

---

**Property:  
Our Social Institution**

Peter M. Gerhart

---

© Peter M. Gerhart, 2012



# Summary of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Ownership: Socially Recognized Authority Over Resources</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Public or Private Ownership . . . . .	3
1.2	Ownership and Coordination . . . . .	24
1.3	Private Ownership and the Market . . . . .	56
<b>2</b>	<b>Assigning Ownership</b>	<b>93</b>
2.1	Recognition . . . . .	94
2.2	Capture . . . . .	99
2.3	Find . . . . .	118
2.4	Adverse Possession . . . . .	131
2.5	Shifting Natural Boundaries . . . . .	150
2.6	Conflicting Gifts . . . . .	156
<b>3</b>	<b>Ownership: Right to Exclude</b>	<b>161</b>
3.1	Trespass . . . . .	162
3.2	Exclusion Limits . . . . .	173
3.3	Remedies for Trespass . . . . .	219
3.4	Licenses and Affirmative Easements . . . . .	235
<b>4</b>	<b>Ownership: Rights to Transfer, Divide, and Burden</b>	<b>271</b>
4.1	The Feudal System: “Owners” as Tenants . . . . .	273
4.2	The Evolution of the Right to Transfer . . . . .	275
4.3	The Evolution of the Right to Divide . . . . .	277
4.4	The Evolution of the Right to Burden . . . . .	279
4.5	Justifying the Development of Ownership Rights . . . . .	282
4.6	Body Parts and the Right to Transfer, Divide, and Burden . . . . .	284
<b>5</b>	<b>Spatial Coordination of Ownership</b>	<b>321</b>
5.1	Nuisance: Common Law Spatial Coordination . . . . .	322
5.2	Zoning: Legislative Spatial Coordination . . . . .	365
5.3	Servitudes: Private Arrangement for Spatial Coordination . . . . .	375
5.4	Private Governance Regimes: Modern Spatial Coordination . . . . .	397
<b>6</b>	<b>Temporal Coordination of Ownership</b>	<b>405</b>
6.1	Restricting Present Control . . . . .	408
6.2	Restrictions on Marketing . . . . .	412
6.3	Restrictions on Temporal Division . . . . .	421

6.4	Restrictions on Running of Covenants . . . . .	457
6.5	Restrictions on Current Uses . . . . .	470
<b>7</b>	<b>Shared Ownership Coordination</b>	<b>489</b>
7.1	Entity Property . . . . .	491
7.2	Co-ownership Outside of Entities . . . . .	493
7.3	Marital Property . . . . .	507
7.4	Landlord-Tenant Decision Making . . . . .	516
<b>8</b>	<b>Regulation of Property Transfers</b>	<b>555</b>
8.1	Methods of Conveyance . . . . .	556
8.2	Formal Requirements . . . . .	556
8.3	Real and Personal Property Warranties . . . . .	556
8.4	Risk of Loss . . . . .	561
8.5	Fixtures . . . . .	561
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Governance of Private Property</b>	<b>571</b>
9.1	The Limits of Private Law as a Governance Mechanism . . .	571
9.2	Building and Fire Codes . . . . .	571
9.3	Zoning: From Spatial Coordination to Development Policy . .	571
9.4	Environmental Protection . . . . .	571
<b>10</b>	<b>Limits on Public Governance</b>	<b>573</b>
10.1	Eminent Domain . . . . .	574
10.2	Limitation on Government Regulation of Use . . . . .	604
10.3	Constitutional Conditions . . . . .	665

