Bill as Introduced

HB 185 – AS INTRODUCED

2003 SESSION

03-0670
01/09

HOUSE BILL *185*

AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs.

SPONSORS: Rep. J. Pratt, Ches 24; Rep. Craig, Hills 50; Rep. Rowe, Hills 47; Sen. Foster, Dist 13; Sen. Peterson, Dist 11

COMMITTEE: Judiciary

ANALYSIS

This bill clarifies the law relative to pretermitted heirs.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

03-0670
01/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Wills; Child Not Named. RSA 551:10 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:10 Child Not Named. If any person shall die testate leaving a child born after the date of the will who is still living or adopted after the date of the will who is still living and who is not provided for or referred to in the will, the child shall, unless it appears to the probate court that the omission was intentional and not occasioned by accident or mistake, take the portion of the testator's estate to which it would have been entitled if the testator had died intestate, provided that if the will provides for another child or children the pretermitted child shall take no more than the largest bequest or devise to a child named in such will.

2 Wills; Share of Unnamed Child. RSA 551:11 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:11 Share of Unnamed Child. If the property not devised or bequeathed by the testator shall be insufficient to satisfy the just share of such child after allowing for advancements to such child, the same shall be made up from the testate estate in such equitable manner as the probate court shall deem proper.

3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

HB 185 – AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

25mar03... 0521h

2003 SESSION

03-0670
01/09

HOUSE BILL *185*

AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs.

SPONSORS: Rep. J. Pratt, Ches 24; Rep. Craig, Hills 50; Rep. Rowe, Hills 47; Sen. Foster, Dist 13; Sen. Peterson, Dist 11

COMMITTEE: Judiciary

ANALYSIS

This bill clarifies the law relative to pretermitted heirs.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

HB 185 – AS AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

25mar03... 0521h

03-0670
01/09

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Three

AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Wills; Child Not Named. RSA 551:10 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:10 Child Not Named. If any person shall die testate leaving a child born or adopted after the date of the will, or, if there are codicils, the date of the most recent codicil thereto, and if such child is not provided for or referred to therein, that child shall take the portion of the testator's estate to which he or she would have been entitled if the testator had died intestate unless it appears to the probate court that the omission was intentional and not occasioned by accident or mistake; provided, however, that if the will provides for another child or children, the pretermitted child shall take no more than the largest bequest or devise to a child named in such will.

2 Wills; Share of Unnamed Child. RSA 551:11 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:11 Share of Unnamed Child. If the property not devised or bequeathed by the testator shall be insufficient to satisfy the just share of such child after allowing for advancements to such child, the same shall be made up from the testate estate in such equitable manner as the probate court shall deem proper.

3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

Amendments

Senate Judiciary
April 17, 2003
2003-1327s
01/09

Amendment to HB 185

Amend the bill by replacing all after the enacting clause with the following:

1 Wills; Child Not Named. RSA 551:10 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:10 Child Not Named. If any person shall die testate leaving a child born or adopted, and such child is not provided for or referred to therein, such pretermitted child or such child's issue if such child has predeceased the testator shall, unless it appears to the probate court that the omission was intentional and not occasioned by accident or mistake, take that portion of the testator's estate to which such child or such child's issue would have been entitled if the testator had died intestate; provided, however, that if such last will or any codicil thereto provides for another child of the testator or the issue of another child of the testator who has predeceased the testator, the pretermitted child shall take that portion of the testator's estate equal to the greater of (a) the largest sum of all bequests and devises to any one child of the testator named in such last will and any codicil thereto, or (b) the sum of all bequests and devises to all of the issue of another child of the testator who predeceased the testator. The issue of a pretermitted child who predeceased the testator shall take that portion of the testator's estate equal to the lesser of (a) the largest sum of all bequests and devises to any one child of the testator named in such last will and any codicil thereto, or (b) the sum of all bequests and devises to all of the issue of another child of the testator who predeceased the testator. The portion of the testator's estate, if any, that the issue of a pretermitted child who predeceased the testator take shall be disbursed equally if the issue are all of the same degree of kinship to the testator, but if of unequal degree those of more remote degree take by representation.

