walrath* (1998) 14 Cal. 4th 907, 72 Cal. Rptr. 2d 856. The California Supreme Court ruled that a FC § 2640 claim can be traced to the proceeds of community property to which separate property was contributed. In other words, FC § 2640 creates a tracing right of reimbursement through more than one property acquisition transaction.



The California Supreme Court's ruling on the issues raised in *Walrath* have necessitated accountants to refine their tracing methods so as to include new procedures in the determination of separate property contributions to community property assets acquired during marriage. The reimbursement calculations will now have to track the metamorphoses of separate property contributions from one use to another. Questions arise as to the proper method of tracing when the "new" use does not involve the acquisition of property. *Walrath* requires the application of competent tracing techniques and a determination of the equity at the time the asset is refinanced to establish the percentage of separate property reimbursement interest being transferred to the new asset.



[Attachment A](#)



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

A Moore/Marsden calculation should be computed as of the date of refinance. The information needed to prepare the calculation is as follows (excluding improvements discussed more in detail separately):

◆ Date of Acquisition:

- ◆ Original Acquisition Price
- ◆ Down Payment
- ◆ Amount Financed

◆ Date of Marriage:

- ◆ Fair Market Value
- ◆ Original Loan Balance

◆ Date of Refinance:

◆ Fair Market Value *(Typically a real estate appraisal has been prepared in connection with the refinance. The owner-spouse has the burden to refute the appraised value. This is particularly relevant when the appraised value was solely to assure the lender that sufficient equity exists, as opposed to a true "fair market value" appraisal.)*

◆ Original Loan Repayment *(Comprised only of the principal loan obligation excluding interest and fees typically remitted to lender)*



[Attachment B](#)



When applying the Marsden formula, the community is to receive credit for repaying the remaining loan balance. (*In re Marriage of Branco* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 1621, 55 Cal.Rptr.2d 493.) Although the owner's separate property will obtain credit for all premarital appreciation and principal repayments through date of refinance, a recharacterization of the loan for purposes of the Marsden formula from separate to community has the potential for drastically changing the character of the appreciation that occurred during marriage, prior to the refinance.





## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

An example can best illustrate the mechanics of the Moore/Marsden Rule as follows, under the following hypothetical facts preceding the date of marriage:

The owner-spouse acquired a residence with a fair market value of \$500,000 with \$100,000 cash downpayment and the remaining \$400,000 secured by a first trust deed. Immediately prior to marriage, principal payments of \$10,000 were made, leaving an outstanding mortgage note balance of \$390,000. The parties then marry and together repay the note by another \$15,000. Assuming the residence appreciated by \$200,000 during marriage, a standard Marsden apportionment allocates 97% of the appreciation to the owner-spouse's separate property, as depicted below.

	<u>Owner Spouse</u>	<u>Community</u>	<u>Total</u>
<b>Allocated Costs:</b>			
Down Payment	\$100,000		\$100,000
Principal paid prior to Marriage	10,000		10,000
Principal paid during Marriage		\$15,000	15,000
Principal Balance @ Transmutation	<u>375,000</u>		<u>375,000</u>
<b>Total Allocated Costs</b>	<b>485,000</b>	<b>15,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>
<b>Allocation Percentage</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Appreciation:</b>			
Prior to Marriage	100,000		100,000
During Marriage @ Transmutation	<u>194,000</u>	<u>6,000</u>	<u>200,000</u>
<b>Total Allocated Appreciation</b>	<b>294,000</b>	<b>6,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>Total Cost plus Appreciation</b>	<b>779,000</b>	<b>21,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>
Less Loan Balance	<u>(375,000)</u>		<u>(375,000)</u>
<b>Net Allocated Equity @ Transmutation/(prior to Refinance)</b>	<b>\$404,000</b>	<b>\$21,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

Assume the same facts as above which resulted in a total repayment by the community of \$15,000 after marriage. Additionally assume the parties refinance the property at this juncture. Then, this new loan upon refinancing obtained during marriage is community property. The overall effect of such a refinance is that the owner-spouse receives 22% of the marital appreciation, not the 97% appreciation as computed above, before the refinance. The disparity is solely attributable to the refinance event.

