Don’t Let Death be Your Deadline Get a Will Before It’s Too Late: Expand Holographic-Wills Law to Incentivize Will-Making

Angela Vallario[[1]](#footnote-2)\*

Procrastination is the number one reason for Americans’ lack of will-making. Many fail to get this important task completed before death despite acknowledging its importance. No one thing will remedy the lack of will-making in America. This Article suggests one way to address the problem is to more aggressively educate people on why a will is necessary, especially when blended families and children are part of the intestate’s family. The education efforts should target young adults in their senior year of high school and be further employed at universities, coupled with broader efforts to reach adults. Law students, in line with ABA303(a)(3), are uniquely situated to provide education to their communities and local area. Additionally, attorney-supervised law students could engage in will-making while simultaneously creating experiential learning opportunities.

Secondly, Americans need a self-help option that is readily available when needed. This minimizes concerns of the holographic will by expanding holographic-will law to include a one-page fill-in the blank statutory form. Although a professionally prepared will is ideal, there need to be other options to encourage will-making. Americans are self-sufficient and making a holographic form available when people have medical issues or travel could incentivize some to prepare a holographic form as a stepping stone towards a more complex estate plan, and serve as a placeholder to avoid intestacy in the event of the inevitable.

Introduction

According to a recent national opinion survey,[[2]](#footnote-3) most Americans do not have any estate planning documents in place (e.g., wills).[[3]](#footnote-4) Several prominent predeceased political figures and famous celebrities failed to prepare a will before death.[[4]](#footnote-5) Surprisingly, the COVID-19 pandemic did not have much of an impact on Americans’ reluctance to get their affairs in order.[[5]](#footnote-6) A 2022 survey by Caring.com (herein “2022 Survey”) revealed that the threat of COVID-19 motivated younger adults (18-34) to prepare wills,[[6]](#footnote-7) but the overall number of Americans without a will remains high, at sixty-seven percent (67%).[[7]](#footnote-8) The 2022 Survey confirmed that most Americans do not have a will.[[8]](#footnote-9) Although most people acknowledge the need for a will, they fail to put one in place.[[9]](#footnote-10) The 2022 Survey consistently reported procrastination as Americans’ primary reason for not having a will.[[10]](#footnote-11) Americans’ second highest justification was not having enough assets to need estate planning.[[11]](#footnote-12)

This Article begins by examining national surveys as to why people do not have wills.[[12]](#footnote-13) This Article makes two recommendations on how to incentivize will-making: (1) educate Americans as to the essential nature of wills,[[13]](#footnote-14) and (2) urge jurisdictions to expand holographic-will legislation.[[14]](#footnote-15)

First, Americans should be educated as to why a will is essential for every adult.[[15]](#footnote-16) The education must include the consequences of not having a will and its significant disadvantages, especially those impacting blended families and children.[[16]](#footnote-17) Multiple marriages and stepchildren were not contemplated in the intestacy laws and are detrimentally impacted by outdated statutes.[[17]](#footnote-18) Further, the default statutes do not protect children who need guardians and a management mechanism for their inheritance, which can easily be accomplished with a Uniform Transfers to Minors Act (UTMA) provision in a simple will.[[18]](#footnote-19) An introduction to the need for a will should begin when a person attains legal capacity, typically during his or her senior year in high school.[[19]](#footnote-20) The education efforts should be part of the needed financial literacy programs for young adults in high school and college.[[20]](#footnote-21) Educational programs and discounted service opportunities must also be made available. These efforts require volunteers—which is where law schools and their students could create experiential learning opportunities by educating their communities and providing legal services in a supervised environment.[[21]](#footnote-22)

Second, Americans need to be provided with a “quick-fix” to their lack of will-making. This Article recommends that jurisdictions expand holographic-will legislation to add a holographic form,[[22]](#footnote-23) which would allow people to take matters more easily into their own hands. A holographic will is in the testator’s handwriting and is unwitnessed.[[23]](#footnote-24) In 2021, television host Larry King disposed of his $50,000,000 estate with his handwritten will that said, “I want 100% of my estate divided equally among my children.”[[24]](#footnote-25) Currently, forty-four (44) states permit holographic wills,[[25]](#footnote-26) but this Article suggests that holographic-will law be further expanded to more easily provide Americans with a self-help option.[[26]](#footnote-27) The legislation should adopt the UPC’s “material portion” requirement and add a simple one-page holographic form requiring the form to be completed in the testator’s handwriting.[[27]](#footnote-28) Additionally, to incentivize will-making, the holographic form must be accessible and available at locations where people might contemplate death and where they are more likely to implement the form.[[28]](#footnote-29) Although a holographic will has its disadvantages,[[29]](#footnote-30) it could serve as a stepping stone for those willing to explore more comprehensive estate planning and would be sufficient to avoid intestacy in the event of the inevitable.[[30]](#footnote-31)

