

1920

# Deeds Delivered Conditionally to the Grantee

Ralph W. Aigler

*University of Michigan Law School*

Available at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles/1254>

Follow this and additional works at: <https://repository.law.umich.edu/articles>



Part of the [Evidence Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Aigler, Ralph W. "Deeds Delivered Conditionally to the Grantee." *Mich. L. Rev.* 18 (1920): 314-6.

This Response or Comment is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Scholarship at University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Articles by an authorized administrator of University of Michigan Law School Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact [mlaw.repository@umich.edu](mailto:mlaw.repository@umich.edu).

# MICHIGAN LAW REVIEW

PUBLISHED MONTHLY DURING THE ACADEMIC YEAR, EXCLUSIVE OF OCTOBER, BY THE  
LAW SCHOOL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE \$2.50 PER YEAR.

35 CENTS PER NUMBER

RALPH W. AIGLER, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HENRY M. BATES

EDSON R. SUNDERLAND

E. C. GODDARD

JOSEPH H. DRAKE

JOHN B. WAITE

STUDENTS, APPOINTED BY THE FACULTY

ALAN W. BOYD, of Indiana

BEN B. MATTHEWS, of Arkansas

MORSE D. CAMPBELL, of Michigan

FRANK C. PATTERSON, of Michigan

ROLLA L. CARPENTER, of Michigan

LISLE L. POLLOCK, of Michigan

ROBERT G. DAY, of Ohio

JESSE M. SEABRIGHT, of Ohio

HENRY I. EAGER, of Kentucky

HAROLD M. SHAPERO, of Michigan

LOUIS KAWIN, of Michigan

HAROLD R. SMITH, of Michigan

GEORGE H. KRETZSCHMAR, of Michigan

WINTER N. SNOW, of Maine

LEWIS H. MATTERN, of Ohio

ARVID B. TANNER, of Minnesota

LESTER E. WATERBURY, of Illinois

## NOTE AND COMMENT

DEEDS DELIVERED CONDITIONALLY TO THE GRANTEE.—Generally courts have shown a commendable disposition to get away from the formalism which in the past played such a large part in determination of questions of delivery. While the actual tradition of the instrument to the grantee or to someone on his behalf, on the one hand, or its retention in the hands of the maker, on the other, is still very important evidentially, such facts are not by any means controlling. Thus it is entirely possible for a deed to be delivered though it never has been out of the grantor's hands; likewise a deed may be undelivered though in the hands of the grantee by the voluntary act of the grantor. See the discussion by Professor Tiffany in 17 MICH. L. REV. 104, *et seq.*, citing many cases. This result has come from the growing appreciation by the courts that delivery after all is simply the manifestation of the grantor's intent that, as to him, the instrument is a completed legal act. This intent is normally shown by a handing over of the deed to the grantee or to someone for him, but there are other ways of showing such intent. A deed in the hands of the grantor *prima facie* has been delivered; if in the hands of the grantor, *prima facie*, it has not been delivered.

It is, however, remarkable that in certain types of cases there is adherence to the old, formalistic idea that the conclusions referred to above as *prima facie* are conclusive. This is especially striking in those cases where a deed is handed to the grantee to become final and operative only on the happening of an event or the performance of some condition. In *Whyddon's Case*, Cro. Eliz. 520, decided in 1596 by the Court of Common Pleas, and in *Williams v. Green*, Cro. Eliz. 884, by the same court in 1602, it was held that "the delivery of a deed cannot be averred to be to the party himself as an escrow." The contrary was held by the Queen's Bench in 1601 in *Hawksland v. Gatchel*, Cro. Eliz. 835. While it cannot be said that the English courts have repudiated *Whyddon's Case*, there are reasons for thinking that when the question comes up squarely for decision the doctrine of *Hawksland v. Gatchel* will be followed. See *Murray v. Earl of Stair*, 2 B. & C. 82; *Watkins v. Nash*, L. R. 20 Eq. 262; *London Freehold & Leasehold Property Co. v. Suffield*, (1897) 2 Ch. 608.

In this country the courts very generally have approved of *Whyddon's Case*, even the most recent decisions. *Weber v. Christen*, 121 Ill. 91; *Wilson v. Jenks*, 63 Ind. App. 615; *Wipfler v. Wipfler*, 153 Mich. 18; *Hamlin v. Hamlin*, 192 N. Y. 164; *Chaudoir v. Witt*, (Wis. 1919) 174 N. W. 925. The reasoning underlying these holdings, when any is disclosed by the opinion, is shown by the following from the opinion of Gray, J. in *Hamlin v. Hamlin*, *supra*: "If we should give full effect to the plaintiff's claim, it would be to hold the delivery by her of the deeds to have been conditioned and not absolute; but that would be violative of the settled rule in this state that a delivery cannot be made to the grantee conditionally. Any oral condition accompanying the delivery, in such case, would be repugnant to the terms of the deed and parol evidence to prove that there was such a condition attached to the delivery is inadmissible. The reason for the rule applies to every case where the delivery is intended to give effect to a deed without the further act of the grantor and such was this case \* \* \* These deeds had passed out of the plaintiff's possession and into that of the grantee, by the deliberate act of the former, and no oral condition, at the time, will be admitted to contradict the import of the written instruments." In short, the trouble is, as these courts view it, that the admission of parol evidence to show the condition is to violate the parol evidence rule.

In his celebrated work on Evidence Dean Wigmore has pointed out with characteristic clearness the true nature of the so-called Parol Evidence Rule. 4 WIGMORE ON EVIDENCE, § 2400, *et seq.* The matter here under consideration involves that part of the Rule dealing with the "enaction, or creation, of the act." Parol evidence is almost invariably admissible to show that no legal act has been consummated. *Ibid.* § 2408. In *Curry v. Colburn*, 99 Wis. 319, it was held that a grantor could show that his deed, which was complete on its face, had been handed to the grantee only for the purpose of taking it to an attorney for examination. See, too, *Sample v. Greathard*, 281 Ill. 79. Yet both these courts hold that a grantor will not be permitted to show by parol that a deed handed to the grantee was to become operative only on the

happening of an event. In *Wilson v. Powers*, 131 Mass. 539, in an action on a promissory note it was held permissible to show that the note had been handed to the payee to take effect only on the performance of a condition. Devens, J., said: "The manual delivery of an instrument may always be proved to have been on a condition which has not been fulfilled in order to avoid its effect." In truth it seems that with reference to instruments other than deeds of conveyance such facts may be proved. See *Pym v. Campbell*, 6 E. & B. 370; 4 WIGMORE ON EVIDENCE, § 2410. There seems to be here a striking instance of a survival of a formalistic doctrine (explained by the relation between delivery of deeds of conveyance and primitive modes of conveyance) regarding which English courts have shown a more enlightened view than have courts on this side. Indeed this is characteristic of the attitudes of the courts in the two countries regarding the law of Real Property, generally.

Reference should be made to *Lee v. Richmond*, 90 Iowa 696, where the rule of *Whyddon's Case* was not applied.

R. W. A.