	<u>Owner Spouse</u>	<u>Community</u>	<u>Total</u>
Allocated Costs:			
Down Payment	\$100,000		\$100,000
Principal paid prior to Marriage	10,000		10,000
Principal paid during Marriage		\$15,000	15,000
Principal Paid Off from Refinance		375,000	375,000
<b>Total Allocated Costs</b>	<b>110,000</b>	<b>390,000</b>	<b>500,000</b>
<b>Allocation Percentage</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>100%</b>
Appreciation:			
Prior to Marriage	100,000		100,000
During Marriage @ Refinance	44,000	156,000	200,000
<b>Total Allocated Appreciation</b>	<b>144,000</b>	<b>156,000</b>	<b>300,000</b>
<b>Total Cost plus Appreciation</b>	<b>254,000</b>	<b>546,000</b>	<b>800,000</b>
Less Loan Balance		(375,000)	(375,000)
<b>Net Allocated Equity @ Refinance</b>	<b>\$254,000</b>	<b>\$171,000</b>	<b>\$425,000</b>



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

### Timing is everything.



Proper timing may have avoided such an inadvertent result. Consider adding the new spouse to title prior to the refinance, rather than at time of, and in conjunction with the refinance process. Under these facts, a different set of rules may be applied where the separate property is preserved. [*In re Marriage of Neal* (1984) 153 Cal.App.3d 117, 200 Cal.Rptr. 341, disapproved on other grounds, *In re Marriage of Buol* (1985) 39 Cal.3d 751, 763, 218 Cal.Rptr. 31, 705 P.2d 354 and *In re Marriage of Fabian* (1986) 41 Cal.3d 440, 451, 224 Cal.Rptr. 333}, the community "acquires" its interest on the date that the new spouse's name is added to title. On that date, the loan is still deemed a separate property contribution and the owner-spouse's right of reimbursement pursuant to Family Code § 2640 is determined.] In the above example, adding the new spouse to title immediately before the refinance results in an allocation to owner-spouse's separate property of 97% of the post-marital appreciation. Thereafter, the community simply receives dollar-for-dollar credit in future appreciation.

Note that the above reimbursement under FC § 2640 describes reimbursement to one spouse for his or her separate property interest to community property. Prior to the revision in the law, the court stated that nothing in FC § 2640 gave one spouse a right of reimbursement for separate property contributions made to the other spouse's separate property (*Marriage of Cross*, 94 Cal. App. 4th 1143, 114 Cal. Rptr. 2d 839). The court had reasoned that if the Legislature had intended to give a spouse a right to reimbursement for separate property contributions made to the other's spouse's separate property, the Legislature could have included the appropriate language to achieve this intent. In amending FC § 2640, effective as of January 1, 2005, the legislature did just that. In section (c) of FC § 2640, the law now states that a party shall be reimbursed for the party's separate property contributions to the acquisition of property of the other spouse's separate property estate during the marriage, unless there has been a transmutation in writing or a written waiver of the right to reimbursement. The legislature determined that the amount reimbursed shall be without interest or adjustment for changes in monetary values and may not exceed the net value of the property at the time of the division. Presumably, this statute will not be applied retroactively to contributions made before its operative date. (See *In re Marriage of Fabian* (1986).





## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

After the equity in the residence is "apportioned" on the date of the refinance using the Marsden formula, the parties may undertake additional title transactions. The following are possible scenarios and the associated consequences:



(1) The parties re-title the residence into joint form: This transaction results in a straightforward application of Fam. Code § 2640. Absent a written agreement waiving reimbursement, the original owner-spouse receives reimbursement for his or her separate property contribution as determined by the Marsden formula on the date the new spouse's name is added to the title. The remaining equity, if any, is allocated equally.

(2) The non-owner spouse executes a quitclaim deed:



A quitclaim deed is often executed under these circumstances when the parties wish to maintain their respective interests in the residence in the same ratio as immediately before the refinance. As discussed earlier with *Brooks & Robinson* and *Starr* the case law is unclear, as two contradictory authorities exist under similar facts. *Marriage of Stoner* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 858, 195 Cal.Rptr. 351, held that the execution of a quitclaim deed prevents any further accumulations of community property in the property, even when the parties repay principal using community funds. In contrast, *Marriage of Branco* (1996) 47 Cal.App.4th 1621, 55 Cal.Rptr.2d 493, provides for future community interest to accumulate arising from community transactions such as principal repayment and refinance after the date of quitclaim.

