# Richardson v. Franc

- James and Lisa (P) traverse over 150-foot road on Greg and Terri's (D) land
  - Already written easement for "access and public utility purposes"
- P, for 20 years, landscaping, irrigation, and lighting
  - No objection
- D now object to use of road
  - Ask to remove landscaping, irrigation, and lighting
  - Say easement is expressly limited to access and public utility



# Richardson v. Franc

- License
  - Written or Oral?
  - Explicit or Implicit?
- Improvement
  - Of what?
  - Need reliance?
    - On what?
- Consent
  - Explicit or Implicit?
  - How long should it last?
  - Worry about the lack of a writing?
  - Fair there is no payment?

### **Easements**

- Benefit > Burden
- Ways to create an easement
  - Express/Writing
  - Implied two types:
    - Necessity
      - 1. Initially commonly owned property (unity of ownership)
      - 2. Necessity
      - 3. Transaction that creates necessity
    - Prior Use (Implication)
      - 1. Common ownership
      - 2. Before severance, prior use (quasi-easement)
      - 3. Reasonable necessity

### **Easements**

- Ways to create an easement
  - Prescription
    - 1. open and notorious use
    - 2. hostile and adverse
      - —without owner's consent
    - 3. continuous and uninterrupted
    - 4. for statutory period
  - Estoppel (irrevocable license)
    - 1. License
    - 2. Improvement
    - 3. Reliance
    - 4. Consent

# Richardson v. Franc

How well does Richardson track your intuitions about everyday behavior? Would you ask permission before engaging in the landscaping at issue here? Would you advise a client to? Suppose you asked your neighbor for an easement of way to enable you to build on an adjoining property? You're friends, and he says yes. But you know a thing or two about the law, so you know that if your relations turn sour you would have to rely on an irrevocable license claim. Would you push for a formal grant in writing? Is that a neighborly thing to do? For one view, see Shepard v. Purvine, 248 P.2d 352, 361-62 (Or. 1952) ("Under the circumstances, for plaintiffs to have insisted upon a deed would have been embarrassing; in effect, it would have been expressing a doubt as to their friend's integrity."). Does it make a difference that you know to ask? What about