

2012 Edition

Property of Spouse in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

- **“Wife and husband property rights not affected by marriage.** Neither husband nor wife shall acquire by the marriage any right to or interest in any property held by the other before or acquired after such marriage, except as to the share of the survivor in the property as provided by sections 45a-436 and 45a-437. The separate earnings of the wife shall be her sole property. She shall have power to make contracts with her husband or with third persons, to convey to her husband or to third persons her real and personal estate and to receive conveyances of real and personal estate from her husband or from third persons as if unmarried. She may bring suit in her own name upon contracts or for torts and she may be sued for a breach of contract or for a tort; and her property, except such as is exempt by law, may be taken on attachment and execution, but shall not be taken for the debts of her husband, except as provided in section 46b-37. The husband shall not be liable for her debts contracted before marriage, nor upon her contracts made after marriage, except as provided in said section.”
CONN. GEN. STAT. [§ 46b-36](#)
- **Joint duty of support:** “The evolutionary changes in married women's rights that enabled them to acquire and dispose of property also generated changes in the obligations of each spouse to the marriage. In the evolutionary process the primary obligation of the husband to provide support for his wife and children under the common law evolved into a joint duty of each spouse to support the family. [Conn. Gen. Stats.] Section 46b-37(b) provides the basic statutory predicate for this change. Article fifth of the Connecticut constitution, amending 20 of article first of the Connecticut constitution, however, provides the constitutional underpinnings for contemporary departure from the primary duty of one spouse to the joint duty of each spouse to support his or her family. It must also be recognized that even when the husband had the primary duty to support his wife, his duty was not absolute and unyielding.” [Yale University School of Medicine v. Collier](#), 206 Conn. 31, 35-36, 536 A.2d 588 (1988).

TREATED ELSEWHERE

- **Property Rights upon Death of Spouse**, see [Rights of Surviving Spouse](#)
- **Property Rights upon Dissolution (Divorce), Legal Separation or Annulment**, see [Equitable Distribution of Marital Property](#)
- **Property Rights Prior to Marriage**, see [Return of Engagement Ring and Courtship Gifts](#) and [Premarital Agreements in Connecticut](#)

Table of Contents

Section 1: Married Women's Act in Connecticut	3
Section 2: Property Rights of Spouses.....	7
Table 1: Joint Duty of Spouses to Support Family.....	11

These guides are provided with the understanding that they represent only a beginning to research.

View our other pathfinders at

<http://www.jud.ct.gov/lawlib/selfguides.htm#Pathfinders>

This guide links to advance release slip opinions on the Connecticut Judicial Branch website and to case law and public acts hosted on Google Scholar and Google Books. The online versions are for informational purposes only.

Section 1: Married Women's Act in Connecticut

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

SCOPE:

Bibliographic sources relating to the history and effect of the passage of the Married Women's Act of 1877 in Connecticut.

DEFINITION:

- “An enhancement of the wife's legal status had been brought about by the enactment of the Married Women's Act in 1877. See Public Acts 1877, c. 114 (now General Statutes 46b-36). This legislation enabled a married woman to control her own property and to sue and be sued in the same manner as her husband.” [Yale University School of Medicine v. Collier](#), 206 Conn. 31,34, 536 A.2d 588 (1988).
- “We think that in enacting this law the State adopted a fundamental change of public policy . . . that in every marriage contracted since April 20th, 1877, husband and wife alike retain the capacity of owning, acquiring and disposing of property, which belongs to unmarried persons; that the power of contracting, incident to such capacity, necessarily follows, and that the legal status of husband and wife involves the capacity to contract with each other and with others. Under the law of status which the Act of 1877 abolished, the wife could not contract with her husband or any one else, because her legal identity and capacity of owning property attached to the husband, and for the same reason the husband could not contract with his wife.” [Mathewson v. Mathewson](#), 79 Conn. 23, 35, 63 A. 285 (1906)
- “Her identity is no longer merged in that of her husband. She is recognized as having a complete legal entity of her own, with rights of her own, and enforceable as her own.” [Marri v. Stamford Street Railroad Co.](#), 84 Conn. 9, 22, 78 A. 582 (1911).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2011).
[§ 46b-36](#) “. . . The separate earnings of the wife shall be her sole property. She shall have power to make contracts with her husband or with third persons, to convey to her husband or to third persons her real and personal estate and to receive conveyances of real and personal estate from her husband or from third persons as if unmarried. She may bring suit in her own name upon contracts or for torts and she may be sued for a breach of contract or for a tort; and her property, except such as is exempt by law, may be taken on attachment and execution, but shall not be taken for the debts of her husband, except as provided in section 46b-37. . .”