I. The Caring.com Surveys

From 2017 to the present, Caring.com has conducted national surveys of 2,500-2,600 Americans collecting data on whether those surveyed had a will.[[31]](#footnote-32) These will surveys were intended to raise awareness of the importance of estate planning, especially among people that may not feel that they had the resources or tools needed to create a will. The surveys consistently found that most did not have a will.[[32]](#footnote-33) The 2022 Survey identifies a list of common reasons why people have not prepared a will.[[33]](#footnote-34) According to the survey, the number one reason why people have not prepared a will is procrastination.[[34]](#footnote-35) The second most common response was that they did not have enough wealth.[[35]](#footnote-36) Fewer responded that they did not know how to create a will or that it would be too expensive.[[36]](#footnote-37) This data showed that despite not having a will, a majority of people believe estate planning documents are very important.[[37]](#footnote-38) The Caring.com surveys are not alone in recognizing such trends.[[38]](#footnote-39) Nearly two-thirds of Americans acknowledge they do not have a will.[[39]](#footnote-40) This well-known dilemma needs to be addressed, yet incentivizing will-making has proven to be difficult.[[40]](#footnote-41) One would think that the COVID-19 pandemic would have incentivized will-making, but it did not.[[41]](#footnote-42) More aggressive efforts need to be made toward educating younger people as to why a will is necessary and providing them with a self-help option to resolve the dilemma.

II. Educate Americans on Why a Will is Necessary and the Consequences of Dying Intestate

Educating adults early and often on the disadvantages of intestacy helps people appreciate why everyone needs a will.[[42]](#footnote-43) Education should begin when the person gains legal capacity.[[43]](#footnote-44) Education efforts could be a part of the much-needed drive to add financial literacy programs in high schools as a starting point.[[44]](#footnote-45) Although each jurisdiction has intestate succession statutes that determine a person’s heirs[[45]](#footnote-46) if the person dies without a will, education efforts should focus on the consequences of dying intestate.[[46]](#footnote-47) Intestacy statutes are based on what lawmakers objectively believe most people would want, without any consideration as to the specific family relations, and provide one-size-fits-all default statutes.[[47]](#footnote-48) Many intestate succession statutes were also enacted more than half a century ago with few changes to reflect modern times.[[48]](#footnote-49) Unfortunately, because these laws address the unrepresented, they do not receive much attention from lawmakers until someone is harmed, who then takes the impact to lawmakers.[[49]](#footnote-50) For example, in 2019, Maryland’s General Assembly modified its intestacy laws as to the intestate’s spouse,[[50]](#footnote-51) when a spouse of twenty-eight years was required to share her deceased spouse’s probate estate with his parents.[[51]](#footnote-52) The spouse testified before legislators for two consecutive years to modify Maryland law to no benefit of her own.[[52]](#footnote-53) However, the entire intestacy regime is outdated and needs to be updated.[[53]](#footnote-54) There are many disadvantages to having intestacy control the disposition of probate wealth at death.[[54]](#footnote-55) This Article’s focus is on significant problems impacting blended families and children.

A. Disregard of Blended Families

Intestacy laws were enacted when blended families were less prevalent than they are today.[[55]](#footnote-56) The outdated intestacy provisions do not appropriately account for stepchildren in determining the intestate’s heirs.[[56]](#footnote-57) Under the current intestacy regime, a stepchild, who lacks the blood connection to the intestate, is the last to inherit,[[57]](#footnote-58) before the property escheats.[[58]](#footnote-59) Therefore, distant blood relatives, such as aunts and uncles (descendants of grandparents), inherit to the exclusion of stepchildren.[[59]](#footnote-60)