All waiver of interests must be made in writing to be recognized. Intent alone, such as clear oral understanding between the parties, is insufficient to transmute the character of such proceeds (Ibid; Fam. Code §852.) Absent a writing wherein the non owner-spouse relinquishes his or her interest in the loan proceeds, the loan remains a community obligation and the associated proceeds are a community asset. (*In re Marriage of Witt* (1987) 197 Cal.App.3d 103, 242 Cal.Rptr. 646.)




## Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning



### Improvements

No reported appellate decision had considered whether the Moore/Marsden rule properly extends to community expenditures for improvements to one spouse's separate property prior to 2001.

The Third District Court of Appeal addressed this very issue. (*In re Marriage of Wolfe* (2001) 91 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 962.) After intensively tracking the evolution of the law in this area, the Wolfe court "discarded" the gift presumption for such improvements. As the court noted: "There is little logic in a rule that presumes an unconditional gift when one spouse uses community funds to improve the other spouse's property... As we explained, our courts do not indulge such a presumption when community funds are used to assist in the purchase or to reduce an encumbrance on a separate asset. The application of community funds results in what amounts to co-ownership of the asset. There is no reason to presume a gift when funds are applied to improve separate property."



Immediately following the *Wolfe* decision, the Second District Court of Appeal, Division Two addressed the issue of community-funded improvements to separate property. (*In re Marriage of Allen* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 497.) Agreeing with the ruling under *Wolfe*, the Court rejected the notion that "a wife's consent to the use of community funds to improve her husband's separate real property raises a presumption that the funds were a gift of the funds to the husband."

This area has not been codified and as a result, the pre-1984 cases are still viable authority. The recent cases, however, provide a more coherent result based in logic and equity.



Attachment C

### Date of Valuation



The proper date of valuation for Moore/Marsden calculation is date of trial.

*In re Marriage of Sherman* (2005) 133 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 795, 35 Cal.Rptr.3d 137, husband purchased residence in 1993 for \$1,226,600. He married Wife in 1995 and separated 2001. \$99,475 of community property was used to pay down the mortgage. In 1998, Husband refinanced the residence and withdrew \$495,403. He used \$329,191 of these proceeds to



## *Moore/Marsden Was Just The Beginning*

make improvements to the property. When the parties separated, Wife and Children moved out of this residence. The Fair Market Value of the residence was \$3,500,000 at date of separation (DOS) and \$3,950,000 at date of trial (DOT). The parties stipulated to a different community property equity, depending on the approach adopted by the court. The issue was whether the proper date of valuation of the community property interest in the residence was DOS or DOT. The trial court used DOS and Court of Appeal reversed.

HELD: The proper date of valuation for Moore/Marsden calculation is date of trial.

Fam. Code §2552 (a) provides: "For the purpose of division of the community estate upon dissolution of marriage or legal separation of the parties, except as provided in subdivision (b), ••the court shall value the assets and liabilities as near as practicable to the time of trial••." Subdivision (b) provides authority for an alternate valuation date, which Husband did not request.

"A date of separation valuation of property is appropriate "when the hard work and actions of one spouse ••alone•• and after separation, greatly increases the 'community' estate which then must be divided with the other spouse." 'On the other hand, when an asset increases in value from nonpersonal factors such as inflation or market fluctuations, generally it is fair that both parties share in that increased value.'"

This analysis applies to community property interest in a separate property residence. No facts were set forth suggesting that the \$450,000 increase in value was due to Husband's efforts. Husband did not provide a reason why a DOT valuation would be inequitable. The fact Husband made all of the mortgage payments after separation did not alter the analysis. He also received the exclusive benefit of continuing to live in the home.

The trial court should have valued the residence as close to DOT as practicable in determining the community's pro tanto interest.

