

A Reprint from *Tierra Grande*


# CO TENANTS

BY JUDON FAMBROUGH

## NOT SO COZY A RELATIONSHIP

**T**exas real estate may be owned individually or jointly. Joint owners are called

co-owners or cotenants, and the relationship is known as a cotenancy.

Texas law recognizes three forms of cotenancy: community property, joint tenants with the right of survivorship (JTWS), and tenants in common (TIC). This article focuses on TIC but touches on JTWS.

### Cotenant Rights

Co-ownership, regardless of the type, gives each cotenant the right to use, occupy and possess each part of the property, but not exclusively. Cotenants may not exclude other cotenants

from possessing, using or occupying the same part or parcel. This undivided right of possession forms the basis of the cotenancy relationship.

Cotenants may terminate the cotenancy at any time by partitioning, which changes co-ownership to sole ownership. Partitioning divides the property according to value, not area, and may occur voluntarily or judicially.

Voluntary partitioning requires an agreement among the cotenants to divide the property in a certain manner. After exchanging deeds, each former cotenant owns a certain parcel outright.

Judicial partitioning, on the other hand, is done by the court. If the court finds the property cannot be divided fairly and equally, it orders the property to be sold with the proceeds divided among the owners according to their undivided interests. Judicial partitioning is a time-consuming, expensive process.

Cotenants have the right to transfer their undivided interests to a third party without the other cotenants' consent. With the exception of a conveyance from an owner of a JTWS, a grantee receives the seller's identical, undivided interest in the property.

### Types of Cotenancies

TIC is, by far, the most frequently occurring type of cotenancy. Texas law presumes the formation of this cotenancy when the deed or will creating the interest lacks the word "survivorship." Language such as "to share and share alike" or "to share jointly" creates a TIC. Language such as "with all the

rights of such tenants at common law, including the right of survivorship” creates a JTWS.

The primary difference between the two hinges on the dispensation of the deceased’s interest at death. Under a TIC relationship, each cotenant controls (directly or indirectly) the distribution at death. If the cotenant dies with a will, the property goes to those designated in the will. If the cotenant dies without a will, the property goes to the next of kin according to the Texas Probate Code.

Under a JTWS relationship, the deceased’s interest goes automatically to the surviving cotenant(s) without the need of probate. The former owner cannot prevent this from occurring. The cotenant living the longest gets all the property. Obviously, the advantage goes to the youngest co-owner.

However, Texas law thwarts attempts to ensure the heirs of one cotenant get all the property. Assume, for example, an older co-owner in a JTWS relationship transfers his or her undivided interest to a much younger third party. The other cotenants object, but cannot stop the transfer because the interest is freely transferable. This seems to set the stage for the younger cotenant getting sole ownership of the property.

However, Texas law prevents this. The recipient (grantee) of an undivided interest from a cotenant in a JTWS relationship takes it as a TIC, not as a JTWS.

### Legal Relationship, Shared Responsibilities

**A**lthough co-owners share the nonexclusive right to use and possess the property, the legal relationship ends there. No cotenant is a legal partner or agent of the other. No cotenant has the authority to bind another cotenant to an agreement or a debt. No fiduciary duty exists among the cotenants unless an express agreement exists. However, cotenants do share some responsibilities.

Individually and collectively, cotenants have a duty to protect and preserve the property. A cotenant who expends funds for this purpose is entitled to reimbursement from the others for their proportional share. Equity gives the cotenant making the expenditures a lien on the property to enforce repayment.

Similarly, cotenants have a duty to preserve and protect the property from waste. Waste constitutes the unauthorized or

the cotenant quits paying the taxes and purchases the property at the tax foreclosure sale. Does this give the cotenant sole title to the land?

The answer is no. Texas law presumes a cotenant purchasing the property at a tax sale does so for the benefit of all the cotenants. The purchaser simply reinstates the cotenancy relationship as it existed before the tax sale.

### Improvements

**C**otenants have the right to improve the property without the others’ consent as long as doing so does not injure or prejudice the others’ rights. Cotenants may agree in advance to share the costs. If one or more cotenants undertake an improvement without the others’ consent, the sharing of costs is contingent on the improvement being necessary and beneficial.

Consider this example. Three cotenants own an equal, undivided interest in rural property. They agree to build a new barn costing \$30,000. Each contributes \$10,000. No problems arise.

