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IN 1954 THE SECOND DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF CALIFORNIA
rendered an eloquent, if rather theatrical, opinion in the case
of George Pepperdine Foundation v. Pepperdine.1 It was alleged
that George Pepperdine endowed the Foundation with over
$3,000,000; that he dominated and controlled the Foundation
from the time of its incorporation; that other trustees were in-
active and were dominated by Pepperdine; that plaintiff's as-
sets were continually diminished through the bad investments of
Pepperdine; that through Pepperdine's negligent management,
not only the original $3,000,000 was lost, but that a debt of
$551,300 was incurred. In the trial court the case was dismissed
after special and general demurrers were sustained, and plain-
tiff refused to amend its complaint.

Before affirming the judgment of the trial court, the Court
of Appeals heaped lavish praise on Pepperdine for his generosity
and charitable instincts. The following quote is typical of the
language used:

Who is the “Foundation” otherwise than the shadow of
George Pepperdine, if not his alter ego? If he as an indi-
vidual could not be sued for negligently investing his own
moneys intended for charitable uses, why should his “Foun-
dation” under the management of strangers prosecute an
action to recover from the original donor and his friends
what, through negligence, they lost for the Foundation.

The court also held that the Foundation was a public char-
itable trust, the beneficiaries of which were an indefinite class
of persons. Therefore, the only person qualified to maintain an
action on behalf of the Foundation was the attorney general. This
portion of the case was later overruled in Holt v. College of
Osteopathic Physicians and Surgeons,2 but for at least ten years
it was the law in California.

* B.E. (Chem.), Youngstown University; Process Engineer at Lubrizol
Corp.; Third-year student at Cleveland-Marshall Law School of Baldwin-
Wallace College.

2 40 Cal. Rptr. 244, 394 P. 2d 932 (1964).
GUARDIAN OF PUBLIC CHARITIES?

The *Pepperdine* case graphically illustrates the need for closer supervision of charitable trusts by governmental agencies. If the attorney general of California or his subordinates had the duty and power to supervise the administration of charitable trusts, perhaps the $3,000,000 would have been preserved for the benefit of prospective beneficiaries rather than lost through the alleged negligence.

As a result of cases of this nature, the legislature of California adopted the [Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act](https://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/clevstlrev/vol14/iss2/4) in 1955. While California was the first state to adopt the uniform act, it was not the first state to adopt legislation to supervise and control the administration of charitable trusts.

In 1943, New Hampshire pioneered in this type of legislation. The New Hampshire act gave the attorney general the authority to prepare and maintain a register of all charitable trusts in that state. The office of director of charitable trusts was established. The director was appointed by the governor, to serve under the supervision of the attorney general. Wide powers to formulate rules and regulations for gathering information and to further investigate charitable trusts were given to the attorney general. Trustees were required to attend investigations if their attendance was requested. Provision was made for the attorney general to bring whatever action was necessary to compel trustees’ compliance with the act.

The success of the New Hampshire legislation was apparent at once. By 1944, over 900 trusts with combined assets of over $9,000,000 were registered. Evidence of mismanagement was found in approximately 25 percent of the trusts. This imme-
diate success did not cause a stampede among other states to adopt similar legislation. It was not until 1950 that another state, Rhode Island, passed a law which was closely patterned after the New Hampshire act. Two other states followed suit in 1953; Ohio and South Carolina, and Massachusetts joined them in 1954.

In 1954, the National Conference of Commissioners of Uniform State Laws, having recognized the need for legislation in this area, published the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act, which was similar to the New Hampshire law. As has been stated, California soon passed the uniform act. Iowa (1959), Michigan (1961), Illinois (1961), and Oregon (1963) have since passed the uniform act. There are slight variations in the versions passed by the above states, but the general effect of their laws is the same.

While the legislatures of these states have provided the law, they have not always provided the revenue necessary to hire the human machinery needed. Such a situation exists in Ohio, where in 1960 one assistant attorney general aided by one clerk was expected to supervise 1,130 charitable trusts with assets of over $250,000,000. Obviously, this one assistant attorney general working at full efficiency could not reasonably be expected to properly supervise that number of trusts. This appears to be false economy on the part of the state. State welfare funds are used to support the poor who might be prospective beneficiaries of the trust income were it not diverted by negligent or inefficient administration. In addition, revenue is lost by granting tax immunity to trusts, foundations and nonprofit corporations which, through poor or dishonest management, never achieve the goals for which they originated.