2 Wills; Share of Unnamed Child. RSA 551:11 is repealed and reenacted to read as follows:

551:11 Share of Unnamed Child. If the property bequeathed or devised by the testator shall be insufficient to satisfy the share of such pretermitted child or the share of the issue of such child if such child predeceased the testator after allowing for advancements to such child or such child's issue if such child predeceased the testator, the same shall be made up from the testate estate in such equitable manner as the probate court shall deem appropriate.

3 Effective Date. This act shall take effect January 1, 2004.

Committee Minutes

Judiciary Committee

Hearing Report

To: Members of the Senate

From: Susan Duncan
Senior Legislative Aide

Re: **HB 185** – *AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs.*

Hearing date: April 15, 2003

Members present: Senators Peterson, Foster, Clegg and Roberge

Members absent: Senator Sapareto

Sponsor(s): Representatives Pratt, Craig and Rowe
Senators Foster and Peterson

What the bill does: This bill clarifies the law relative to pretermitted heirs.

Who supports the bill: Representative Jack Pratt
Judge John Maher, Administrative Judge of the Probate Court
Attorney Ann Meissner-Flood

Who opposes the bill: No one spoke in opposition

Summary of testimony received:

- This legislation reverses current law.
- A pretermitted heir is someone left out of a Will.
- Under the provisions of HB 185 the child left out of the Will would take the same share of the estate as if the person had died intestate (without a Will).
- This legislation tries to limit the share of an unnamed child who is not referenced in a Will.
- It has been assumed that if a child was born prior to a Will being drawn, the person drawing the Will was aware of the child's birth.
- The legislation caps the amount the unnamed child could inherit at the same amount given to other children who are named in the Will.
- The legislation clarifies that if there isn't sufficient property or assets in an estate to satisfy the provisions of the Will, then the

Court has to use equitable judgment to make up the portion of the shares.

- Senator Foster said that when he studied law (and noted that he does not practice Probate law), he was taught that you have to mention someone if you specifically want to omit them from receiving any assets. He asked: "why are we flipping it?"
    - Judge Maher responded that some practitioners felt that it should be changed and asked for this legislation to be filed.
- Senator Foster asked what about the case where a spouse may have a child that no one knows anything about.
- Senator Peterson asked regarding a child born out of wedlock and was unknown, would they be afforded a full share under this reading.
    - Attorney Meissner-Flood responded that if a child was born before the Will was drafted, they would be cut out; if they were born after the Will was drafted, they would be included.
- Senator Foster asked Judge Maher to please check to see if other states are heading in this direction.
- Senator Peterson then asked if the other parent of the out of wedlock child could come forward and ask the estate for unpaid back child support.
- Judge Maher clarified that the most important portion of the legislation is lines 8 – 9 rather than the section dealing with a named or unnamed child.
- Judge Maher spoke regarding the difference between a judgment creditor versus an intestate obligation. He noted that one can always sue on a judgment.

Funding: No financial impact

Future action: The committee took the bill under advisement.

Judge Maher will get back to the committee with clarifications.

Also, he will look into whether a notation needs to be made on the bill that Wills drawn prior to the adoption of the effective date of this act would not be affected.

***Black's Law Dictionary* defines Pretermitted heir as:**
A child or other descendant omitted by a testator.
Where a testator unintentionally fails to mention in his will, or make provision for, a child, either living at the date of the execution of the will or born thereafter, a statute may provide that such child, or the issue of a deceased child, shall share in the estate as though the testator had died intestate.
In re Prices's Estate, 56 Cal.App.2d 335,
132 P.2d 485. See Pretermission statute.

sfd
[file: HB 185 report]
Date: April 16, 2003

Date: April 15, 2003
Time: 11:50 a.m.
Room: State House, Room 105-A

The Senate Committee on Judiciary held a hearing on the following:

HB 185 relative to pretermitted heirs.

Members of Committee present: Senator Peterson
Senator Foster
Senator Clegg

The Chair, Senator Andrew R. Peterson, opened the hearing on HB 185.

Judge John Maher: Mr. Chairman, again, my name is John Maher. I am the Administrative Judge of the Probate Court. With me is Ann Meissner Flood, who was the primary drafter of this with another gentleman who is not here, Wells Anderson.

