The exam results were within the expected parameters of performance. Question 1 was directly related to Torrens priority issues. Disappointingly, students did poorly at applying the correct priority rule, especially in relation to s 43A, even after being told that the question would be based on this issue.

Question 2 was concerned with mortgages. The case was partly based on *Forsyth v Blundell* and on s 111A but few students discussed that case and section. Most students failed to discuss s 111A and its effects on sales and purchasers.

Question 3 was based on easements and covenants. The easement component was built around the an omitted easement as per *Dobbie v Davidson*. The covenant issue was dealt with poorly by most students, many discussing easements rather than restrictive covenants. The question was concerned with the passing of the burden under *Tulk v Moxhay*.

Question 4 related to coownership. The first part was concerned with the facts surrounding *Delehunt v Carmody*. The issue concerning the nature of the coownership was decided by s 26 CA. Most students were able to discuss the issues of severance and adjustment.