1. Stepchild Problem

The stepchild’s lack of blood connection to the intestate should not be determinative. If lawmakers were to re-examine the objective intent of testators considering the twenty-first century family, stepchildren would be included. Like adopted children, stepchildren should inherit sooner than distant blood relatives despite the lack of blood connection to the intestate.[[60]](#footnote-61) Under current law, stepparent adoption has additional disadvantages for the stepchild because it artificially removes the stepchild from the biological parent’s family tree.[[61]](#footnote-62) In 2017, the Uniform Parentage Act was promulgated by the Uniform Law Commission (ULC), and modified the definition of family.[[62]](#footnote-63) In 2019, the ULC proposed an amendment (hereinafter “2019 Amendment”) to the Uniform Parentage Act’s treatment of intestate succession.[[63]](#footnote-64) The 2019 Amendment creates *de facto* parenthood,[[64]](#footnote-65) allowing a stepchild to have more than two lines of family.[[65]](#footnote-66) If adopted by the states, the expanded definition of family treats a stepchild as a child of both the biological parents and stepparent, and resolves the stepchild problem for those adopted.[[66]](#footnote-67) The adopted stepchild is treated as an adopted child and thus moves up in the family tree without removing himself/herself from the biological parent’s (parent not married to stepparent) family tree.[[67]](#footnote-68) This allows the adopted stepchild to inherit as a descendant under both the biological parents and adopting parent.[[68]](#footnote-69) Nevertheless, adoption of the stepchild requires the consent of the biological parent and may not always be an option.[[69]](#footnote-70) Despite the progress made with the yet-to-be-adopted 2019 Amendment,[[70]](#footnote-71) the stepchild problem remains for those unadopted, which is why a will is essential when a stepchild is part of the intestate’s family.[[71]](#footnote-72)

2. Executor Conflicts

Another problem stemming from intestacy’s disregard of blended families is the appointment of an executor or personal representative (collectively “executor”) primarily in multiple marriages.[[72]](#footnote-73) When someone dies without a will, the intestate succession statutes provide a statutory priority as to who is granted letters of administration.[[73]](#footnote-74) The first in line for the appointment are the spouse and the intestate’s adult children.[[74]](#footnote-75) Having the spouse and adult children from a prior marriage equally entitled to serve as executor presents obvious conflicts.[[75]](#footnote-76) Additionally, the statutory priorities provide that all adult children are equally entitled to letters, which could cause sibling rivalry and destroy family bonds.[[76]](#footnote-77)

B. Failure to Protect Children

In addition to the disregard of blended families, the intestate succession statutes fail to protect children who are left without a guardian or any management mechanism for their inheritance.[[77]](#footnote-78)

1. Guardian

A child under the age of 18 (minor) needs a guardian upon the death of his or her parents.[[78]](#footnote-79) Minors cannot own property and thus require a guardian of the person and a guardian of the property (unless otherwise indicated, collectively, “guardian”).[[79]](#footnote-80) The guardian must be an adult legally responsible to supervise a child and administer the minor’s property.[[80]](#footnote-81) Without a will, appointing a guardian for a minor is costly and time-consuming, and creates much uncertainty and chaos for the minor.[[81]](#footnote-82) The court process begins with a court appointment based on a petition.[[82]](#footnote-83) The petition must be filed by “a person interested in the welfare of the minor.”[[83]](#footnote-84) The potential petitioners include the minor’s heirs and any government agency that is paying benefits to the minor.[[84]](#footnote-85) Yet, a will is an easy way to make such a guardianship appointment.[[85]](#footnote-86) Therefore, regardless of wealth, parents with minor children need a will to appoint a guardian should both parents die.[[86]](#footnote-87) The testamentary appointment of a guardian named in the will eliminates the need for court intervention.[[87]](#footnote-88) Petitioners with few limitations[[88]](#footnote-89) present additional problems for stepchildren.[[89]](#footnote-90) A will could have named one guardian for biological children and stepchildren.[[90]](#footnote-91) In addition to the lengthy and expensive court process of appointing a guardian, minors may need to have separate legal representation,[[91]](#footnote-92) and each guardian of the property will be required to submit annual accountings to the court.[[92]](#footnote-93)

2. Inheritance Management

Intestacy also fails to provide for any inheritance management for minors.[[93]](#footnote-94) A simple will could include a minor’s provision indicating that any payment made to a beneficiary who has not attained the age of majority shall be distributed to a custodian under the Uniform Transfers to Minors Act (UTMA) until the child reaches age twenty-one.[[94]](#footnote-95) Without a will providing for property managed under the UTMA, the property of a minor must be held in a Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) account,[[95]](#footnote-96) with petitions required of the guardian for withdrawals.[[96]](#footnote-97)

The consequences of allowing intestacy to have the final word, and its failure to appoint an executor or guardian for minor children, need to be broadcasted among Americans.[[97]](#footnote-98) For those with minor children, there is no excuse to not prioritize will-making, which is essential regardless of the level of wealth, and this information must find its way to procrastinators.