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Ownership: Socially Recognized Authority Over Resources</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Public or Private Ownership . . . . .	3
	<i>Hinman v. Pacific Air Transport</i> . . . . .	3
	<i>Illinois Cent. R. Co. v. State of Illinois</i> . . . . .	5
	<i>Johnson v. M'Intosh</i> . . . . .	12
	A Note on Shared Ownership . . . . .	17
	<i>U.S. v. One Lucite Ball Containing Lunar Material</i> . . . . .	18
1.2	Ownership and Coordination . . . . .	24
1.2.1	Common Property . . . . .	24
	THE TRAGEDY OF THE COMMONS, <i>Garrett Hardin</i> . . . . .	25
	TOWARD A THEORY OF PROPERTY RIGHTS, <i>Harold Demsetz</i> . . . . .	28
	A Note on Private Governance . . . . .	36
	... POLYCENTRIC GOVERNANCE..., <i>Elinor Ostrom</i> . . . . .	36
1.2.2	Private Property . . . . .	42
	THE TRAGEDY OF THE ANTICOMMONS, <i>Michael A. Heller</i> . . . . .	43
	A Note on the Coordination Problem . . . . .	48
	A Note on the Holdout Problem . . . . .	48
	... SECRET PURCHASES ..., <i>Daniel B. Kelly</i> . . . . .	49
	A Note on Disclosure Requirements. . . . .	54
1.3	Private Ownership and the Market . . . . .	56
1.3.1	Shaping the Market System . . . . .	56
	<i>Hamlyn v. Moore</i> . . . . .	56
	<i>Keeble v. Hickeringill</i> . . . . .	58
	<i>International News Service v. Associated Press</i> . . . . .	60
	A Note On The Burdens and Benefits of Ownership . . . . .	72
1.3.2	Intellectual Property . . . . .	73
	Unfair Means of Competition . . . . .	73
	Misappropriation of Ends . . . . .	74
	<i>Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.</i> . . . . .	76
	The Right of Publicity . . . . .	86
	<i>White v. Samsung Electronics America, Inc.</i> . . . . .	86
<b>2</b>	<b>Assigning Ownership</b>	<b>93</b>
2.1	Recognition . . . . .	94
	<i>Johnson v. M'Intosh</i> . . . . .	94
2.2	Capture . . . . .	99
	<i>Pierson v. Post</i> . . . . .	99

	<i>Tyler v. Wilkinson</i> . . . . .	103
	<i>Ghen v. Rich</i> . . . . .	108
	<i>Popov v. Hayashi</i> . . . . .	112
2.3	Find . . . . .	118
	<i>Hannah v. Peel</i> . . . . .	118
	<i>Willcox v. Stroup</i> . . . . .	125
2.4	Adverse Possession . . . . .	131
	2.4.1 Color of Title . . . . .	132
	<i>Ewing v. Burnet</i> . . . . .	132
	2.4.2 Boundary Disputes and Survey Mistakes . . . . .	136
	<i>Evanich v. Bridge</i> . . . . .	136
	<i>Howard v. Kunto</i> . . . . .	139
	2.4.3 Squatters . . . . .	143
	<i>Nome 2000 v. Fagerstrom</i> . . . . .	143
2.5	Shifting Natural Boundaries . . . . .	150
	<i>Stop the Beach Renourishment, Inc. v. Florida Department of Environmental Protection</i> . . . . .	150
2.6	Conflicting Gifts . . . . .	156
	<i>Gruen v. Gruen</i> . . . . .	156
<b>3</b>	<b>Ownership: Right to Exclude</b> . . . . .	<b>161</b>
3.1	Trespass . . . . .	162
	<i>Jacque v. Steenberg Homes, Inc.</i> . . . . .	162
	<i>State v. Shack</i> . . . . .	166
3.2	Exclusion Limits . . . . .	173
	3.2.1 Necessity . . . . .	173
	<i>Ploof v. Putnam</i> . . . . .	173
	<i>Vincent v. Lake Erie Transp. Co.</i> . . . . .	175
	The No-Duty Principle . . . . .	180
	3.2.2 Buying Property . . . . .	185
	<i>Rase v. Castle Mountain Ranch, Inc.</i> . . . . .	185
	<i>State ex rel. Thornton v. Hay</i> . . . . .	192
	<i>McConico v. Singleton</i> . . . . .	200
	3.2.3 Owner's Use of Property . . . . .	201
	<i>State ex. rel. Postal Telegraph Cable Co. v. Delaware &amp; A. Telegraph &amp; Telephone Co.</i> . . . . .	202
	A Note on Public Accommodations Legislation . . . . .	206
	<i>Intel Corp. v. Hamidi</i> . . . . .	208
3.3	Remedies for Trespass . . . . .	219
	3.3.1 Property Rule Protection . . . . .	219
	<i>Glavin v. Eckman</i> . . . . .	219
	3.3.2 Liability Rule Protection . . . . .	224
	<i>Wetherbee v. Green</i> . . . . .	224
	<i>Somerville v. Jacobs</i> . . . . .	227
3.4	Licenses and Affirmative Easements . . . . .	235
	3.4.1 Licenses . . . . .	235
	3.4.2 Affirmative Easements . . . . .	236
	3.4.3 Creation of Easements . . . . .	238

