The question here is: How did the -402 file get created without a proper case filing when it was not remanded (returned), was not transferred and was not “refiled” in the probate court? There is no proof of service of the filing of Candace Curtis federal lawsuit in the probate court.

The -402 action is allegedly “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412249-402” which is clearly not the federal case. After Carl’s resignation the estate was without an estate representative and “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412249-402” was allegedly dissolved into “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412249-401” by an agreed order, among the attorneys, to consolidate “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412249-402” with “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412249-401”, wherein the -402 file, having never been properly opened, was closed to further filing.

1. Ostroms [motion to enter remand of the federal case as if it was a transfer](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Tab%2026%20%202014-06-05%20412249-401%20Motion%20to%20Enter%20Remand%20as%20a%20Transfer%20and%20Order%20Accepting%20Transfer%20Certified.pdf) of estate of Nelva Brunsting
2. [Order accepting remand](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/2014-05-22%20Order%20accepting%20Remand.pdf) of the federal case as a transfer of estate of Nelva Brunsting
3. [Carl’s February 17, 2015 resignation](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Tab%2027%202015-02-19%20Case%20412248%20PBT-2015-57597%20Carl%20Resignation_Certified.pdf)
4. [Tab 28 2015-02-20 Case 412249-401 Agreed Docket Control Order\_Certified.pdf](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Tab%2028%202015-02-20%20Case%20412249-401%20Agreed%20Docket%20Control%20Order_Certified.pdf)
5. 2015-03-05 The Attorneys “[Agreed Order to Consolidate](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Tab%2029%20%202015-03-05%20Agreed%20Order%20to%20Consolidate%20412249-402%20into%20412249-401_Certified.pdf)”
6. 2019-11-04 [2019-11-04 Amy & Anita Brunsting Orig. Counterclaim in -401](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/2019-11-04%20Amy%20&%20Anita%20Brunsting%20Orig.%20Counterclaim.pdf)
7. 2022-03-18 [Carl & Carole non-suit](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/2022-03-18%20Carl%20&%20carole%20non-suit.pdf): Carl and Carole agree to nonsuit their claims against one another.
8. Tab 44 [Drina’s 2022-03-18 Notice of non-suit](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Tab%2044%202022-03-18%20Carl's%20Notice%20of%20non-suit%20of%20relator__Certified.pdf)\_\_Certified: Carl files notice of nonsuit of nominal defendant Candace Curtis
9. Certified 18210428- C# 4 [Rule 11 Agreement](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/Certified%2018210428-%20C%23%204%20Rule%2011%20Agreement%202021-12-05.pdf) 2021-12-05 Certified: Drina agrees to Carl’s nonsuit of Anita and Amy and, Anita and Amy agree to nonsuit Carl.

All of these acts would leave the impression that Candace Curtis was the only plaintiff remaining in “estate of Nelva Brunsting 412,249-401” and that Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting remained in the -401 as counter-plaintiffs’.

There are no proofs of service for the filing of any estate of Nelva Brunsting 412,249-402 action. *Candace Louise Curtis vs Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting and Does 1 to 100 in the Southern District of Texas* is clearly not the estate of Nelva Brunsting by any number, see Curtis v Brunsting 704 F.3d 406. [SDTX Dkt 24]

There are no proofs of service for the filing of Anita and Amy Brunsting’s alleged counter claims, (filed more than six years after their original answer [Dkt 29] in SDTX). All you will find is Candace Curtis [waiver of service](http://www.probatemafia.com/Brunsting/%5b99%5d%202013-04-22%20PBT-2013-130579%20Candy%20curtis%20waiver%20of%20service.pdf) as a Nominal Defendant.