C. Educate Americans Early and Often

Education efforts should begin as high school graduates go off to college, trade schools, join the military or enter the workforce. Early intervention should be the norm, impressing upon young people the significance of becoming an adult.[[98]](#footnote-99) Early introduction as to the need for a will and the consequences of dying intestate provides a greater chance of buy-in.[[99]](#footnote-100) If young adults are given opportunities to get their affairs in order, it could inspire their parents to lead by example and to do the same.[[100]](#footnote-101) Changing the culture about wills and beginning the conversation sooner are keys to resolving the widespread lack of will-making dilemma.[[101]](#footnote-102) Since no one knows the exact moment of his or her death, the sooner people are educated as to the importance of will-making, the better chance he or she prepares a will, allowing it to serve as a placeholder for its subsequent update.[[102]](#footnote-103)

Colleges and universities should communicate to their students the need for a will in pre-law, accounting, economics, and finance courses.[[103]](#footnote-104) Academic institutions should incorporate the importance of a will through broader incentives to promote financial literacy among their students.[[104]](#footnote-105) Institutions, as educators and employers, should encourage will-making by providing their students and employees with an optional legal-benefits plan[[105]](#footnote-106) (similar to how those institutions offer health insurance).[[106]](#footnote-107)

Reaching adults after the accumulation of wealth, marriage, and/or children can be more difficult because, unlike in high schools and universities, there is no captive audience. However, efforts to encourage will-making could be accomplished with employer-provided legal-benefits plans,[[107]](#footnote-108) newspaper articles,[[108]](#footnote-109) programs offered at schools,[[109]](#footnote-110) community centers,[[110]](#footnote-111) financial institutions,[[111]](#footnote-112) assisted living locations,[[112]](#footnote-113) churches,[[113]](#footnote-114) libraries,[[114]](#footnote-115) television,[[115]](#footnote-116) and social media.[[116]](#footnote-117) These programs need to be coupled with low-cost opportunities to complete the task.[[117]](#footnote-118)

Educating people early and often at different stages in life by using opportunities where a captive audience exists is one way to spread the message, thus creating the conversation sooner in hopes that the dialogue will motivate some to act. This could be done at high schools by partnering with attorney-parents, attorney-alumni, and local state bar associations. Those lawyers could assist with the will-preparation for students at discounted fees or satisfy state pro bono mandates.[[118]](#footnote-119) Additionally, for parents of students, a list of referrals could be provided with lawyers willing to provide services at discounted fees. This initiative encourages legal volunteers to educate the community and service potential demands.

Law schools could play a vital role as community educators and providers of will-making services. Law students are often educated on the need for a will and the consequences of intestacy in trusts and estates, estate planning, and other related courses.[[119]](#footnote-120) Those educated law students can then become messengers for their law schools and the broader community. Supervised law students are uniquely situated to deliver the education and needed access to will preparation.[[120]](#footnote-121) In 2014, the American Bar Association Standard 303(a)(3) imposed a six (6) experiential credit requirement on law school students to satisfy with a law clinic or externship experience.[[121]](#footnote-122) Clinics are a popular way of satisfying these experiential credits, but there are too few estate planning clinics[[122]](#footnote-123) despite everyone needing a will regardless of wealth.[[123]](#footnote-124) Law schools could create experiential opportunities for their students by having supervised law students educate their communities and provide the needed will-making services. Will preparation is in line with ABA Standard 303(a)(3) and enhances learning.[[124]](#footnote-125) Law professors could partner with legal aid organizations, law school alumni, and the probate courts to educate and provide limited services to their communities in furtherance of the ABA’s experiential mandate.[[125]](#footnote-126)

Education efforts cannot reach all Americans,[[126]](#footnote-127) so it is also necessary to provide Americans with an easy self-help option to prepare their own will when they are inclined to do so. One way to incentive will-making is to expand holographic-will law and provide a template (holographic form) for Americans to complete in their own handwriting.

PART III: Expand Holographic-will Legislation to Incentivize Will-Making

One takeaway from the pandemic is that it empowered people to take matters into their own hands by finding alternatives to the gym, doctor visits, and classroom instruction.[[127]](#footnote-128) Because an individual can also prepare his or her own will without an attorney, this Article recommends that jurisdictions expand holographic-will legislation to make it easier for Americans to take matters into their own hands.[[128]](#footnote-129) A holographic will is an unwitnessed will that is in the testator’s handwriting,[[129]](#footnote-130) which does not comply with the jurisdiction’s attested-will statutes.[[130]](#footnote-131)