19 Cal. Gov't Code, supra, n. 3
20 Iowa Code Ann. §§ 682.48 to .59 (1946).
GUARDIAN OF PUBLIC CHARITIES?

Why is it important to adopt legislation which gives the attorney general the duty of collecting information concerning the administration of charitable trusts and the power to institute an action to correct abuse? This question is quickly answered by an examination of the authorities as to what other party can institute such an action.

Generally neither the settlor nor his heirs can bring an action to enforce a charitable trust unless he has reserved a power to do so. These decisions are justified upon looking at the status of the settlor after the trust is created. He conveys the legal title to the trustee and the equitable title to the prospective beneficiaries; therefore, without a specific reservation, the settlor has no remaining interest on which to base his action.

Generally, the beneficiaries of a charitable trust are unknown and therefore lack the necessary interest to bring suit to enforce the trust. In the rare case where the beneficiary can be determined, he can successfully enforce the trust.

It is obvious that where trust funds are being diverted or mishandled a trustee would not ordinarily bring a suit against himself. However if there are several trustees, one or more may institute a suit to compel the others to properly carry out their duties.

Thus it is apparent that parties other than the attorney general only infrequently have sufficient interest to bring a suit to enforce a charitable trust. In addition, since the public is the true beneficiary of the trust, a representative of the public should enforce it. That representative is generally held to be the attorney general.

But even where he has the right to supervise and enforce, legislation is needed to give him power to obtain information as to how the various trusts and nonprofit corporations are being

25 Amundson v. Kletzing-McLaughlin Memorial Foundation College, 247 Iowa 91, 73 N. W. 2d 114 (1955); Fairbanks v. City of Appleton, 249 Wis. 476, 24 N. W. 2d 893 (1946).
26 Doyle v. Whalen, 87 Me. 414, 32 A. 1022 (1895).
27 Wiegand v. Barnes Foundation, 374 Pa. 149, 97 A. 2d 81 (1953); Barker v. Hauberg, 325 Ill. 538, 156 N. E. 806 (1927).
30 Bogert, Trusts & Trustees, § 411 (2d Ed. 1964).
administered. Has this ability to obtain information been provided?

Where sufficient personnel have been provided, and there has been a concerted effort by that personnel, the results have been good. This has been true particularly in New Hampshire and Rhode Island. In several other states, there has been little apparent activity since the passage of their legislation. Whether this has been due to lack of personnel, general apathy or simply yielding to political pressures, the general public is being dealt a serious injustice by this inaction.

For several years, a committee of the United States Congress has been investigating abuses by foundations. This investigation has revealed many abuses perpetrated by some of the largest foundations in the nation. Congressman Wright Patman, chairman of this committee, has proposed certain legislative reforms to correct these abuses. While certain of these suggestions, if enacted, would serve their designated purpose, they would also serve to handicap, if not cripple, many legitimate and conscientious foundations. In an era when the growth of the federal government has been the subject of considerable criticism, do we need restrictive federal legislation in this field? If state governments can effectively fulfill this function, federal intervention would seem unnecessary.

Such legislation without sufficient funds for providing qualified personnel will accomplish very little. In addition, competent leadership, which must come from the attorney general, is essential. Most states have not enjoyed this in the past. This is best summarized in the words of Professor Bogert:

Under the practice which has prevailed for centuries in England and the United States, the attorney general, without great fault on his part, has proved a poor guardian of the welfare of charitable gifts.

---


33 Ibid. See also, N. Y. Times, p. 1 (Feb. 9, 1964) as to the Treasury Dept. findings on these proposals.

34 For detailed reviews of the report, see: Riecker, Foundations and the Patman Committee Report, 63 Mich. L. Rev. 95 (Nov. 1964); Krasnowiecki and Brodsky, Comment on the Patman Report, 112 U. Pa. L. Rev. 190 (1963); N. Y. Times, supra, n. 33.

35 Bogert, op. cit., supra, n. 12, at 634.
The following paragraphs will summarize the legislation of the various states dealing with this subject. While it is not intended to be a comprehensive study of all state laws concerning charitable trusts and nonprofit corporations, it will be a useful outline in determining which state legislatures have provided adequate legislation.

