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Here, Husband insisted that his injury awardwas separate property because he got the accident shortly after they had beenseparated and he filed a suit for divorce.

Wife contended that community propertystill exists even when the spouses were separate. Sharon also insist that accordingto the Arizona rule, the right for compensating from the injury of one’s spousewas community property. The Court found that the appropriate analysis wasnecessary for this case.

When the separate property was defined, the word ‘ acquired’was used. In the case of Soto v Vandenventer, the court compared an sample casethat if a wife took a horse to the marriage and rode a horse and hit by car, then, the injury from her accident would be community property, but the awardfrom the horse would be separate property. The body of James was his separateproperty like the horse in case of Soto v Vandenventer. The loss of wage andmedical expenses would be community property like the wife’s injury in case ofSoto v Vandenventer. That is, the well-being award because of the spouse’sinjury would be separate property.