A. Attested Wills

An attested will is recognized in every state for persons with legal and testamentary capacity.[[131]](#footnote-132) Jurisdictions vary on attested-will requirements, but most states require an attested will be written, signed by the testator, and attested to by two witnesses.[[132]](#footnote-133) The witness requirement evolved from the Wills Act,[[133]](#footnote-134) and its purpose is to protect against fraud and perjury.[[134]](#footnote-135) Some jurisdictions require the witnesses to be of a certain age,[[135]](#footnote-136) some require the witnesses to be credible,[[136]](#footnote-137) and others require witnesses to be disinterested.[[137]](#footnote-138) The presence requirement also varies among jurisdictions.[[138]](#footnote-139) If the attested will fails to strictly comply with the statutory formalities of the jurisdiction of domicile at death, then *de facto* wills could be recognized using a savings statute or harmless error.[[139]](#footnote-140)

1. *De Facto* Attested Wills

Every state has a savings statute allowing the attested will to be valid in the jurisdiction of domicile if it would be valid in the jurisdiction where the will was executed.[[140]](#footnote-141) These savings statutes, otherwise known as choice of law statutes, recognize a document that does not comply with the domicile jurisdiction’s attested-formalities to be admitted to probate if the will complies with the laws of the jurisdiction where it was executed.[[141]](#footnote-142) Therefore, if a will is not in compliance with the laws of the jurisdiction of domicile, it will be treated as valid in the domicile jurisdiction if prepared per the attested will statute of the jurisdiction in which it was executed.[[142]](#footnote-143)

Additionally, if an attested will fails to satisfy the attested-will requirements of the jurisdiction of domicile at death, some jurisdictions, by statute or common law, will treat the will as valid if the formality flaw amounts to a “harmless error.”[[143]](#footnote-144) The harmless error rule permits a document to be considered valid even though it did not strictly comply with the jurisdiction’s formal will requirements.[[144]](#footnote-145) The proponent of the document must show by clear and convincing evidence that the document was intended to be the decedent’s will.[[145]](#footnote-146) This doctrine will permit a document with minor errors to be probated.[[146]](#footnote-147) However, a document that entirely lacks compliance will not be admitted to probate.[[147]](#footnote-148) Some jurisdictions have even adopted a “partial” harmless error doctrine where certain errors involving lack of compliance are forgiven, but other errors are not.[[148]](#footnote-149)

Distinguished from the attested will, most states also statutorily recognize holographic wills, which must include some handwritten insertion by the testator.[[149]](#footnote-150) Thirty-one states recognize holographic wills by a holographic-will statute.[[150]](#footnote-151) An additional eleven states allow *de facto* holographs through a separate savings statute[[151]](#footnote-152) and two more recognize holographic wills using harmless error.[[152]](#footnote-153) Currently, Americans can prepare a holographic will in forty-four jurisdictions with only six states—Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Missouri, New Hampshire, Ohio, and the District of Columbia—prohibiting holographic wills.[[153]](#footnote-154)

B. Holographic-will legislation

Under common law, holographic wills had to be entirely in the handwriting of the testator, signed at the physical end, and dated.[[154]](#footnote-155) The thirty-one states recognizing holographic wills by statute all require the document to be signed by the testator (as opposed to proxy),[[155]](#footnote-156) but vary as to the other statutory requirements.[[156]](#footnote-157) For purposes of discussion, this Article has categorized the statutory requirements by those that (1) allow holographic wills only for persons in the military, (2) vary as to the extent of the testator’s handwritten insertion, (3) must be dated, (4) require witness testimony, (5) mirror the attested wills and (6) allow *de facto* holographs.

1. Military Holographs

Holographic wills were initially reserved for those in the armed forces where legal advice and witnesses were not readily available.[[157]](#footnote-158) Initially intended only for those deployed for war, military holograph states now recognize holographs during a declared or undeclared war and other armed conflict.[[158]](#footnote-159) Maryland, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont are the only states with military holographs.[[159]](#footnote-160) Military holographs must be wholly in the handwriting of the testator and signed while in the armed forces outside the United States.[[160]](#footnote-161) A further limitation is that military holographs remain valid for a year after discharge from the armed forces unless the testator lacks testamentary capacity, in which case, they remain valid until death.[[161]](#footnote-162)