Now consider the same scenario except this time one cotenant builds the barn without the others’ consent. The cotenant then asks the other two to contribute \$10,000 each. They refuse. The amount of their liability depends on whether the improvement was necessary and beneficial.

If the improvement was not necessary and beneficial, the others have no obligation or liability to contribute. If the property is subsequently partitioned, though, the cotenant shouldering the costs may recover the enhanced value to the land, not the amount expended.

If the improvement was necessary and beneficial, such as drilling a well to supply water for cattle, the other cotenants become liable for their proportional share of the total costs, not the enhancement. The classification of an improvement is critical in determining the recovery.

### Profits, Accounting

Rents and profits must be shared proportionately. When the cotenants agree in advance to an income-producing project, the allocation of costs, expenses and profits should

be detailed. Problems arise when one or more cotenants initiate a project without informing the others and getting their permission.

In this instance, the “others” are known as nonconsenting cotenants.

Texas case law frees nonconsenting cotenants from any liability for loss and from any out-of-pocket costs associated with such an endeavor. The cotenants initiating the project absorb all out-of-pocket costs and all losses. If there is a profit, all cotenants share in them proportionately. The initiating cotenants must provide the nonconsenting cotenants with an accounting of the costs, expenses and profits.

Say four children inherit a farm. Two of them plant the land in cotton without consulting the others. They spend \$100 an acre to bring the crop through harvest. The law states that



*Although co-owners share the nonexclusive right to use and possess the property, the legal relationship ends there.*

wrongful destruction or severance of improvements, trees, minerals or other tangible property from the property. Waste does not include ordinary wear and tear. The party committing the waste becomes liable to the others for damages.

Cotenants are responsible for the payment of a common debt, such as the mortgage and property taxes. A cotenant paying a disproportionate share of these debts may recover the costs from the others. Again, equity holds each cotenant equally liable, and all are bound to contribute proportionately according to their undivided interest. This raises some questions.

Assume one cotenant pays all the property taxes for years and the others refuse to reimburse him or her. Rather than sue,

all the costs and expenses must be borne by the two entrepreneurs. On paper, each nonconsenting cotenant is liable for one-fourth of the costs (\$25 an acre). But because they did not consent, their portion of the costs are repaid (if at all) from the revenue generated.

Assume the sale of cotton generates \$200 an acre. Each nonconsenting cotenant receives \$25 an acre income, not \$50 an acre. Their \$25 per-acre liability is repaid from their \$50 per-acre share of the gross revenue.

Now assume the sale generates only \$80 per acre. The nonconsenting cotenants receive nothing. Their \$25 per-acre liability is partially repaid from their \$20 an acre share of the income. On paper, they lose \$5 per acre. However, they have no legal responsibility for the loss.

To learn more about consenting and nonconsenting mineral cotenants, see *Rights and Responsibilities of Mineral Cotenants* (<http://recenter.tamu.edu/pdf/843.pdf>).

## Adverse Possession

Suppose two children, a brother and sister, inherit rural land. The brother lives on the property and uses it to earn a living. He does not account to his sister and retains all the profits. He pays all the property taxes. The sister never visits the property nor asks for an accounting. After ten years, can the brother assert adverse possession and assume ownership of the entire farm?

Texas statutes define adverse possession as “an actual and visible appropriation of real property, commenced and continued under a claim of right that is inconsistent with and is hostile to the claim of another person” (Section 16.021, Texas Civil Practices and Remedies Code).

Because the brother has the right of possession as a cotenant, as does the sister, his use of the property is not inconsistent and hostile to the sister’s rights and title. Therefore, the brother cannot claim adverse possession.

This does not mean that adverse possession cannot occur.

One cotenant may claim adverse possession after clearly repudiating the other cotenants’ title to the property. This occurs in one of two ways. The claimant may give notice to the others that he or she claims the land solely as his or her own. The claimant may also commit an act that gives unequivocal notoriety of an adverse claim. Mere possession of the land coupled with the payment of taxes does not form a basis for claiming adverse possession against another cotenant.

Repudiation of title may occur indirectly when one cotenant sells his or her undivided interest. If the deed purports to convey “all rights, title and interest” in the property, not just the grantor’s undivided interest, repudiation occurs. If the grantee enters the property and excludes the other cotenant(s) for a period of time, the grantee becomes the sole owner by adverse possession.