**Alabama**

By statute, any person interested in the execution of a trust, including the settlor, may bring an action in equity for the removal of any trustee who has violated or threatened to violate his trust. On the basis of this statute, the Supreme Court of Alabama held that the state, on relation of the attorney general, was a proper party to institute a suit seeking establishment and enforcement of a public charity.

**Alaska**

Alaska's statute dealing with nonprofit corporations does not specifically discuss charitable trusts or the power of the attorney general to supervise and enforce them.

**Arizona**

Nonprofit corporations are required to file an annual statement with the corporation commission. Failure to comply can result in a monetary penalty or revocation of the corporation's charter.

A trustee of any testamentary trust may file an account with the court where the will was probated, or he may be required to do so upon the request of any beneficiary.

**Arkansas**

In 1963, Arkansas enacted a nonprofit corporation law. The act provides that the attorney general or prosecuting attorney of the county in which the corporation is domiciled may

---

40 Id. at § 104.
41 Id. at § 212.
42 Id. at tit. 14, § 1021.
bring an action for involuntary dissolution for violations of certain listed regulations.44

Charitable organizations must file required information with the secretary of state before soliciting funds.45 These organizations must also keep records and file annual reports with the same official. There are special provisions for medical,46 dental47 and professional corporations.48

California
California adopted the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act in 1955.49 It was amended in 1959 to include charitable corporations.50 Hospitals, educational and religious institutions are exempted from the operation of the act.51

In the Corporation Code, the attorney general is given an additional power to investigate any nonprofit corporation holding property subject to a charitable trust.52

Colorado
The statutes dealing with nonprofit corporations,53 make no mention of the power of the attorney general or district attorney. However, the statutes have been enforced by a district attorney,54 and in a proceeding for a writ of mandamus against the secretary of state, the attorney general defended him.55

Connecticut
One of the duties of the attorney general is that he shall represent the public interest in the protection of any gifts, legacies or devises intended for public or charitable purposes.56 In addition to the cases where the attorney general has initiated the

44 Id. at § 1918.
45 Id. at §§ 1602 to 1604.
46 Id. at §§ 1701 to 1717.
47 Id. at §§ 1801 to 1817.
48 Id. at §§ 2001 to 2018.
49 Cal. Gov't Code, supra, n. 3.
50 Id. at § 12581.
51 Id. at § 12583.
action,\textsuperscript{57} it has also been held that a beneficiary can commence the suit if the attorney general refuses.\textsuperscript{58}

Trustees of charitable community trusts are required to render annual accounts to the proper district court.\textsuperscript{59} In another section, all testamentary trustees are required to file annual accounts.\textsuperscript{60}

\textbf{Delaware}

All trustees named in a will or appointed by a Court of Chancery are required to file periodic reports with that court.\textsuperscript{61}

\textbf{District of Columbia}

While not statutory, by judicial decision, a United States attorney may institute an action to require a trustee of a public charity to render an accounting.\textsuperscript{62}

\textbf{Florida}

The statutes dealing with nonprofit corporations\textsuperscript{63} provide that the attorney general, upon the complaint of any person (coupled with prima facie evidence) shall prosecute the offending corporation, either to annul its franchise or prevent its improper acts.\textsuperscript{64} Nonprofit corporations, organizations or associations which solicit anything of value are required to obtain a permit from the clerk of the circuit court.\textsuperscript{65}

All trustees are required to file annual accounts unless waived by the court.\textsuperscript{66} Trustees may be removed for cause by the courts own motion, or upon the application of any beneficiary.\textsuperscript{67} In charitable trusts with unascertainable beneficiaries, the attorney general should represent their interests.\textsuperscript{68}

\textsuperscript{57} Adams v. Link, 145 Conn. 634, 145 A. 2d 753 (1958); Conway v. Emery, 139 Conn. 612, 96 A. 2d 221 (1953).
\textsuperscript{58} Day v. City of Hartford, 16 Conn. Supp. 228 (1949); Daily v. City of New Haven, 60 Conn. 314, 22 A. 945 (1891).
\textsuperscript{60} Id. at § 268.
\textsuperscript{64} Id. at § 617.09; see Jordan v. Landis, 128 Fla. 604, 175 So. 241 (1937).
\textsuperscript{65} Id. at § 617.22.
\textsuperscript{66} Id. at § 737.12.
\textsuperscript{67} Id. at § 737.18.
\textsuperscript{68} Id. at § 737.251.
Georgia

In all cases involving charitable trusts, the attorney general, or the solicitor general represent the beneficiaries. Either official can sue or be sued in this capacity. Either official can sue or be sued in this capacity. The superior courts of Georgia have visitorial power over all corporations including those organized for charitable purposes.