STATUTES:
(continued)

[§ 46b-37.](#)

- (a). "Any purchase made by either a husband or wife in his or her own name shall be presumed, in the absence of notice to the contrary, to be made by him or her as an individual and he or she shall be liable for the purchase."
- (b). "Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, it shall be the joint duty of each spouse to support his or her family, and both shall be liable for:
- (1) The reasonable and necessary services of a physician or dentist;
 - (2) hospital expenses rendered the husband or wife or minor child while residing in the family of his or her parents;
 - (3) the rental of any dwelling unit actually occupied by the husband and wife as a residence and reasonably necessary to them for that purpose; and
 - (4) any article purchased by either which has in fact gone to the support of the family, or for the joint benefit of both."

HISTORY:

- Public Act 1877, Chapter 114. "[An Act in Alteration of the Act Concerning Domestic Relations.](#)"
- [Mathewson v. Mathewson](#), 79 Conn. 23, 35 (1906). History of married women's act in Connecticut.

CASES:

- [Jewish Home for the Aged v. Nuterangelo](#), No. CV 04-0489608 S (Conn. Super. Ct. J.D. of New Haven, Dec. 10, 2004), 38 CONN. L. RPTR. 408 (February 21, 2005), 2004 WL 3130225. "The problem with this count is that the common-law right of action known as the doctrine of necessities could only be asserted against husbands. *Yale University School of Medicine v. Scianna*, 45 Conn.Sup. 84, 19 Conn. L. Rptr. 77 (1997). This was because, at common-law, a married woman had no property and therefore could make no contracts. *Id.*, 1W. Blackstone, Commentaries on the Laws of England (1807) p. 442. Indeed, it was this gender bias in the common law that led to the promulgation of the Married Women's Act of 1877. Public Acts 1877, c. 114. This statute created a new cause of action making spouses liable for the cost of any article purchased by either that went to the support of the family. *Id.*, § 2. This statutory remedy was, however, independent of the common-law doctrine of necessities. *Buckingham v. Hurd*, 52 Conn. 404, 406 (1884). The point is that the common-law duty of support applied only to husbands."
- [Wendt v. Wendt](#), 59 Conn. App. 656, 687-688, 757 A.2d 1225 (2000). "As the court in this case rightly stated: 'The plaintiff would have the decision in this case take its place along with the great events making changes in women's rights: the 1848 Seneca Falls [New York] Convention; the Married Women's Act of 1877 in Connecticut [Public Acts 1877, c. 114, now General Statutes § 46b-36]; the nineteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, ratified in Connecticut on September 14 and 20, 1920; and the ERA to the Connecticut constitution,

adopted November 27, 1974. This historical progression, while compelling, does not warrant the results the plaintiff seeks. The plaintiff seeks, by judicial fiat, to declare unconstitutional, statutes in order to correct an economic disorder.' We agree with the court and conclude that the plaintiff has not successfully proven a violation of the ERA."

- [Yale University School of Medicine v. Collier](#), 206 Conn. 31, 34, 536 A.2d 588 (1988). "An enhancement of the wife's legal status had been brought about by the enactment of the Married Women's Act in 1877. See Public Acts 1877, c. 114 (now General Statutes 46b-36). This legislation enabled a married woman to control her own property and to sue and be sued in the same manner as her husband."
- [Dzenutis v. Dzenutis](#), 200 Conn. 290, 294, 512 A.2d 130 (1986). "[W]e had held in the analogous husband-wife context that the enactment of the Married Women's Act of 1877 gave a wife separate and independent legal status and thus abrogated the common law rule of spousal immunity both for intentional torts; *Brown v. Brown*, 88 Conn. 42, 47, 89 A. 889 (1914); and for negligent ones. *Bushnell v. Bushnell*, 103 Conn. 583, 587, 131 A. 432 (1925)."
- [Mesite v. Kirchenstein](#), 109 Conn. 77, 86, 145 A. 753 (1929). "The suggested analogy between the action by a wife against her husband for personal injuries suffered through his negligence, which we permit, and a like action by a child against his parent is not a close one. We based our decision in [Brown v. Brown](#), 88 Conn. 42, 89 A. 889, upon the Married Women's Act, which took effect April 20th, 1877, under which, as we construed that Act, the wife in marriages thereafter contracted, retained her own legal identity, formerly merged in that of her husband, and the logical result of that changed status gave to her the right to maintain an action against her husband for a tort committed upon her person as she might against a third person who had committed a like tort. [Bushnell v. Bushnell](#), 103 Conn. 583, 131 A. 432. The Act gave the wife a separate and independent legal identity and conferred upon her the same rights arising out of contracts or torts that her husband possessed."
- [Brown v. Brown](#), 88 Conn. 42, 45 (1914). ". . . the right of husband and wife to sue each other for breach of contract is one of the consequences of the new status established by the Act."
- [Marri v. Stamford Street Railroad Company](#). 84 Conn. 9 (1911). "Women married on or after April 20th, may sue for and recover in her own name compensation for all personal, physical injuries sustained by her and negligently caused by another." (*Hopson v. St. Mary's Hospital*, 176 Conn. 485 (1979) has overruled *Marri* concerning the preclusion of a cause of action for loss of consortium.)