Essentially, this is on pretermitted heirs. Essentially, what that means is somebody who is left out of a will. The current law is that, if a person is left out of a will, they will take the same share that they would have taken had the person died intestate. This changes a presumption to some degree and that is this. The old law, the current law, would be, regardless of when that person was born. This will change it so that it will only affect those people who are adopted or born after the testator has drafted a will or the last codicil of that testator. Then it will be presumed that they were forgotten by mistake.

So, that is a substantial change, meaning that in, somebody had a child and then made a will and forgot to put that child in the will, it will be presumed that they were intentionally omitted. So, I wanted to bring that to your attention. Now we will only be going forward that it was a mistake after that will or last codicil was drafted.

You're looking at me, Mr. Chairman, and maybe I haven't explained it properly, so I will go over it again in that regard. Right now, regardless of

when the person has been born, if they are left out of a will, it will be presumed that the testator made a mistake and that person will take as if the testator died intestate without a will.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Unless they are specifically excluded?

Judge Maher: Right. I intentionally leave X out or I intentionally leave them a dollar or something like that. This changes that so that, if in fact the person was born and then the person made a will or then has several codicils to that will, the last codicil, that person will not be included in the presumption to have been forgotten. It would only be a person who was born after the last codicil or after the will who will benefit from that presumption.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: That appears to be different than the testimony that Representative Pratt gave. So, that's why I was looking at you in that way.

Judge Maher: Did I misstate that?

Attorney Flood: No, you're absolutely correct. I think Representative Pratt might have not been as clear as Judge Maher on what we were doing with HB 185. Judge Maher's explanation is correct.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: And so, do you have other testimony on 185?

Judge Maher: I think I will turn it over to Attorney Flood.

Attorney Flood: As I said, my name is Ann Meissner Flood and I am an attorney from Orr & Reno.

Judge Maher is correct. What we were trying to do here was take into account or limit, to limit isn't the right word, but that's the word that comes to my mind. Limit the share of an unnamed child who was not referenced in the decedent's will. What we are saying is that, if that child was in existence when the testator executed his or her will or any codicil, if they had been born, then the presumption is that the testator was aware of that child and intentionally excluded that child as a taker under the will. That's the way it was.

This statute says that, if you have a child who is born after the date of the will or any codicil thereto and the child was not mentioned or otherwise referred to in those documents, that the court has the ability, the child will take a share of the intestate estate unless the court finds that the omission

was intentional. So, you've got a clear line being drawn about someone who is born after the date of a will being executed versus someone who was in existence when the will was executed.

We are only allowing a child who was born after the date of a will was executed to receive an intestate share. Actually, it's not exactly an intestate share because, if the decedent has, if you read line 7, there is a provided however and the provided however states that if, in the decedent's will he has made other provisions for his other children, that the child who has been omitted only takes the same share that the decedent left to the other siblings, his other children. Rather than getting an intestate share, his share is capped at whatever the decedent gave his other children. So, it's trying to create parity amongst children in terms of what they receive. So, if the decedent left a dollar to all of his children but forgot to leave one, the one child who is forgotten shouldn't be able to go back and claim his intestate share, which would be, if there were three children and no spouse, he would get, that the child who has been left out would receive a third. But if in the decedent's will, he has left the other two children only a dollar, then the third child is deemed to receive just a dollar. He gets the same share that the siblings would get.

Judge Maher: And another way of looking at that is, if the decedent had a half a million dollars and he left everything to his wife, but he left $5,000 to one child, but had two. Under the intestacy section, the wife would take the first $250,000 and then the other half would be split between the wife and children. But, as a practical matter, one would have received $5,000 and the other would be receiving a lion's share and that is a basic unfairness. So that's why we drafted it the way we did.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Question Senator Clegg.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Can you explain to me from line 10 down?

Judge Maher: Yes, we didn't talk about that yet. Thank you very much, Senator.

If the property not devised or bequeathed by the testator shall be insufficient to satisfy the just share of such child. What happens is there were certain specific bequests and the child was supposed to take an intestate share and that share can be determined as to what it should be - $25,000, $50,000, what have you, but there is insufficient funds because of the specific bequests to pay that intestate share, then the court has to use equitable judgment and balance off the other specific legacies, specific bequests, to make up a sufficient sum of money for that unclaimed share.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: So basically you cut a piece of everybody until you can get...

Judge Maher: That's right, sir.