Hawaii

Hawaii provides for a director of regulatory agencies. Nonprofit corporations are required to report to him annually. For failure to report, or certain other offenses, the director may dissolve the corporation.

Idaho

Under Idaho law, every action must be prosecuted in the name of the real party in interest. In the statutes listing the duties of the attorney general, there is no mention of his representing the beneficiaries of a charitable trust. On the basis of these two statutes, the Supreme Court of Idaho ruled that the attorney general is unable to maintain an action to protect a public charity.

Illinois

Illinois has adopted the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act. In other sections of the statutes, nonprofit corporations are required to file annual reports with the secretary of state. For failure to do so, the attorney general can bring an action for involuntary dissolution.

---

70 Ibid.
71 Id. at tit. 22, § 704.
73 Id. at ch. 172, § 16.
74 Id. at § 131.
75 Idaho Code tit. 5, § 301 (1948).
76 Id. at tit. 67, § 1401.
77 Hedin v. Westdala Lutheran Church, 59 Idaho 241, 81 P. 2d 741 (1938).
79 Id. at § 163a63.
80 Id. at § 163a49.
GUARDIAN OF PUBLIC CHARITIES?

Indiana

In the Indiana General Not For Profit Corporation Act, such corporations are required to file annual reports with the secretary of state. The secretary of state is given wide investigatory powers and for violations of the Act, he can refuse to file the report. If litigation follows, it is the duty of the attorney general to represent the state.

Trustees of charitable trusts are required to file an annual report with the circuit court.

Iowa

Iowa has enacted the Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act. Other sections of the Code require annual accountings to be filed with the secretary of state. The charter of the corporation may be revoked upon failure to file.

Kansas

All trustees are required to file annual accounts. There are no provisions which require nonprofit corporations to account, although there is a Chapter dealing with nonprofit corporations.

Kentucky

All trustees are required to report periodically. In the portion of the statutes dealing with nonprofit corporations, there is no requirement to report.

Louisiana

In Louisiana, business corporation law is applicable to nonprofit corporations. All fraternal, patriotic, charitable, benev-

82 Id. at § 25-535.
83 Id. at § 25-537.
84 Id. at §§ 25-539 and -549.
85 Id. at § 31-712.
86 Iowa Code Ann. §§ 682.48 to .59 (Supp. 1964).
87 Id. at § 504.30.
88 Id. at § 504.31.
90 Id. at ch. 17, §§ 2901 to 3008.
92 Id. at §§ 273.010 to .990.
gent, literary, scientific, athletic or social organizations are re-
quired to file annual membership lists with the secretary of
state. For failure to file, the district attorney has authorization
to prosecute, and the attorney general can institute an action
to have the organization dissolved.

Louisiana also has sections dealing with charitable trusts.

Maine

The attorney general is instructed to enforce due applica-
tion of funds given or appropriated to public charities.

Maryland

The Trusts Administration Act gives a court of equity full
jurisdiction to enforce charitable trusts upon application of the
attorney general. The attorney general, a trustee or any inter-
ested party can apply to the court for application of the cy pres
doctrine.

Massachusetts

Charitable trust act similar to New Hampshire.

Michigan

Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes
Act.

Minnesota

All charitable associations, except those specifically exempt-
ed, are required to file initially and report annually to the
secretary of state. If the association fails to comply, the attor-
ney general has a right to revoke its registration. The statutes
dealing with nonprofit corporations provide that the attorney
general, director of social welfare, commissioner of taxation or

94 Id. at § 401.
95 Id. at § 404.
96 Id. at § 405.
97 Id. at art. 1, §§ 2271 to 2295.
103 Id. at § 309.53.
104 Id. at § 309.58.
105 Id. at § 317.01 to .69.
commissioner of insurance, or all of them, may require answers to interrogatories, and have the right to examine corporate books and records.\textsuperscript{106}

**Mississippi**

No specific legislation.