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Husband and Wife*
 - 111. Married Women's Property Act
 - 112. _____. Constitutionality
 - 113. _____. Construction and operation in general
 - 114. _____. Retroactive operation

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 7 Arnold H. Rutkin Et Al., Connecticut Practice Series, [Family Law And Practice With Forms](#) (3d ed. 2010).
 - § 7.1 Married Women's Property Act
 - § 7.2 Property Rights of Married Persons
 - § 7.3 Authority of Spouses to Act for Each Other
 - § 7.4 Property Acquired During the Marriage
 - § 7.5 Partition

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 41 [C.J.S.](#) *Husband and Wife* (2006).
 - § 4. Unity; effect of Married Women's Acts
 - § 10. Right to own separate property
- 41 [AM. JUR. 2d](#) *Husband & Wife* (2005).
 - § 3. Statutory supersession of common-law status of married women
 - § 11. Right to hold property separately; generally
 - § 12. —Validity of transfer intended to defeat rights of surviving spouse
 - § 13. Rights of nonholding spouse respecting separately held property
 - § 14. What constitutes separately held property; generally
 - § 15. Earnings of spouses
 - § 16. Profits and proceeds
 - § 17. Presumptions and proof of separate ownership; generally
 - § 18. Estate by entireties; generally
 - § 19. Distinction between estate by entireties and joint tenancy
 - § 20. Prevalence today; effect of Married Women's Acts

LAW REVIEWS:

- *Law of the domicile, capacity of a married woman to make a personal contract*, 27 YALE LAW JOURNAL 669 (1912).
- *Late Nineteenth Century Married Women's Property Law: Reception of the Early Married Women's Property Acts by Courts and Legislatures*, by Chused, Richard H. 29 AM. J. LEGAL HIST. (1985).

COMPILER:

Christopher Roy, Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Library at New Britain, 20 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051. 860-515-5110. [Email](#).

- * Originally compiled by Lawrence Cheeseman, retired Connecticut Judicial Branch Supervising Law Librarian.

Section 2: Property Rights of Spouses

A Guide to Resources in the Law Library

SCOPE:

Bibliographic sources relating to the property rights of each spouse in an ongoing marriage.

SEE ALSO:

- Alimony Research Guide: [§ 1. Duty to Support Spouse](#)
- Child Support Research Guide: [§ 1. Duty to Support Children](#)

DEFINITIONS:

- **Joint duty of support:** "It is clear that the statute [CONN. GEN. STATS. § 46b-10, now § 46b-37] imposes a joint liability upon the husband and the wife regardless of which one of them made the contract for the services." [Maislin v. Lawton](#), 30 Conn. Sup. 593, 594, 314 A.2d 783 (1973).
- "Indeed, since 1903, when the statute was first amended to include the language establishing liability for the 'services of a physician'; Public Acts 1903, c. 9; the legislature has amended the statute several times. See Public Acts 2001, No. 01-195, § 35; Public Acts 1992, No. 92-140; Public Acts 1988, No. 88-364, § 58; Public Acts 1978, No. 78-230, § 17; Public Acts 1977, No. 77-288, § 1; see also Public Acts 1957, No. 191 (amended to include 'services of a . . . dentist'); Public Acts 1943, No. 166 (amended to include 'hospital expenses'); cf. Public Acts 1935, c. 60." [Wilton Meadows Ltd. Partnership v. Coratolo](#), 299 Conn. 819, 14 A.3d 982 (2011).
- **Necessities:** "The parent's and spouse's duty to support his family extends to the provision of necessities, that is, suitable clothing, lodging, food and medical attendance." [United States v. Edwards](#), 572 F. Supp. 1527, 1537 (1983).