2. Extent of Testator’s Handwritten Insertion

Holographic-will statutes require the testator’s signature and at least a “material portion” be in the testator’s handwriting.[[162]](#footnote-163) The ULC promulgated three generations of holographic will requirements. The first generation, like military holographs, must be entirely handwritten. The second generation requires “material provisions” to be in the testator’s handwriting. The third generation requires a “material portion” be in the testator’s handwriting.[[163]](#footnote-164) The testator’s “penmanship serves as concrete evidence of authenticity.”[[164]](#footnote-165) Today, jurisdictions vary as to the extent of the testator’s handwriting required.[[165]](#footnote-166) Rather than codifying common law requirements, states borrowed and modified those requirements.[[166]](#footnote-167) The requirement that the document be entirely in the testator’s handwriting has been said to “clothe the document with indicia of authenticity.”[[167]](#footnote-168) Five states allow holographs for any purpose (not limited to military) provided that the will is written entirely in the handwriting of the testator.[[168]](#footnote-169) This “entirely handwritten” requirement has resulted in the invalidation of holographic wills that were clearly intended to serve as testamentary transfers.[[169]](#footnote-170) In 2021, North Carolina modified its holographic law requiring the holograph to be entirely handwritten with a codification that printed information would not invalidate the wills as long as the handwritten aspect was sufficient to constitute a holographic will.[[170]](#footnote-171) Requiring the document be entirely in the handwriting of the testator increases the likelihood that the holographic will would be invalid, partially dispose of assets, and potentially neglect to include the appointment of the executor or guardian.[[171]](#footnote-172)

In 1969, the ULC promulgated holographic-will law that validated a handwritten will as long as the “material provisions” of the document were in the handwriting of the testator.[[172]](#footnote-173) However, the ULC in 1990 modified its holographic-will law requiring only the “material portion” of the document to be in the testator’s handwriting.[[173]](#footnote-174) Nevertheless, Arizona, California, and Idaho retained the “material provisions” language.[[174]](#footnote-175) Nine jurisdictions currently require a “material portion” of the will to be in the testator’s handwriting.[[175]](#footnote-176) A “material portion” of the document requires the dispositive provisions, including words identifying the property and devise, to be in the testator’s handwriting.[[176]](#footnote-177) The “material portion” requirement allows for the testator to complete a pre-printed or computerized form.[[177]](#footnote-178)

3. Date Required

A date is rarely required of an attested will,[[178]](#footnote-179) yet holographic-will statutes in five jurisdictions require the holograph to be dated.[[179]](#footnote-180) These five jurisdictions vary as to the extent of the handwritten insertion, but statutorily require the document to be dated.[[180]](#footnote-181) Among the five states, Louisiana is the only state that has such a requirement for an attested will.[[181]](#footnote-182) For a holographic will, the date requirement is advisable due to the absence of a witness, making it challenging to know whether or not the holograph revoked other wills located at the testator’s death.[[182]](#footnote-183) If the holographic will is not dated, and no other wills are located, the holographic will could be found valid using harmless error or a savings statute.[[183]](#footnote-184) The date is an easy insertion, an important retention from common law, and clarifies any uncertainty as to whether the holograph implicitly revokes an earlier will.[[184]](#footnote-185)

4. Witness Testimony

Although there is no witness requirement for a holographic will, three states (Arkansas, Tennessee, and Virginia) mandate witness testimony to support that the handwritten document belongs to the testator.[[185]](#footnote-186) Although understandable, this requirement discourages holographs.[[186]](#footnote-187) In these jurisdictions, the probate of each and every holograph will require court intervention and would more likely deter holograph will-making due to the cost and time involved in having the will probated.

5. Holographs Mirror Attested Wills

Pennsylvania is the only state that does not distinguish between attested and holographic wills, requiring the will to be in writing (not handwritten) and signed at the end.[[187]](#footnote-188)

6. *De Fact*o Holographs

Like attested wills, some jurisdictions permit *de facto* holographs using a choice of law or harmless error principles.[[188]](#footnote-189) Eleven states have no holographic-will statute yet recognize holographic wills using another state’s law through a savings statute.[[189]](#footnote-190) Additionally, Minnesota and Oregon allow holographic wills under the harmless error doctrine.[[190]](#footnote-191) In total, thirteen states recognize *de facto* holographic wills.[[191]](#footnote-192)

C. Expand Holographic-Will Law to include Holographic Form

An expanded self-help option could inspire Americans to more easily address their procrastination toward making a will. UPC § 2-502(b) should be adopted and expanded to include a fill-in-the-blank form (holographic form) to be completed in the testator’s handwriting, and signed by the testator.[[192]](#footnote-193) Ideally, any legal document should be accompanied by the advice of legal counsel; however, surveys have consistently reported that this is not occurring among most people.[[193]](#footnote-194) The addition of a holographic form with instructions and warnings in laypersons’ terms is designed to minimize the holographic concerns while avoiding intestacy.[[194]](#footnote-195)