Senator Robert Clegg, Jr., D. 14: Thanks.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Senator Roberge for a question.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: What would you have to do in order to make it clear to the court that you did want to leave one child out?

Judge Maher: You would intentionally omit them, Senator.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Okay. Thank you.

Attorney Lehmann: The will could say this is intentional, this decision is intentional and not occasioned by accident or mistake.

Judge Maher: Yes. Or, in many times, we say well I gave a significant amount to my son, Rick, during my lifetime and so, I feel a great affection for him, but I have taken care of the other people who might benefit from my bounty or something like that.

Senator Sheila Roberge, D. 9: Okay.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Senator Foster?

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: I will preface my remarks by saying I am a co-sponsor and I did show some of the people in my law office and they thought it was a good idea. But, being somewhat ignorant of the law, one thing I did notice is that you happened to mention somebody to cut them out of your will, why are we flipping that presumption? Was it causing problems? When you are executing a will and you want to write somebody out of a will, I think what I am hearing you say now is that, if they are living when we execute the will and we are silent and they are not dealt with, we are assuming that they were written out of the will?

Judge Maher: That's correct.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Why are we flipping that presumption?

Judge Maher: A number of practitioners came to us and felt that that was unfair, that people are writing wills and then doing codicils to wills, that a lot of parents do a lot of things for their children during their lifetime and don't think to intentionally do that. So, it was the consensus of this ad hoc committee that I worked with, with Ann and others, was that they felt they needed to move that presumption back a little bit and so it was a policy decision that we are recommending because many practitioners were recommending it to us.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Follow up?

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Follow up.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Isn't one of the standard questions you must ask, do you intend to leave this child out of the will when you're doing it? From an estate planning perspective, I would think that was on the checklist or whatever.

Attorney Flood: It most certainly is, but the comment, I think, from the ad hoc committee was that occasionally you run into a situation where you have a couple before you and somebody might have a child that they know about, but their spouse doesn't know about and they don't want to volunteer that there is this other child out there that nobody knows about. It would make sense that if theoretically you are aware of your children that if you want to include them that you include them. That was the comment that was made and was part of the reason for reversing the presumption.

Judge Maher: Another aspect, Senator, is that surprising me and will continue to, that so many people will avoid going to an attorney to draft a will. They will take something, just download it and not ever be asked that question because they are following some sheet that they downloaded and they are doing this will. We see literally, estates with several hundred thousand dollars where people have just done the wills themselves. So, they don't have the benefit of Ann Flood asking that question.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Further questions? I have a couple if you would. The bill, as I see it, has three different changes in law. The first one, you have clarified for us, which I do think is somewhat different than what Representative Pratt told us.

The second two are that the one, for whatever reason is not in the will, is not going to get more than the other children are assessed and forgiven and the language about the insufficient estate to deal with specific bequests. The second two I have no problem with and understand.

The first one, however, raises some questions in my mind. Our will, my will, has a line in it that, if there were other children, they got covered globally because we live in a town with a penchant towards a no growth policy at times and we thought we could personally fight against that by having as many children as possible. So, with the fact that when we hang our clothes in the same closet, we seem to develop an issue, we thought we would have that in the will. However, if I was to develop a codicil later and had an attorney who didn't focus on it or even a clerk who made a clerical error in that office and then a child was left out because we have changed this presumption, that would be of concern because you seem to have so much weighing on the language of the last codicil and the way this is written. Am I missing something?

Judge Maher: No.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you. Secondly, you do have the instance, I'm sure...

Judge Maher: I'm sorry. I just spoke...

Attorney Flood: I think that if your original will mentions any children born after the date of your document includes children, references after-born children, then they are not omitted. Because you haven't named them specifically or they haven't come into existence, doesn't put them in the category of this statute because they have been provided for. So, this would be clearly only someone who was born after the date that you have executed it and is not referenced in a manner such as you have just made reference to.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: However, if it didn't have the clause that I put in, you would be, under that circumstance?

Attorney Flood: Yes. And then that child would be deemed, if that child wasn't specifically referenced and he was born after the date of the will or the codicil, the last codicil to the will, then that child would receive exactly the same share as his or her siblings.

Judge Maher: But, what I got from Senator Peterson was if there was a child that was born before the will.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Yes.