STATUTES:

- CONN. GEN. STAT. (2011).
 - [§ 46b-36](#). Wife and husband property rights not affected by marriage
 - [§ 46b-37](#). Joint duty of spouses to support family. Liability for purchases and certain expenses. Abandonment.
"[I]t shall be the joint duty of each spouse to support his or her family, and both shall be liable for . . ."
 - [§ 45a-631](#). Minor's property to be received or used only by guardian of estate. Release.
 - [§ 19a-550](#). Patients' bill of rights. (nursing homes)

CASES:

- [Wilton Meadows Ltd. Partnership v. Coratolo](#), 299 Conn. 819, 14 A.3d 982 (2011). "We therefore conclude that excluding nursing home expenses from spousal liability under § 46b-37 (b) creates 'a harmonious and consistent body of law,' and one that 'makes sense within the overall legislative scheme.' (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Sokaitis v. Bakaysa*, supra, 293 Conn. 23. In so doing, we also conclude that the trial court properly determined that § 46b-37 (b) (4) does not include services or general expenses associated with nursing home care, including food and medicine consumed by nursing home residents."
- [Yale Diagnostic Radiology v. Estate of Harun Fountain](#), 267 Conn. 351, 838 A. 2d 179 (2004). The defendants claim, however, that the doctrine of necessities has been legislatively abrogated by § 46b-37 (b) (2). . . . We disagree. Section 46b-37 (b) (2) governs the joint liability of parents for the support and maintenance of their family, and, in doing so, merely codifies the common-law principle, long recognized in Connecticut, that both parents are *primarily* responsible for providing necessary goods and services to their children.
- [Yale University School Of Medicine v. Scianna](#), 45 Conn. Sup. 84, 87, 701 A.2d 65 (1997). "The problem lies in the statute's requirement that the availability of what might be called the separation defense depends on the provision of reasonable support. This provision makes sense when the person being sued is the spouse obligated to provide support. If that spouse chooses not to comply with his support obligation he is undeserving of the law's solicitude and can justly be sued for services rendered to the unsupported spouse. But what if the person being sued is the recipient of support? How can the law justly hinge the availability of the separation defense on the provision of reasonable support under these circumstances? That is the problem in this case."
- [Cherniack v. Home National Bank & Trust Co.](#), 151 Conn. 367, 368, 198 A.2d 58 (1964). "It is important to bear in mind in this connection that under Connecticut law neither husband nor wife acquires, by virtue of the marriage, any interest in the real or personal property of the other during that other's lifetime."
- [North v. North](#), 183 Conn. 35, 39-40, 438 A.2d 807 (1981). "Although a party may have received property through inheritance, assigning such property to the other spouse does not violate § 46b-36."
- [Wagner v. Mutual Life Insurance Co.](#), 88 Conn. 536, 542, 91 A. 1012 (1914). "From the finding it appears that Mrs. Wagner always retained the possession and control of, and collected the income from, her personal property free from the domination and supervision of her husband; and that as to the proceeds of the securities sold and loaned him, and all other loans made, he agreed to repay the same with interest. It is also found that Mr. Wagner always treated the moneys loaned him by Mrs. Wagner, and all of her securities, as her sole and separate estate."

CASES:
(continued)

ACT FOR EACH OTHER

- [Botticello v. Stefanovic](#), 177 Conn. 22, 27, 411 A.2d 16 (1979). "Moreover, the fact that one spouse tends more to business matters than the other does not, absent other evidence of agreement or authorization, constitute the delegation of power as to an agent."
- [Schneidau v. Manley](#), 131 Conn. 285, 288, 39 A.2d 885 (1944). "The burden rested on the plaintiff to prove that Manley [husband] in agreeing upon the sale of the property, in so far as his wife's undivided interest therein was concerned, was acting as her agent with the scope of his authority."
- [Cyclone Fence Co. v. McAviney](#), 121 Conn. 656, 659, 186 A. 635 (1936). "The marital relation per se bestowed no authority upon the husband to act as agent for the wife or to enter into a binding contract for her without her consent."