A Note on Profits . . . . .	238
<i>Pine Valley Meats, Inc. v. Canal Capital Corp.</i> . . . . .	239
<i>Slater v. Ward</i> . . . . .	244
<i>Neary v. Martin</i> . . . . .	247
<i>Broyhill v. Coppage</i> . . . . .	254
3.4.4 Interpretation and Modification of Easements . . . . .	257
<i>Crimmins v. Gould</i> . . . . .	258
<i>Scott v. Long Valley Farm Kentucky, Inc.</i> . . . . .	264
3.4.5 Termination of Easements . . . . .	266
<i>Lindsey v. Clark</i> . . . . .	267
A Note on Conservation Easements . . . . .	270
<b>4 Ownership: Rights to Transfer, Divide, and Burden</b>	<b>271</b>
4.1 The Feudal System: “Owners” as Tenants . . . . .	273
4.2 The Evolution of the Right to Transfer . . . . .	275
4.2.1 Descent: Automatic Transfer After Death . . . . .	275
4.2.2 Alienation: Transfer by Sale or Gift . . . . .	276
4.2.3 Devise: Transfer After Death by Will . . . . .	276
4.3 The Evolution of the Right to Divide . . . . .	277
4.3.1 Spatial Division . . . . .	277
4.3.2 Temporal Division . . . . .	278
4.4 The Evolution of the Right to Burden . . . . .	279
4.4.1 Servitudes: Exclusion and Usage Limits . . . . .	279
4.4.2 Mortgages: Financial Obligations . . . . .	280
4.5 Justifying the Development of Ownership Rights . . . . .	282
4.6 Body Parts and the Right to Transfer, Divide, and Burden . . . . .	284
4.6.1 Marketing Body Parts . . . . .	284
<i>Moore v. The Regents of the University of California</i> . . . . .	284
A Note on Blocked Exchanges . . . . .	304
4.6.2 Markets in Wombs . . . . .	306
4.6.3 Control of Donated Body Parts . . . . .	307
<i>Colavito v. New York Organ Donor Network, Inc.</i> . . . . .	307
<i>Hecht v. Superior Court</i> . . . . .	313
<b>5 Spatial Coordination of Ownership</b>	<b>321</b>
5.1 Nuisance: Common Law Spatial Coordination . . . . .	322
5.1.1 The Issues . . . . .	322
THE PROBLEM OF SOCIAL COST, <i>Ronald Coase</i> . . . . .	323
A Note on Methodology . . . . .	329
5.1.2 Unreasonable Location or Activity Decisions . . . . .	329
<i>Page County Appliance Center, Inc. v. Honeywell, Inc.</i> . . . . .	330
<i>Foster v. Preston Mill Co.</i> . . . . .	334
<i>Kellogg v. Village of Viola</i> . . . . .	338
<i>Spur Industries, Inc. v. Del E. Webb Development Co.</i> . . . . .	341
A Note on Public Nuisance . . . . .	347
5.1.3 Where To Internalize Unavoidable Costs . . . . .	349
<i>Boomer v. Atlanta Cement Co.</i> . . . . .	349

