

Louisiana Law Review

Volume 35 | Number 2

*The Work of the Louisiana Appellate Courts for the
1973-1974 Term: A Symposium*

Winter 1975

Private Law: Partnership

Milton M. Harrison

Repository Citation

Milton M. Harrison, *Private Law: Partnership*, 35 La. L. Rev. (1975)

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.law.lsu.edu/lalrev/vol35/iss2/10>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews and Journals at LSU Law Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Louisiana Law Review by an authorized editor of LSU Law Digital Commons. For more information, please contact kayla.reed@law.lsu.edu.

PARTNERSHIP

Milton M. Harrison*

*Stone v. Stone*¹ is a very significant decision in the law of partnerships. The Louisiana supreme court, in reversing the decision of the court of appeal, interpreted two principles. First, a provision in partnership articles that the partnership will terminate at death of one of the partners does not mean that the partnership is for a term (until death), and terminable only for cause,² but rather is terminable at the will of any partner without cause.³ In addition, the court held that the right to terminate a non-term partnership at will is so fundamental that a provision in the agreement for disputes to be settled by arbitration does not apply to the right to dissolve.

The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal, in *Obiol v. Industrial Outdoor Displays*,⁴ reiterated the position it had taken in *Bersuder v. New Orleans Public Service, Inc.*⁵ to the effect that a partner who is not also an employee of the partnership is not a "third person" within the contemplation of the workmen's compensation law. These cases, and the recent cases from other circuits,⁶ are incorrect and it is to be hoped that the Louisiana supreme court will grant writs and correct the erroneous application of partnership law in this area.⁷

* Professor of Law, Louisiana State University.

1. 281 So. 2d 177 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1973), *rev'd* 292 So. 2d 686 (La. 1974).

2. LA. CIV. CODE art. 2887.

3. *Id.* art. 2884.

4. 288 So. 2d 425 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1974).

5. 273 So. 2d 46 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1973).

6. *Leger v. Townsend*, 257 So. 2d 761 (La. App. 3d Cir. 1972), *writ refused*, 261 La. 464, 259 So. 2d 914 (1972); *Cockerham v. Consol. Underwriters*, 262 So. 2d 119 (La. App. 2d Cir. 1972), *writ refused*, 262 La. 315, 263 So. 2d 49 (1972).

7. For an excellent treatment of this problem, see Note, 34 LA. L. REV. 654 (1974).