PRESUMPTIONS

- [Utzler v. Braca](#), 115 Conn. App. 261, 972 A. 2d 743 (2009). "The plaintiff has, however, cited no authority for the proposition that the law presumes that one spouse has been unjustly enriched by the other spouse's misappropriation of a third person's property. Indeed, enactment of chapter 114 of the Public Acts of 1877, p. 211 (now General Statutes § 46b-36) entitled 'An Act in Alteration of the Act concerning Domestic Relations,' but commonly called the Married Women's Act, makes such an argument untenable."
- [Franke v. Franke](#), 140 Conn. 133, 139, 98 A.2d 804 (1953). "If the purchase price is paid by one spouse and the conveyance is taken in the name of the other, there is a presumption that a gift was intended This presumption, however is one of fact and not of law and may be rebutted."
- [Newman v. Newman](#), 134 Conn. 176, 179, 55 A.2d 916 (1947). "Where one spouse puts up a building on land owned in common by husband and wife, without any understanding or agreement that the other shall share the expense, the presumption that it was for the joint benefit of both must prevail."

CONVEYANCES

- [New Haven Trolley & Bus Employees Credit Union v. Hill](#), 145 Conn. 332, 334, 142 A.2d 730 (1958). "Under our law the legal effect of such a conveyances [to husband and wife] is as though the grantees were unrelated."
- [Hughes v. Fairfield Lumber and Supply Co.](#), 19 Conn. Supp. 138, 139, 110 A.2d 730 (1955). "In this state, husband and wife takes as joint tenants and a conveyance of his interest by one of them is valid and effectual."

**WEST KEY
NUMBERS:**

- *Husband and Wife*
#68-76 Property & Conveyances
#110 et seq. Wife's separate estate

DIGESTS:

- U.S. SUPREME COURT DIGEST: *Husband and Wife* §§ 16-31
§§ 16-23. Wife's separate estate or business
§§ 24, 25. Contracts with or conveyances to each other
§§ 26-31. Conveyances or mortgages to third person
- ALR DIGEST: *Husband and Wife*

ENCYCLOPEDIAS:

- 41 [C.J.S.](#) *Husband & Wife* (2006).
§ 10 Right to own separate property
§ 12 Rights of creditors in separate property of debtor's spouse
§ 13 What constitutes separate property
§ 66 Duty of support, generally
§ 72 Doctrine of necessities
- 41 [AM. JUR. 2d](#) *Husband & Wife* (2005).
Property rights and interests §§11-44
Liability of debts of other spouse §§ 141-145
Duty of support §§ 146-182
- Annotation, *Rights of married woman as creditor of husband*,
16 L.Ed. 416

**TEXTS &
TREATISES:**

- 7 Arnold H. Rutkin Et Al., Connecticut Practice Series, [Family Law And Practice With Forms](#) (3d ed. 2010).
§ 7.2 Property Rights of Married Persons
§ 7.3 Authority of Spouses to Act for Each Other
§ 7.4 Property Acquired During the Marriage
§ 7.5 Partition

COMPILER:

Christopher Roy, Connecticut Judicial Branch Law Library at New Britain, 20 Franklin Square, New Britain, CT 06051.
860-515-5110. [Email](#).

- * Originally compiled by Lawrence Cheeseman, retired Connecticut Judicial Branch Supervising Law Librarian.

Table 1: Joint Duty of Spouses to Support Family

Joint Duty of Spouses to Support Family Conn. Gen. Stats. § 46b-37 (2011)	
Purchases by spouse	(a) Any purchase made by either a husband or wife in his or her own name shall be presumed, in the absence of notice to the contrary, to be made by him or her as an individual and he or she shall be liable for the purchase.
Necessities	(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, it shall be the joint duty of each spouse to support his or her family, and both shall be liable for: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The reasonable and necessary services of a physician or dentist; (2) hospital expenses rendered the husband or wife or minor child while residing in the family of his or her parents; (3) the rental of any dwelling unit actually occupied by the husband and wife as a residence and reasonably necessary to them for that purpose; and (4) any article purchased by either which has in fact gone to the support of the family, or for the joint benefit of both.
Abandoned spouse	(c). Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, a spouse who abandons his or her spouse without cause shall be liable for the reasonable support of such other spouse while abandoned.
Separation	(d). No action may be maintained against either spouse under the provisions of this section, either during or after any period of separation from the other spouse, for any liability incurred by the other spouse during the separation, if, during the separation the spouse who is liable for support of the other spouse has provided the other spouse with reasonable support.
Abandonment without cause	Abandonment without cause by a spouse shall be a defense to any liability pursuant to the provisions of subdivisions (1) to (4), inclusive, of subsection (b) of this section for expenses incurred by and for the benefit of such spouse. Nothing in this subsection shall affect the duty of a parent to support his or her minor child.