	<i>Fontainebleau Hotel Corp. v. Forty-Five Twenty-Five, Inc.</i> . . . .	354
	<i>Bowlston v. Hardy</i> . . . . .	358
	<i>Acton v. Blundell</i> . . . . .	359
	5.1.4 The Significance Requirement . . . . .	363
5.2	Zoning: Legislative Spatial Coordination . . . . .	365
	<i>Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co.</i> . . . . .	365
	<i>Nectow v. City of Cambridge</i> . . . . .	371
5.3	Servitudes: Private Arrangement for Spatial Coordination . .	375
	5.3.1 Creating Enforceable Private Arrangements . . . . .	377
	<i>Sanborn v. McLean</i> . . . . .	377
	<i>Winn-Dixie Stores, Inc. v. Dolgencorp, Inc.</i> . . . . .	380
	5.3.2 Reasonableness of Ends and Means . . . . .	384
	<i>Shelley v. Kraemer</i> . . . . .	385
	5.3.3 Modification and Termination of Covenants Because of Changed Circumstances . . . . .	392
	<i>Western Land Co., Ltd. v. Truskolaski</i> . . . . .	392
5.4	Private Governance Regimes: Modern Spatial Coordination .	397
	<i>Hidden Harbour Estates, Inc. v. Basso</i> . . . . .	399
<b>6</b>	<b>Temporal Coordination of Ownership</b> . . . . .	<b>405</b>
6.1	Restricting Present Control . . . . .	408
6.2	Restrictions on Marketing . . . . .	412
	<i>Ogle v. Burmister</i> . . . . .	412
	6.2.1 Contractual Restraints on Transfer . . . . .	415
	6.2.2 Forfeiture Restraints . . . . .	415
	6.2.3 Property Transferred to Charities and Non-Profits . .	416
	<i>Rolfe &amp; Rumford Asylum v. Lefebre</i> . . . . .	416
	A Note on Charitable Easements . . . . .	419
6.3	Restrictions on Temporal Division . . . . .	421
	6.3.1 Present Estates and Future Interests . . . . .	421
	6.3.2 Estates Limited in Time . . . . .	428
	6.3.3 Nomenclature When Estates are Limited by Time . .	429
	6.3.4 Nomenclature For Estates Not Limited by Time . . .	430
	6.3.5 Limitations on Conditional Grants and The Rule Against Perpetuities . . . . .	438
	<i>The Duke of Norfolk's Case</i> . . . . .	441
	A Note on the Reform of the Rule Against Perpetuities . . .	455
6.4	Restrictions on Running of Covenants . . . . .	457
	PROPERTY, CONTRACT, AND VERIFICATION, <i>Henry Hansmann &amp;</i> <i>Reinier Kraakman</i> . . . . .	457
	<i>Cole v. Hughes</i> . . . . .	460
	<i>Tulk v. Moxhay</i> . . . . .	463
	6.4.1 Notice . . . . .	466
	6.4.2 Changed Circumstances . . . . .	466
	<i>Paquette v. Coble</i> . . . . .	467
6.5	Restrictions on Current Uses . . . . .	470
	6.5.1 The Doctrine of Waste . . . . .	470
	<i>Moore v. Phillips</i> . . . . .	470