1. Expand Holographic-Will Law

UPC § 2-502(b) provides that “a will that does not comply with subsection (a) [attested will requirements] is a valid holographic will, whether or not witnessed if the signature and material portions of the document are in the testator’s handwriting.” (1) **a document in the form set below in section (c) may be used to create a valid holographic will. (2) an electronically transmitted copy of the holographic form is valid and binding as the original.**

****

2. Holographic Form

This Article proposes that holographic-will law be expanded to include a statutory form that must be completed only in the handwriting of the testator, thus meeting the “material portion” requirement already adopted by nine jurisdictions.[[195]](#footnote-196) The “material portion” adoption provides for the testator’s insertion requirement to be minimized.[[196]](#footnote-197) Although consistent with the UPC’s approach, requiring the holograph form to be completed in the testator’s handwriting removes any uncertainty as to what constitutes a “material portion.”[[197]](#footnote-198) The one-page fill-in-the-blank form includes important information and warning[[198]](#footnote-199) followed by three sections: Part I Fiduciaries; Part II Disposition of Assets; and Part III Minors Money Management, and is then signed and dated by the testator.

a. Important Information and Warning

As with any form, the holographic form should include instruction on its completion to increase the likelihood that the document is completed correctly.[[199]](#footnote-200) Like the statutory Power of Attorney, the holograph forms will attempt to warn the testator as to the risks associated with the self-help option.[[200]](#footnote-201) The warning emphasizes the holographic form as a legal document and its effect on prior wills. The form includes an express revocation of earlier wills in an attempt to avoid having multiple wills construed together.[[201]](#footnote-202) The suggestion that the form’s location be communicated to the named executor is necessary due to the nature of the holograph and the risks associated with no one being aware the testator prepared a will if it is not discovered upon death.[[202]](#footnote-203)

b. Fiduciaries

Naming an executor avoids the embedded conflicts problem.[[203]](#footnote-204) The appointment of a guardian addresses the single most important reason for testators with children to have a will.[[204]](#footnote-205) The appointment of both guardians of person and property is important because, in the case of the stepparent leaving property to the stepchild, the biological parent would automatically become the guardian of the person, but the stepparent may name a guardian of the property for the stepchild. These appointments are intentionally listed in Part I and designed to force the testator to identify this selection first, because oftentimes, these are difficult decisions which should be addressed before deciding how assets should be distributed.[[205]](#footnote-206)

c. Disposition of Estate

The dispositive provisions require the testator to indicate the condition of survivorship otherwise the anti-lapse statutes will apply. Every state has an anti-lapse statute that aids in the construction of a will when the named beneficiary has predeceased the testator.[[206]](#footnote-207) Laypersons do not understand the nuances of anti-lapse. However, while a discussion on whether the holographic form should draft around the default rules is beyond the scope of this Article, the instructions instruct the preparer to indicate survivorship if consistent with testamentary wishes. The self-help option is designed to be a straightforward, simple, and layperson-friendly way to make a complete disposition of the testator’s property to avoid intestacy.

d. Property Management for Minors

The UTMA, as part of the holographic form, provides some management mechanism for a minor’s inheritance to be managed until reaching the age of twenty-one. Although the scope of management will not be to the same extent as a trust,[[207]](#footnote-208) the UTMA is better than the alternative.[[208]](#footnote-209) Regardless of whether the testator names a guardian of the person, the UTMA provision allows the testator to name a guardian of the property to manage the inheritance for any minor.[[209]](#footnote-210)

3. Access

The one-page fill-in-the-blank holographic form is designed to encourage people to take advantage of the self-help option. Accessibility to consumers at schools, libraries, community centers, probate courts and a variety of government websites is important to encourage its use.[[210]](#footnote-211) Will-making can be incentivized by making forms readily available when one ponders his or her own demise, like when the testator in need of medical attention or while traveling.

a. Health Incentive

The holographic form should be readily available for patients at hospitals, surgery centers, rehabilitation centers, and nursing homes when the testator needs medical attention. Upon admission, in a non-emergency situation, a patient has an opportunity to think about his/her demise and may be more inclined to prepare a will.[[211]](#footnote-212) A holographic will could be offered to patients along with an advance medical directive upon admission to medical facilities. These forms should also be available through patient advocate services or to be downloaded from the state’s website.[[212]](#footnote-213)

b. Travel Incentive

Holographic-will forms should also be readily available at places of travel like airports, train stations, and ports, where people may think about the possibility of death, offering Americans an immediate opportunity to make a will.[[213]](#footnote-214) Holographic forms could be available upon request at customer service counters throughout places of travel. For those traveling alone or without children, who neglected to have a lawyer-prepared will before travel, the holographic will form could be the needed opportunity to memorialize testamentary wishes. With places of travel, there is a safekeeping dilemma in the event of death during travel, but, unlike the military holograph, when a passenger safely returns from travel the will remains valid.[[214]](#footnote-215) The expanded law recognizes this concern and suggests an electronically transmitted copy be valid.[[215]](#footnote-216) Passengers could take photos on their phone and email or upload to the Cloud for safekeeping in the event of death.