Since the parties stipulated to the community property equity depending on the approach and date of valuation used, there was no need for the court to address the propriety of *Bono v. Clark* formula which gives the community a pro tanto interest in separate property improved with community funds, as opposed to reimbursement, as provided by Fam. Code §2640 (b).

After Marriage of Sherman, Bono will probably be either limited to probate and civil cases or simply ignored, the latter is preferable in the author's opinion.



**Statistical Facts in the Determination of Community vs. Separate Property Interest in  
Single Family Residence in Lucerne, California**

Acquisition of Property:

Date		
Purchase Price		
Down payment (net of costs)		
1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed		

NO INFORMATION WAS PROVIDED REGARDING  
THE ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE OR TERMS.

Marriage:

Date	January 11, 1992
Fair Market Value	
1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed	

There was no allocation made from the date of marriage through the date of transmutation appreciation. I believe the reason was the value probably did not change much since the date of transmutation was less than six months from the date of marriage.

Not Provided  
Not Provided

Transfer:

Date	June 1992		
Title	Gilbert Walrath and Gladys Walrath, Husband and Wife, as Joint Tenants		
Fair Market Value			228,000
1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed Balance		<u>82,000</u>	
Net Equity at the Date of Transfer ( <i>Gilbert's Separate Property Contribution</i> )			<u><u>146,000</u></u>

Principal Reduction:

Date	Between June 1992 and 1993		
Principal Payment ( <i>Gladys's Separate Property Contribution</i> )	20,000	Payment from Gladys Walrath	

Refinance:

Date	In 1993	FMV	\$240,000	
		Loan	<u>(60,000)</u>	
Fair Market Value				240,000
Amount of New 1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed				180,000
Original 1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed Paid-off		60,000		
Fees and costs		1,500		
Stipulated use of loan proceeds:				
Pay-off mortgage on a property in Nevada		62,000		
Acquire and improvement Utah property		40,500		
Joint Savings		16,000		

Trial:

Fair Market Value			175,000
Refinanced 1 <sup>st</sup> Trust Deed		<u>174,000</u>	
Net Equity at Date of Trial			<u><u>1,000</u></u>

**Analysis of Community vs. Separate Property Interest in  
Single Family Residence in Lucerne, California**

**TRIALCOURT CALCULATION:**

Description	Line	Column			
		[a] Gilbert Separate Interest	[b] Gladys Separate Interest	[c] Community Interest	[d] Total Interest
Allocated Costs:					
+ Net Equity at the Date of Transfer	1.	146,000	0		146,000
+ Principal payment paid prior to Refinance	2.	0	20,000	2,000	22,000
+ Principal Balance paid with Refinance	3.		0	60,000	60,000
Total Allocated to Costs of Acquisition (Add lines 1 thru 3)	4.	146,000	20,000	62,000	228,000
Separate Property Contributions by the Parties	5.	146,000	20,000		
Trial: Parties entitled to reimbursement per proportionate basis	6.	88%	12%		
Fair Market Value at Trial	7.			175,000	
Less: Community Property Encumbrance	8.			(174,000)	
Net Equity (Line 7 less line 8)	9.			1,000	
F.C. §2640 Reimbursement due the Parties (Line 9[c] x 6[a] and 6[b])	10.	880	120		

Gilbert's	\$146,000	88%
Gladys'	20,000	12%
Total	\$166,000	100%

**TRIAL COURT SUMMARY:**

	Line	Column				
		[a] Utilization of Lucerne Refinance	[b] Equity at Trial	[c] Gilbert F.C. §2640 Claim	[d] Gladys F.C. §2640 Claim	[e] Community Equity (if applicable)
Assets:						
Utah - acquire and improve	11.	40,500	74,500	0	0	74,500
Nevada - pay-off debt	12.	62,000	125,000	0	0	125,000
Deposit to Joint Account	13.	16,000	16,000	0	0	16,000
Lucerne - loan paydown	14.	60,000	1,000	880	120	0
No Record - Assumed for fees and costs	15.	1,500				
	16.	180,000	216,500			215,500
F. C. §2640 Reimbursement Originating for Lucerne Contributions				880	120	
Nevada-subject to an undisputed prior separate property contribution by Gilbert				63,000		(63,000)
F. C. §2640 Reimbursement due Gilbert & Gladys plus Balance of Community Equity				63,880	120	152,500
				Gilbert	Gladys	Total
Allocation of Net Equity						
F.C. §2640 Reimbursement due Parties				63,880	120	64,000
Balance of Community Property Equity				76,250	76,250	152,500
Total Allocation of Net Equity at Trial				140,130	76,370	216,500