**Missouri**

The attorney general, circuit attorney or prosecuting attorney has the right to investigate and if necessary, institute quo warranto proceedings against a nonprofit corporation for misuse or nonuse of its franchise.\textsuperscript{107}

**Montana**

Montana has statutes dealing with religious, social and benevolent corporations\textsuperscript{108} but such corporations are not required to file an annual account. There is no provision for supervision by the attorney general.

**Nebraska**

It is the duty of the respective county attorney to represent all beneficiaries of charitable trusts and to enforce such trusts in the proper court.\textsuperscript{109}

**Nevada**

In a charitable trust, the attorney general is given the same rights as the beneficiaries have in a private trust.\textsuperscript{110}

**New Hampshire**

New Hampshire legislation has been discussed earlier.

**New Jersey**

All trustees are required to account to the court at least once each three years.\textsuperscript{111}

**New Mexico**

In a charitable trust the attorney general enjoys the same rights as the beneficiaries of a private trust.\textsuperscript{112}

\textsuperscript{106} Id. at § 317.29.


\textsuperscript{112} N. M. Stat. ch. 33, art. 2, §§ 1 to 24 (1953).
New York

Trustees are required to file periodic reports with the proper court.\textsuperscript{113} The attorney general can maintain a suit on behalf of the beneficiaries to enforce a charitable trust.\textsuperscript{114}

North Carolina

Trustees of charitable trusts are required to file annual accounts with the clerk of the superior court.\textsuperscript{115} If the trustees fail to file, or there is evidence of mismanagement, the clerk is to notify the attorney general who will take proper action.\textsuperscript{116}

The statutes dealing with nonprofit corporations,\textsuperscript{117} allow the attorney general to commence an action for involuntary dissolution.\textsuperscript{118}

North Dakota

Both the attorney general and the county attorney are given authority to bring actions to enforce charitable trusts.\textsuperscript{119}

The statutes dealing with nonprofit corporations,\textsuperscript{120} give to the attorney general the duty to commence an action for dissolution\textsuperscript{121} if a corporation breaks certain listed regulations.\textsuperscript{122}

Ohio

Legislation similar to New Hampshire.\textsuperscript{123}

Additional legislation requires nonprofit corporations to file an annual financial report with the probate court.\textsuperscript{124} The prosecuting attorney has authority to examine corporate books and records and to bring an action to require correction of abuses.\textsuperscript{125} The attorney general can also bring an action against a nonprofit corporation.\textsuperscript{126}

\textsuperscript{116} Id. at § 36-20.
\textsuperscript{117} Id. at §§ 55A-1 to -89.1.
\textsuperscript{118} Id. at §§ 55A-50 to -52.
\textsuperscript{119} N. D. Cent. Code Ann. tit. 59, ch. 04, § 02 (1960).
\textsuperscript{120} Id. at tit. 10, ch. 24, § 01 to ch. 28, § 22.
\textsuperscript{121} Id. at tit. 10, ch. 28, § 08.
\textsuperscript{122} Id. at § 07.
\textsuperscript{123} Ohio Rev. Code, supra, n. 15.
\textsuperscript{124} Id. at § 1719.05.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Id. at § 1719.12.
Oklahoma

The statutes dealing with trusts,\textsuperscript{127} confer upon the district courts the power to require accounts and supervise the administration of the trust if necessary.\textsuperscript{128}

There are also statutes dealing with religious, educational and benevolent corporations,\textsuperscript{129} requiring such corporations to register with the Commission of Charities and Corrections.\textsuperscript{130} Charitable corporations are required to file annual reports\textsuperscript{131} with the commission. The corporation must also keep certain records.\textsuperscript{132} Such records are open to inspection by the Commission. Violations are to be prosecuted by the attorney general or the proper county attorney.\textsuperscript{133}

Oregon

Uniform Supervision of Trustees for Charitable Purposes Act.\textsuperscript{134}

Pennsylvania

All charitable organizations must register with the Commission of Charitable Organizations.\textsuperscript{135} It is the duty of the attorney general or district attorney to enforce the act.\textsuperscript{136}

If charitable trust administration is impractical or impossible, the court may, upon the application of any interested party or the attorney general, execute the cy pres doctrine.\textsuperscript{137} If the attorney general is not the petitioner, he must be given notice of the action.\textsuperscript{138}