	<i>Brokaw v. Fairchild</i> . . . . .	474
6.5.2	A Duty to Preserve . . . . .	478
	<i>Eyerman v. Mercantile Trust Co., NA</i> . . . . .	478
<b>7</b>	<b>Shared Ownership Coordination</b>	<b>489</b>
7.1	Entity Property . . . . .	491
7.2	Co-ownership Outside of Entities . . . . .	493
7.2.1	Tenants in Common . . . . .	493
7.2.2	Joint Tenancies . . . . .	496
7.2.3	Tenancy by the Entirety . . . . .	497
	<i>Harms v. Sprague</i> . . . . .	498
	<i>Delfino v. Vealencis</i> . . . . .	502
7.3	Marital Property . . . . .	507
	<i>In re Marriage of Graham</i> . . . . .	507
	<i>Elkus v. Elkus</i> . . . . .	511
7.4	Landlord-Tenant Decision Making . . . . .	516
7.4.1	Termination of Leases . . . . .	516
	<i>Philpot v. Fields</i> . . . . .	518
	<i>Kajo Church Square, Inc. v. Walker</i> . . . . .	519
7.4.2	Tenant's Obligations . . . . .	523
7.4.3	The Landlord's Duty to Mitigate . . . . .	524
	<i>Somner v. Kridel</i> . . . . .	524
7.4.4	The Warranty of Habitability . . . . .	531
	<i>Javins v. First National Realty Corp.</i> . . . . .	531
7.4.5	The Landlord's Obligation to Correct Violations . . . . .	540
	<i>Robinson v. Diamond Housing Corp.</i> . . . . .	540
7.4.6	The Landlord's Obligation to Exercise Approval Rights	
	Reasonably . . . . .	547
	<i>Kendall v. Ernest Pestana, Inc.</i> . . . . .	547
<b>8</b>	<b>Regulation of Property Transfers</b>	<b>555</b>
8.1	Methods of Conveyance . . . . .	556
8.1.1	<i>Inter Vivos</i> for Consideration . . . . .	556
8.1.2	Donative Transfer . . . . .	556
8.1.3	Testamentary Transfer . . . . .	556
8.2	Formal Requirements . . . . .	556
8.2.1	Enfeoffment . . . . .	556
8.2.2	Deeds . . . . .	556
8.2.3	Statute of Frauds . . . . .	556
8.2.4	Acknowledgement . . . . .	556
8.2.5	Enrollment . . . . .	556
8.2.6	Registration of Title . . . . .	556
8.3	Real and Personal Property Warranties . . . . .	556
	THE MARKET FOR "LEMONS", <i>George A. Akerlof</i> . . . . .	556
8.3.1	Covenants of Title . . . . .	560
8.3.2	Personal Property Warranties . . . . .	560
8.4	Risk of Loss . . . . .	561
8.4.1	Real Property . . . . .	561

8.4.2	Personal Property . . . . .	561
8.5	Fixtures . . . . .	561
	<i>Philadelphia Mortgage &amp; Trust Co. v. Miller</i> . . . . .	561
	<i>Teaff v. Hewitt</i> . . . . .	563
<b>9</b>	<b>Public Governance of Private Property</b>	<b>571</b>
9.1	The Limits of Private Law as a Governance Mechanism . . . . .	571
9.2	Building and Fire Codes . . . . .	571
9.3	Zoning: From Spatial Coordination to Development Policy . . . . .	571
9.4	Environmental Protection . . . . .	571
9.4.1	Taking Things Out of The Environment . . . . .	571
9.4.2	Putting Things in the Environment . . . . .	571
<b>10</b>	<b>Limits on Public Governance</b>	<b>573</b>
10.1	Eminent Domain . . . . .	574
10.1.1	Public Use . . . . .	574
	<i>Kelo v. City of New London, Conn.</i> . . . . .	575
10.1.2	Just Compensation . . . . .	592
10.1.3	Taking and the Right to Exclude . . . . .	592
	<i>Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.</i> . . . . .	593
10.2	Limitation on Government Regulation of Use . . . . .	604
	<i>Pennsylvania Coal Co. v. Mahon</i> . . . . .	605
	<i>Penn Central Transportation Co., v. City of New York</i> . . . . .	612
	<i>Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council</i> . . . . .	630
	<i>Tahoe-Sierra Preservation Council, Inc. v. Tahoe Regional Plan-</i> <i>ning Agency</i> . . . . .	652
	<i>Miller v. Schoene</i> . . . . .	659
	A Note on Due Process . . . . .	661
10.3	Constitutional Conditions . . . . .	665
	<i>Nollan v. California Coastal Com'n</i> . . . . .	665
	<i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i> . . . . .	671