**Analysis of Community vs. Separate Property Interest in  
Single Family Residence in Lucerne, California**

**SUPREME COURT CALCULATION:**

Description	Line	Column			
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]
		Gilbert Separate Interest	Gladys Separate Interest	Community Interest	Total Interest
Allocated Net Equity at Date of Refinance:					
+ Net Equity at the Date of Transfer	1.	146,000	0		146,000
+ Principal payment paid prior to Refinance	2.	0	20,000	2,000	22,000
+ Appreciation from date of transmutation to date of refinance	3.		0	12,000	12,000
<b>Total Allocated of Net Equity at Refinance</b> (Add lines 1 thru 3)	4.	<u>146,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>	<u>14,000</u>	<u>180,000</u>
Allocation Percentage (Divide line 4 Column [a] , [b] and [c] by Column [d])	5.	81%	11%	8%	100%
<hr/>					
Separate Property Contributions by the Parties	6.	<u>146,000</u>	<u>20,000</u>		<u>166,000</u>
Allocation Percentage (Divide line 6 Column [a] and [b] by Column [d])	7.	88%	12%		100%

**SUPREME COURT TRACING METHOD:**

Assets:	Line	Column				
		[a]	[b]	[c]	[d]	[e]
		Utilization of Lucerne Refinance	Equity at Trial	Gilbert F.C. §2640 Claim	Gladys F.C. §2640 Claim	Community Equity (if applicable)
Utah - acquire and improve (Multiply 8[a] x 5[a] = 8[c]; Multiply 8[a] x 5[b] = 8[d])	8.	40,500	74,500	32,805	4,455	37,240
Nevada - pay-off debt (Multiply 9[a] x 5[a] = 9[c]; Multiply 9[a] x 5[b] = 9[d])	9.	62,000	125,000	50,220	6,820	67,960
Deposit to Joint Account (Multiply 10[a] x 5[a] = 10[c]; Multiply 10[a] x 5[b] = 10[d])	10.	16,000	16,000	12,960	1,760	1,280
Lucerne - loan pay down (Multiply 11[b] x 7[a] = 11[c]; Multiply 11[a] x 7[b] = 11[d])	11.	60,000	1,000	880	120	0
No Record - Assumed for fees and costs	12.	1,500				
	13.	<u>180,000</u>	<u>216,500</u>			<u>106,480</u>

F. C. §2640 Reimbursement Originating for Lucerne Contributions

96,865	13,155
--------	--------

Nevada-subject to an undisputed prior separate property contribution by Gilbert

63,000	(63,000)
--------	----------

F. C. §2640 Reimbursement due Gilbert & Gladys plus Balance of Community Equity

159,865	13,155	43,480
---------	--------	--------

Nevade Equity	\$125,000
Gilbert F.C. 2640	(113,220)
Gladys F.C. 2640	(6,820)
<b>Equity after 2640</b>	<b>\$4,960</b>

	Gilbert	Gladys	Total
Allocation of Net Equity			
F.C. §2640 Reimbursement due Parties	159,865	13,155	173,020
Balance of Community Property Equity	21,740	21,740	43,480
<b>Total Allocation of Net Equity at Trial</b>	<b>181,605</b>	<b>34,895</b>	<b>216,500</b>



