JOURNAL ARTICLE

Disclosure to discretionary beneficiaries—the latest on Schmidt: Do beneficiaries have absolute rights to trust accounts? What about company documents? Schmidt V Rosewood [2004] 1 NZLR 841 Get access >

Trusts & Trustees, Volume 14, Issue 2, March 2008, Pages 128–132,

https://doi.org/10.1093/tandt/ttn003

Published: 01 March 2008

Extract

Introduction

The last reported decision applying Schmidt v Rosewood is that of the Auckland High Court in Foreman v Kingston. The recent decision of the Bermudian Supreme Court in Wingate v Butterfield (as yet unreported) is the latest to apply Schmidt principles, and the first Bermudian decision since Schmidt. Disclosure was sought by a discretionary beneficiary, against a background of alleged breaches of trust. Bell J followed Schmidt v Rosewood and considered the Plaintiff's application to be a matter for the court's inherent jurisdiction to supervise the administration of a trust and where appropriate intervene. The Defendant, Butterfield Trust (Bermuda) Ltd ('Butterfield') argued that disclosure would be a sterile exercise as the beneficiary's breach of trust claims were time barred. Bell J did not rule on this defence, as breach of trust claims were outside the scope of the application. Bell J considered that even if there were good limitation defences, the supervisory discretion to order disclosure would still be available. Butterfield argued that the Schmidt discretion did not extend to trust documents relating to the management of a trust and the transactional business of that trust. Bell J rejected any such limitation as being without authority and inconsistent with the policy reasons for the court's inherent supervisory jurisdiction. In exercising its discretion to order wide disclosure, the court took account of the nature of the beneficiary's economic interest under the trust. It considered that his complaints about Butterfield's stewardship of the trust were reasonable, and his questions were ones which Butterfield should be required to answer. The beneficiary also sought an account, relying on the oft cited passage from Millett LJ in Armitage v Nurse that suggests beneficiaries have unqualified rights to trust accounts. Bell J interpreted this narrowly, as a right to production of accounts that have already been prepared by the trustee. Accounts had not been prepared

in this case. This was one of the Plaintiff's breach of trust complaints. Bell J approached an account as a matter of discretion, instead of an unqualified right, and suggested that it should only be ordered where it was necessary in the context of the court's inherent jurisdiction to supervise the administration of a trust. It approached an account in the same way as disclosure of information and documentation. It declined to exercise the discretion because it considered an account would add nothing to the order for information and documentation, and would result in significant further expense.

Issue Section: Case Notes

You do not currently have access to this article.

Sign in



• Get help with access

Personal account

- Sign in with email/username & password
- Get email alerts
- Save searches
- Purchase content
- Activate your purchase/trial code
- Add your ORCID iD



Register

Institutional access



Sign in through your institution

Sign in through your institution

Sign in with a library card

Sign in with username/password

Recommend to your librarian

Institutional account management

Sign in as administrator

Purchase

Short-term Access

To purchase short-term access, please sign in to your personal account above.

Don't already have a personal account? Register

Disclosure to discretionary beneficiaries—the latest on Schmidt: Do beneficiaries have absolute rights to trust accounts? What about company documents? *Schmidt V Rosewood* [2004] 1 NZLR 841 - 24 Hours access

EUR €51.00 GBP £44.00 USD \$55.00

Rental



This article is also available for rental through DeepDyve.