Rhode Island

Legislation similar to New Hampshire.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{128} Id. at § 60-175.23 (A).
\textsuperscript{129} Id. at §§ 18-552.1 to -552.18.
\textsuperscript{130} Id. at § 18-552.3.
\textsuperscript{131} Id. at § 18-552.5.
\textsuperscript{132} Id. at § 18-552.6.
\textsuperscript{133} Id. at § 18-552.14.
\textsuperscript{134} Ore. Rev. Stat., supra, n. 23.
\textsuperscript{136} Id. at § 160-14 (f).
\textsuperscript{137} Id. at § 301-10.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{139} Gen. Laws of R. I., supra, n. 14.
South Carolina

Legislation similar to New Hampshire.\textsuperscript{140}

South Dakota

The attorney general has the duty of representing the beneficiaries of charitable trusts.\textsuperscript{141}

Tennessee

At common law, the attorney general could not bring an action to enforce a charitable trust.\textsuperscript{142} Under the present statute,\textsuperscript{143} the courts hold that he still cannot institute such an action; however, the statute is interpreted to give the right of action to the district attorney.\textsuperscript{144} Thus while an individual can sue to enforce a charitable trust,\textsuperscript{145} the attorney general cannot.

Texas

The attorney general is a necessary party to any action to alter\textsuperscript{146} or terminate\textsuperscript{147} a charitable trust. He has the power to agree to alter such a trust if he deems the alteration to be in the best public interest.\textsuperscript{148}

Nonprofit corporations are required to file a report with the secretary of state at least once each four years.\textsuperscript{149} In case of failure to report, the attorney general may bring an action for involuntary dissolution.\textsuperscript{150}

Utah

All testamentary trustees are required to account to the court in which the will was probated.\textsuperscript{151}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{140}Code of Laws of S. C., \textit{supra}, n. 16.
\textsuperscript{142}Green v. Allen, 24 Tenn. 170 (1844).
\textsuperscript{144}State ex rel. Tennessee Childrens Home Society v. Hollingsworth, 193 Tenn. 491, 246 S. W. 2d 345 (1952).
\textsuperscript{146}Civil Stat. of Texas art. 4412a, § 2(b) (1960).
\textsuperscript{147}Id. at § 2(a).
\textsuperscript{148}Id. at § 5.
\textsuperscript{149}Id. at art. 1396, § 9.01.
\textsuperscript{150}Id. at § 7.01.
\textsuperscript{151}Utah Code Ann. tit. 75, ch. .17, § 31 (1953).
\end{flushright}
Vermont

When a gift, devise, legacy or trust is established for a class of unknown beneficiaries, the governor may appoint a person or persons to act as agent or attorney for such beneficiaries.\textsuperscript{152} All trustees of charitable trusts, whether incorporated or not, are required to file an annual account with the probate court.\textsuperscript{153} Upon failure to account for two or more consecutive years, the attorney general can bring an appropriate action to force compliance.\textsuperscript{154}

Virginia

A suit to enforce a charitable trust can be brought in the name of the state if there is no other party capable of prosecuting such a suit.\textsuperscript{155} It is also the duty of the attorney for the Commonwealth to make a motion in the proper court for the appointment of a trustee where none was appointed by the donor or settlor.\textsuperscript{156}

Washington

All trustees are required to account to each adult beneficiary\textsuperscript{157} and such a trustee, if he desires, may account to the court.\textsuperscript{158} There are apparently no provisions requiring trustees of charitable trusts or nonprofit corporations to account.

West Virginia

All trustees are required to file annual accounts with the commissioner of accounts.\textsuperscript{159}

Wisconsin

All trustees of testamentary charitable trusts are required to file annual accounts with the courts.\textsuperscript{160} An action to enforce

\begin{enumerate}
\item Id. at § 2501.
\item Id. at § 2502.
\item Code of Va. § 55–29 (1950).
\item Id. at §§ 55–28 and –29.
\item Id. at § 30.30.030.
\end{enumerate}
a public charitable trust may be brought by the attorney general.\textsuperscript{161} Such actions can also be brought by ten or more interested persons.\textsuperscript{162}

\textbf{Wyoming}

The court may direct trustees to account annually.\textsuperscript{163} It is the duty of the state examiner to examine, at least once a year, the records of any funds given for the purpose of education.\textsuperscript{164}

\textsuperscript{161} Id. at § 231.34(1).

\textsuperscript{162} Id. at § 231.34(2).

\textsuperscript{163} Wyo. Stat. § 4-32 (1957).

\textsuperscript{164} Id. at § 9-104.