Consistent with early intervention in the education of young adults, the first step is the hardest. Once a holograph form exists, it may encourage people to prioritize a legal review or update with a more comprehensive estate plan. Ideally wills should be prepared by lawyers, but the problem of Americans not preparing wills outweighs the ideal situation. Offering individuals the holographic form by making them readily available when people contemplate death could encourage more people exercise testamentary freedom before it is too late.

D. Benefits and Concerns of the Holographic Form

Critics of holographic wills have several concerns. First, the holograph could be the product of fraud or forgery due to the lack of a witness or family members attempting “to probate handwritten documents that were never intended as wills.”[[216]](#footnote-217) Fraud or forgery is an obvious concern of an unwitnessed will that is effective upon the death of the preparer.[[217]](#footnote-218) However, there is no meaningful evidence that supports such concern.[[218]](#footnote-219) The holographic form is a low-cost will that avoids intestacy and its consequences. The use of the statutory form encouraged by the expanded holographic laws makes it less likely for family members to probate documents that were not intended as wills.[[219]](#footnote-220) The holographic form unlike other statutory forms is short, straightforward, and does not try to make a lawyer out of a layperson. The ability of one to engage in self-help eliminates the problems caused by satisfying the witness presence requirement.[[220]](#footnote-221)

Secondly, critics contend there is the potential for the testator’s intent to be frustrated due to the use of ambiguous language in a holograph.[[221]](#footnote-222) The holographic form’s completion in the testator’s handwriting creates a presumption of validity, is consistent with the UPC’s “material portion” requirement, removes doubt as to the meaning of “material” and is a major improvement to those states requiring the document be entirely handwritten.[[222]](#footnote-223)

Thirdly, critics argue that holographs are known to increase litigation.[[223]](#footnote-224) Estate planners will see the expanded legislation with statutory form as a threat. However, Professor Horton’s examination of holographs does not support that “amateur will-making breeds litigation.”[[224]](#footnote-225) For example, the litigation surrounding Larry King’s holographic will is more about King’s soon-to-be ex-wife fighting with his children from a previous marriage, as is common regardless of the statutory will requirements.[[225]](#footnote-226)

Holographs are not just for the military anymore. States should adopt the expanded holographic-will law providing a form that is designed to minimize perceived risks of holographs.[[226]](#footnote-227) Although the holographic form could result in some litigation[[227]](#footnote-228), more importantly, it could resolve the problem of letting intestacy have the final word. Undoubtedly, the do-it-yourself will option sets forth its own set of problems, but for blended families, and those with minor children, it is better than dying intestate.

CONCLUSION

The number of Americans without a will is surprisingly high and is not a new problem. The COVID-19 pandemic did not move the needle in the right direction; furthermore, it proved how difficult it is to motivate people to do something they are not naturally inclined to do themselves. What can be done to encourage people to make wills?

Americans must be provided with education as to the consequences of dying intestate. For blended families, a reminder is needed that a will is necessary to avoid the disinheritance of a stepchild and lessen the likelihood of embedded conflicts in the appointment of an executor. For those with children, dying without a will makes the costly guardianship proceeding necessary. Finally, the lack of inheritance management for children should alert parents to the importance of preparing a will. These education efforts need to be broadcasted early and often. Law students should play a part and help provide the needed education to their local community and beyond. Additionally, supervised law students can engage in the will-making service which provides experiential learning as required by the ABA.

Education needs to be coupled with availability and access. This Article suggests that holographic legislation should be expanded to adopt the UPC’s “material portion” language and codify a one-page statutory form that is readily available to Americans especially when death is contemplated. The use of the statutory form will create a presumption of validity for those wanting to exercise self-help. Although a holograph is not as good as a legally prepared attested will, it is better than the alternative and is a step in the right direction. The holographic form must be available when the testator’s health is at issue and at places of travel where people are most likely to use it (e.g., when death is contemplated). Preparing a holographic form allows the testator to take a step in the right direction, making its review and update a smaller step so that procrastination does not inhibit will-making before it’s too late.
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