

Property in arizona

[Family](#), [Marriage](#)



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

Wife contended that community property still exists even when the spouses were separate. Sharon also insisted that according to the Arizona rule, the right for compensating from the injury of one's spouse was community property. The Court found that the appropriate analysis was necessary 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 example case that 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 award from the horse would be separate property. The body of James was his separate property like the horse in case of *Soto v Vandenventer*. The loss of wage and medical expenses would be community property like the wife's injury in case of *Soto v Vandenventer*. That is, the well-being award because of the spouse's injury would be separate property.