

# NOT A FRAUDULENT TRANSFER...EVEN WITH INTENT TO DEFRAUD?

09.18.2020

*Daily Journal*

Geoffrey M. Gold, a Partner in ECJ's Litigation, Real Estate and Land Use Departments, published an article in the September 16, 2020 issue of the *Daily Journal* titled, "Not a Fraudulent Transfer...Even With Intent To Defraud?"

Until a recent appellate ruling, it appeared that, under California law, if a debtor made a transfer without receiving "reasonably equivalent value" in exchange, that transfer, by itself, could be — but need not be — a basis for finding there was "actual fraud" rendering the transfer voidable under the California Uniform Voidable Transfer Act ("UVTA"). Not anymore. In this article, Geoffrey takes a look at how the recent appellate ruling in *Universal Home Improvement, Inc., et al. v. Robertson, et al.* may impact the law of voidable transfers and preferences.

[Click here](#) to read Geoffrey's full article.

## PROFESSIONALS

Geoffrey M. Gold

## PRACTICE AREAS

Litigation and Alternative  
Dispute Resolution

Real Estate