Pamela Wax-Semus, CFE

**DATA SHEET FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE  
SEPARATE/ COMMUNITY PROPERTY INTEREST**

	<i>Amount</i>	✓ <i>if Unknown</i>	✓ <i>if Not Applicable</i>											
1) Case Name: _____  Property Address: _____ _____ Case Number: _____														
2) Date residence was purchased <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Mo.</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Day</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Yr.</u></td> </tr> </table> (a) Original purchase price <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> (b) Original amount financed <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> Title: _____	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	\$		\$								
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>												
\$														
\$														
3) (a) Improvement prior to marriage - cost <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> (b) Amount improvements increased property value <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table>	\$		\$											
\$														
\$														
4) Date of marriage ( <b>DOM</b> ) <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Mo.</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Day</u></td> <td style="text-align: center;"><u>Yr.</u></td> </tr> </table> (a) Fair market value of property @ DOM <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> (b) 1 <sup>st</sup> trust deed loan balance @ DOM <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> (c) HELOC or 2 <sup>nd</sup> trust deed balance @ DOM <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> (d) HELOC or 2 <sup>nd</sup> T.D. used for acquisition or improvements <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">Yes or No</td> <td style="width: 100px;"></td> </tr> </table> Title: _____	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	\$		\$		\$		Yes or No				
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>												
\$														
\$														
\$														
Yes or No														

## DATA SHEET FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE SEPARATE/ COMMUNITY PROPERTY INTEREST

	<i>Amount</i>	✓ <i>if Unknown</i>	✓ <i>if Not Applicable</i>								
<p><b>5) Date title changed (DTC)<sup>1</sup></b> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Mo.</u></td><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Day</u></td><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Yr.</u></td></tr></table></p> <p>(a) 1<sup>st</sup> trust deed loan balance @ DTC <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(b) HELOC or 2<sup>nd</sup> trust deed balance @ DTC <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(c) Improvements during marriage prior to DTC -cost <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(d) Fair market value of property @ DTC</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">◇ without improvements ( no improvements) <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">◆ with improvements <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>Title: _____</p> <p>Reason for the title change: _____</p> <p>_____</p>	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>									
\$											
\$											
\$											
\$											
\$											
<sup>1</sup> Title changed to either joint form or as one parties' sole and separate.											
<p><b>6) Date of refinancing (DOR)</b> <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Mo.</u></td><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Day</u></td><td style="text-align: center;"><u>Yr.</u></td></tr></table></p> <p>(a) Amount of New Loan <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(b) Loan balance(s) paid off <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(c) Improvements during marriage prior to DOR - cost <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(d) Fair market value of property @ DOR <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(e) Net amount of refinance proceeds <table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="text-align: center;">\$</td></tr></table></p> <p>(f) Purpose of refinance: _____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Title: _____</p>	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$			<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>									
\$											
\$											
\$											
\$											
\$											

## DATA SHEET FOR THE DETERMINATION OF THE SEPARATE/ COMMUNITY PROPERTY INTEREST

	<i>Amount</i>	✓ if <i>Unknown</i>	✓ if Not <i>Applicable</i>																											
<p><b>7) Date of separation (DOS)</b></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Mo.</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Day</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Yr.</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>(a) 1<sup>st</sup> trust deed loan balance @ DOS</p> <p>(b) HELOC or 2<sup>nd</sup> trust deed balance @ DOS</p>	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>	\$		\$		<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>			<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>																		
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>																												
\$																														
\$																														
<p><b>8) Date of current valuation (DOV) <sup>2</sup></b></p> <table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Mo.</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Day</u></td> <td style="text-align: center; width: 30px;"><u>Yr.</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>(a) 1<sup>st</sup> trust deed loan balance @ DOV</p> <p>(b) HELOC or 2<sup>nd</sup> trust deed balance @ DOV</p> <p>(c) Improvements post separation - cost</p> <p>(d) Fair market value of property @ DOV</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◇ without improvements ( no improvements)</li> <li>◆ with improvements</li> </ul> <p>Title: _____</p> <p><sup>2</sup> DOV = Most current date available or date of trial.</p>	<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>	<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 60px; text-align: center;">\$</td> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>	\$		\$		\$		\$		\$		\$		<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>							<table border="1" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="width: 40px;"></td> </tr> </table>						
<u>Mo.</u>	<u>Day</u>	<u>Yr.</u>																												
\$																														
\$																														
\$																														
\$																														
\$																														
\$																														
<p><b>9) Comments:</b></p> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 10px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black; margin-bottom: 10px;"/> <hr style="border: 0; border-top: 1px solid black;"/>																														

# Real Property Improvement Flow Chart