# List of Figures

1.1	Apollo 17 Goodwill Moon Rock Plaque given to the nation of Honduras by President Nixon in 1973, returned to Honduras in 2003. . . . .	19
1.2	Randall Munroe, <i>Hotels</i> , XKCD, <a href="http://xkcd.com/958/">http://xkcd.com/958/</a> . . . . .	28
1.3	Entrance to a duck decoy pipe. . . . .	59
2.1	A picture of a fin-back whale. . . . .	109
2.2	Alex Popov as the ball reached his glove. . . . .	113
2.3	Diagram of Kunto's, Moyer's, and Howard's properties. . . . .	142
3.1	Kenneth Hamidi. . . . .	209
3.2	Diagram of the cattle walkway on Canal's and HRA's land. . . . .	243
3.3	Diagram of the the six lots and the roadway as divided up by John Medeiros. . . . .	252
3.4	Diagram of the road through Coppage's land and the road through Wyke's Land. . . . .	257
3.5	Diagram of Lindsey's and Clark's lots. . . . .	270
5.1	Page County Appliance Center in 1971. . . . .	331
5.2	A picture of a mischievous mink kitten. . . . .	335
5.3	Feedlot and Sun City development with satellite imagery. . . . .	342
5.4	Edon Roc Hotel pool and shadow cast by Fontainebleau Hotel. . . . .	355
5.5	The Shoppes of Cresthaven, West Palm Beach, Florida. . . . .	381
6.1	O's grant. . . . .	423
6.2	O's grant with Bob's and Sally's interests. . . . .	423
6.3	O's grant with Bob's, Sally's, Sam's, and the Museum's interests. . . . .	425
6.4	O's grant with Bob's, Sally's, Sam's, and the Museum's interests, if O is to hold the property until Sam graduates. . . . .	426
6.5	Interests with a life estate. . . . .	430
6.6	Interests without a life estate but with a third party future interest. . . . .	432
6.7	Interests without a life estate but with a future interest in the grantor: grantor automatically cuts off the prior interest. . . . .	432
6.8	Interests without a life estate but with a future interest in the grantor: grantor has the authority to cut off the prior interest. . . . .	433
6.9	Photo of #4 Kingsbury Place by Professor Monica Eppinger . . . . .	479

10.1 Susette Kelo's house. . . . . 577



Figure 5.4: Edon Roc Hotel pool and shadow cast by Fontainebleau Hotel.

(it appears to have been roughly eight stories high at the time suit was filed), alleging that the construction would interfere with the light and air on the beach in front of the Edon Roc and cast a shadow of such size as to render the beach wholly unfitted for the use and enjoyment of its guests, to the irreparable injury of the plaintiff; further, that the construction of such addition on the north side of defendants' property, rather than the south side, was actuated by malice and ill will on the part of the defendants' president toward the plaintiff's president; and that the construction was in violation of a building ordinance requiring a 100-foot setback from the ocean. . . .

The chancellor heard considerable testimony on the issues made by the complaint and the answer and, as noted, entered a temporary injunction restraining the defendants from continuing with the construction of the addition. His reason for so doing was stated by him, in a memorandum opinion, as follows:

“In granting the temporary injunction in this case the Court wishes to make several things very clear. The ruling is not based on any alleged presumptive title nor prescriptive right of the plaintiff to light and air nor is it based on any deed restrictions nor recorded plats in the title of the plaintiff nor of the defendant nor of any plat of record. It is not based on any zoning ordinance nor on any provision of the building code of the City of Miami Beach nor on the decision of any court, nisi prius or appellate. It is based solely on the proposition that no one has a right to use his property to the injury of another. In this case it is clear from the evidence that the proposed use by the Fontainebleau will materially damage the Edon Roc. There is evidence indicating