Adverse possession may also occur when one cotenant constructs a dwelling or business on the premises. If the

cotenant excludes the others from accessing the premises, the cotenant may gain sole title to the area by adverse possession. To prevent this from happening, the other cotenant(s) may demand and collect rent for the occupied area.

For more information on adverse possession, see the Center’s publications “Use It or Lose It” (<http://recenter.tamu.edu/tgrande/vol13-2/1776.html>) and “Fences and Adverse Possession” (<http://recenter.tamu.edu/pdf/1152.pdf>).

## Case Study

Ten cotenants own 55 acres outside of town. A developer purchases nine of the ten cotenants’ interest. With a loan from a bank, the development begins. The developer also grants a pipeline company an easement across the back of the property.

Where does this leave the nonconsenting cotenant? What options does he or she have under the circumstances?

First, the cotenant should check the recorded deeds signed by the other cotenants. Did they convey “all rights, title and interest to the property” or just their undivided share? Conveyance of all rights, title and interest serves as a foundation for repudiation of title and commencement of adverse possession.

Second, the person could do nothing, choose to be a nonconsenting cotenant and demand an annual accounting from the developer. The outstanding 10 percent interest entitles the holdout to 10 percent of all profits generated by the project. The person faces no out-of-pocket costs or liability for loss.

Third, the cotenant could partition the property. The holdout is entitled to a parcel equal to 10 percent of the value of the entire 55 acres, not just a parcel equal to 5.5 acres. If the property cannot be physically divided because of platting or other reasons, the court will order the property sold with 10 percent of the proceeds going to the holdout.

Fourth, the person should inform the developer, builder, lender, title companies and any real estate personnel involved in the sale of the lots of his or her outstanding interest in the



property. The person should demand a key from each homeowner or rent to avoid the appearance of adverse possession.

In this situation, Texas case law reduces the rent payments to coincide with the person's undivided interest. For example, if the rental value for a residential lot is \$5,000 a year, the holdout would be entitled to an annual payment of 10 percent of that amount or \$500 per lot.

What about the pipeline? Because the holdout did not join in the conveyance, is the easement valid?

Probably not. Absent consent or subsequent ratification, the general rule is that one cotenant may not impose an easement on the property in favor of a third party. To avoid the appearance of consent or ratification, the person should send written

notice to the pipeline company informing it of the outstanding interest and demanding removal of the pipeline.

---

*Fambrough (judon@recenter.tamu.edu) is a member of the State Bar of Texas and a lawyer with the Real Estate Center at Texas A&M University.*

---

## THE TAKEAWAY

Owning property as cotenants creates a unique relationship that may not be beneficial to all parties. Each cotenant must know his or her rights and responsibilities for the relationship to be successful.



MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL

Texas A&M University  
2115 TAMU  
College Station, TX 77843-2115

<http://recenter.tamu.edu>  
979-845-2031

**Director**, Gary W. Maler; **Chief Economist**, Dr. Mark G. Dotzour; **Communications Director**, David S. Jones; **Associate Editor**, Nancy McQuiston; **Associate Editor**, Bryan Pope; **Assistant Editor**, Kammy Baumann; **Art Director**, Robert P. Beals II; **Graphic Designer**, JP Beato III; **Graphics Assistant**, Whitney Martin; **Circulation Manager**, Mark Baumann; **Typography**, Real Estate Center.

### Advisory Committee

David E. Dalzell, Abilene, chairman; D. Marc McDougal, Lubbock, vice chairman; James Michael Boyd, Houston; Catarina Gonzales Cron, Houston; Tom H. Gann, Lufkin; Jacquelyn K. Hawkins, Austin; Barbara A. Russell, Douglas A. Schwartz, El Paso; Denton; Ronald C. Wakefield, San Antonio; and John D. Eckstrum, Conroe, ex-officio representing the Texas Real Estate Commission.

*Tierra Grande* (ISSN 1070-0234) is published quarterly by the Real Estate Center at Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843-2115. Subscriptions are free to Texas real estate licensees. Other subscribers, \$20 per year. Views expressed are those of the authors and do not imply endorsement by the Real Estate Center, Mays Business School or Texas A&M University. The Texas A&M University System serves people of all ages, regardless of socioeconomic level, race, color, sex, religion, disability or national origin. Photography/Illustrations: JP Beato III, p. 1.