Judge Maher: Yes. If it was born before the will, that child would be cut out. I understand your point of view. It is a policy decision.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Secondly, you do have the situation of the child born out of wedlock who is unknown but comes forward with DNA evidence at the time of the estate and would, under our current presumption, be afforded a full share. Is that incorrect?

Judge Maher: That's correct.

Attorney Flood: That's correct.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: And, who would be eliminated under this reading?

Attorney Flood: No. Under this reading, the child would receive, if he was born before the execution of the will, he would be eliminated. If he was born after, he would receive the same share that his or her sibling received. The presumption is that you know who your children are.

Judge Maher: And, we have actually had some cases just like that. There was a case down on the seacoast where a gentleman made a will and the child who was born many, many years before it was left out. He had held that child out as his, but never included the child in the will. That child was able to take. Under this, that is true, the child would not be taking.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Wouldn't it make sense to have to require people to specifically exclude their children if they don't want them covered, particularly if we accept sections 2 and 3 of the bill?

Judge Maher: Well, as I say, we bring bills to the Senate or the House. It is the Senate and the House that set policy in the State of New Hampshire. We think that we brought this because a significant number of probate practitioners felt it was a reasonable approach. You don't have to agree with that. It is just that that was our policy at the time. We thought that we would present it to you.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: After all, we are not talking about something beyond lineal heirs here. We are talking about direct descendants here and so I am just disposed to be somewhat careful. I don't know how the other committee members feel about it. But, at any rate, I raise the issue. Senator Foster?

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Just a question. Do you know, are there other states heading in this direction? Would we be a maverick? Going back to 1984, some time prior to 1984, pretermitted heir.

Judge Maher: I wish that Wells were here because he was the point person on this. I think he would say that he believes that this is the posture of the Uniform Probate Code. But, I could be mistaken on that and I would be happy to clarify that issue as to the reason to have him come here and provide it to you folks.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: I'm not familiar with the Uniform Probate Code, but if it's like most, is that something where it is uniform law and there is a lot of commentary that follows the... So, if we wanted to educate ourselves a little bit more on this issue, we could look at the Probate Code.

Judge Maher: You could, but I would probably try to maybe do one better than that and save you some work. You folks have kind of a heavy plate. I would go back to Mr. Anderson, who practices right here in Concord, and say this was the thinking of the ad hoc committee. One of the questions was is this where most states are learning? Could you help us out in that regard? We would like to have some printed material for the Senate Judiciary. I might say that even though it is kind of a funny statement to say, this is accordance with the Uniform Probate Code because, in many instances, states adopt bits and pieces of a probate code. They don't adopt the whole thing. They modify it to what their state legislature thinks is the right policy.

So, I will find that information for you.

Attorney Flood: I think that's accurate and I think we were more concerned, I don't think the practitioners would be still bothered if you decide that you want to keep the presumption. We were more concerned about a pretermitted child coming in and getting more than his or her siblings. I think that's the important policy point that we wanted to make.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Senator Foster?

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Just one more. No more than the largest bequest. So, if there is a child who gets $10 under a will and another child gets $5, you get the $50,000. What that child gets is the same as the other child gets?

Judge Maher: And not more than that.

Senator Joseph A. Foster, D. 13: Not more than that. Thank you.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Just one final question. Under the first section of the bill that we have discussed fairly well, is there a possibility for the other parent of a bastard child, were we to pass this legislation, to come forward and petition the probate court to attach the estate for back child support and are we opening the door to that?

Judge Maher: Well, there is always. You can take a child support obligation to a judgment. You can always sue on a judgment. That would be no different than any other claim. I think I am answering that in a broad sense because this applies, not just to illegitimate kids. This applies...

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: No. I understand, but in the case of the illegitimate who comes forward and is revealed at the probate court level and produces DNA evidence and it is then found that they have been locked out of the will due to our action on this bill. Would it be reasonable to assume that the estate might be attached in that manner?

Judge Maher: Well, that's a very interesting issue because, if a judgment creditor versus an intestate succession entitlement the way you just described that would be if there was an outstanding support obligation which wasn't paid and which has been reduced to judgment. Not all of them are; most of them are not, I might say. That person certainly could come forward and make a claim against the estate, but then that person could also take an intestate share of the residue.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Under current law?

Judge Maher: Under current law, but even under this law, if they were born after. Under current law for sure. Under this, if they were...

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: If they were born before?

Judge Maher: If they were born after and left out. So, there would be a judgment creditor for $50,000 for non-support. It would not actually be the person; it would be the parent who had custody who would be that claimant for support. They would simply be a creditor.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: I'm just trying to probe whether there might be difficulties with this policy, that's all. The way that I have stated the question.

Judge Maher: I don't think that that particular question will be... Your first reason for why you're not happy with the policy, I certainly understand, sir.

Senator Andrew R. Peterson, D. 11: Thank you. Other questions? Seeing none, thank you for appearing on 185. Are there others who wish to testify? Seeing none, I will close the hearing on HB 185.

Hearing concluded at 12:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

L. Gail Brown
Senate Secretary
4/21/03

Speakers

SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Date 4/15/03 Time 11:15 a.m. Public Hearing on **HB 185**

HB 185 – relative to pretermitted heirs.

Please check box(es) that apply.

SPEAKING	FAVOR	OPPOSED	NAME (Please print)	REPRESENTING
☒	☒	☐	John R Maher	Probate Ct.
☒	☐	☐	Rep John Pratt	Chesterfield
☒	☒	☐	Ann Meissner Flood	
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		
☐	☐	☐		

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date:

THE COMMITTEE ON Judiciary

to which was referred House Bill 185

AN ACT relative to pretermitted heirs

VOTE: 5-0

2003-1327s

Having considered the same, report the same with the following amendment and recommend that the bill: **AS AMENDED OUGHT TO PASS.**

Senator Joseph A. Foster
For the Committee

HB185 Docket

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Bill Title: relative to pretermitted heirs.

Date	Body	Description
1/9/2003	H	Introduced and ref to Judiciary; HJ8, p109
1/9/2003	H	Copy to Chairman on 1/9/2003
1/9/2003	H	Hearing Jan 23 11:00 RM208,LOB
2/4/2003	H	Subcom Work Session Feb 5 2:00 RM208,LOB
2/26/2003	H	Subcom Work Session Mar 3 11:30 RM208,LOB
3/17/2003	H	Maj Report OTP/AM for Mar 25 (Vote 14-0;CC)
3/17/2003	H	Prop Comm Am{0521}; HC26, p683
3/25/2003	H	Passed with Am; HJ 29-pt 1, p876 + pt 2, p966
4/3/2003	S	Introduced and Ref. to Judiciary; SJ 11, Pg.273
4/11/2003	S	Hearing; April 15, 2003, Room 105-A, SH, 11:15 a.m.; SC18
4/18/2003	S	Committee Report; Ought to Pass with Amendment{1327} [04/24/03]; SC19, Pg.5-6
4/24/2003	S	Committee Amendment{1327}, AA, VV; SJ 14, Pg.334-335
4/24/2003	S	Ought to Pass with Amendment{1327}, MA, VV; OT3rdg; SJ 14, Pg.335
4/24/2003	S	Passed by 3rd Reading Resolution; SJ 14, Pg.340
5/15/2003	H	Rep Rowe moved to Conc with Sen Am, ML DIV(120-222); Rep Mock moved to Nonconc with Sen Am and
5/15/2003	H	req Conf Comm, MA VV; HJ 42, p1308
5/15/2003	H	(Spkr appts: Reps Rowe, J Pratt, Haytayan & Sorg)
5/29/2003	S	Sen. Peterson Accede to House Request for Committee of Conference, MA, VV; SJ 18, Pg.487
5/29/2003	S	President Appoints; Senators Peterson, Roberge, Foster; SJ 18, Pg.487
5/29/2003	H	Conf Comm meeting June 3 10:00 RM208,LOB (NOTE TIME CORRECTION)
6/3/2003	H	Continued Conf Comm meeting June 10 10:00 RM208,LOB
6/19/2003	S	Committee of Conference Report; Unable to Reach Agreement,{2042} Filed;
6/24/2003	S	Conference Committee Report{2042}, Adopted, VV; SJ 20, Pg.768
6/24/2003	H	Conf Comm Report Adopted VV;

Next|Prev|Results List|Main|Bill Status

Docket Abbreviations