NO. 412,249-401

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS	§	**IN PROBATE COURT**
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	**NUMBER FOUR (4) OF**
	§	
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, ET AL	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	**HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

PLAINTIFF CURTIS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' NO-EVIDENCE MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND MOTION AND DEMAND TO PRODUCE EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODES §§1002, 1003

TO THE HONORABLE PROBATE COURT:

Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis (Curtis) brings her response to the No-Evidence Motion for Partial Summary Judgment filed jointly by Defendants Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting, and will respectfully show that more than a scintilla of evidence exists as to a genuine issue of material fact relating to the existence, authenticity, and validity of an instrument referred to as the 8/25/10 QBD, as hereinafter more fully appears.

TRUST CHRONOLOGY

In 1996 Elmer Brunsting and his wife Nelva Brunsting created The Brunsting Family Living Trust for their benefit and for the benefit of their 5 children (The Trust).

In 2005 Elmer and Nelva restated their trust, completely replacing the original 1996 trust (Restatement).

In 2007 the first and only Amendment to "The Trust" was signed by both Elmer and Nelva, and replaced Amy with Candace as successor co-trustee with Carl (Amendment).

Allegedly, an Appointment of Successor Trustees was executed July 1, 2008 appointing Anita as successor co-trustee with Carl. (7/1/08 AST)

The Brunsting Family Living Trust became irrevocable at the death of Elmer Brunsting on April 1, 2009, pursuant to Article III (B) of the Restatement, and could only be amended by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Upon the death of Elmer on April 1, 2009, The Elmer H. Brunsting Decedent's Trust (DT) was created as an irrevocable trust pursuant to Article III (B) and Article VII (A) of the Restatement, and could only be amended by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Also upon the death of Elmer on April 1, 2009, the Nelva E. Brunsting Survivor's Trust (ST) was created. The ST was revocable and amendable, pursuant to Article III Section (B) and Article VII Section (B)(1) of the Restatement.

On June 15, 2010, a "Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Testamentary Power of Appointment under Living Trust Agreement", was introduced (6/15/10 QBD).

On August 25, 2010, a "Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Testamentary Power of Appointment under Living Trust Agreement", was introduced (8/25/10 QBD).

Upon the death of Nelva, all of the aforementioned Trusts were to terminate, resulting in the creation of five equal (5) Personal Asset Trusts (PAT), one for each beneficiary.

OBJECTION NO. 1 ASSUMING FACTS - BEST EVIDENCE REQUIRED MOTION PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODES §§1002, 1003

There are legitimate questions regarding the existence and authenticity of the 8/25/2010 QBD instrument, as hereinafter more fully appears. Plaintiff Curtis objects to Defendants assuming facts not in evidence, and objects to Defendants' improper attempts at shifting the burden of bringing forth evidence onto Plaintiff(s).

Plaintiff Curtis further objects to the introduction of alleged copies and, therefore, pursuant to Evidence Code §§1002 & 1003, Plaintiff demands Defendants produce only the 8/25/2010 QBD actually signed by Nelva Brunsting, and herein moves the Court for an order that only the original instrument with the wet signed signature page be allowed in evidence on the following ground.

The Allegation of No-Evidence

Defendants' "Joint No-Evidence Motion for Partial Summary Judgment" alleges five (5) blanket no-evidence claims, without reference to a particular petition brought by a particular claimant. Defendants are clearly using the petition brought by Carl Brunsting as Executor of the Estate of Nelva Brunsting, and not the petition brought by Plaintiff Curtis, and do not distinguish although the petitions are plainly distinguishable. Defendants' no-evidence claims are:

1. Nelva's signature on the 8/25/10 QBD was forged.
2. Nelva lacked capacity when she executed the 8/25/10 QBD.
3. Nelva was unduly influenced into executing the 8/25/10 QBD.
4. Nelva was fraudulently induced into executing the 8/25/10 QBD.
5. Nelva executed the 8/25/10 QBD under duress.

Inherent in the first assertion is the notion that Nelva did not sign the 8/25/2010 instrument, while the subsequent assertions are based upon a presumption that Nelva Brunsting did sign the 8/25/2010 instrument, but that the signature was somehow obtained improperly.

Plaintiff Curtis has two pending petitions for declaratory judgement. Only one petition refers to the 8/25/2010 QBD, and it raises ground upon which the 8/25/2010 QBD fails that are not addressed in Defendants' joint motion and, thus, are beyond the scope of this response. However, based upon the five specific no evidence challenges presented, it necessarily follows that the rudimentary division in these 5 contentions is but twofold:

1. Nelva did not sign the 8/25/2010 instrument
2. Nelva signed the 8/25/2010 instrument

If one chooses to believe that Nelva did not sign the instrument, the questions begin with how did the likeness of Nelva's signature and Freed's signature and notary stamp find their way to these papers?[1] A plethora of further inquiries would necessarily follow.

If, on the other hand, one chooses to believe that Nelva did sign the instrument, the subdivisions of inquiry are again twofold:

1. Nelva signed the 8/25/2010 instrument knowledgeably and intentionally
2. Nelva signed the 8/25/2010 instrument, but did so under some form of duress, deception, mistake, or diminished capacity.

Defendants seek to shift the burden onto Plaintiff(s) to prematurely prove the secondary aspects related to the "assumed fact" that Nelva signed the instrument, while at the same time Defendants' motion is quick to say:

> *"There is no evidence that Anita and/or Amy were present when Nelva executed the 8/25/10 QBD."*

[1] The term "these" is plural and was purposely selected as will be shown.

There is also no evidence in the record that suggests Plaintiff Curtis or Plaintiff Brunsting were present when Nelva allegedly executed the 8/25/10 QBD. There is no evidence that Defendant Carole Brunsting was present when Nelva executed the 8/25/10 QBD.

Did Nelva Sign the 8/25/2010 Instrument with Knowledge and Intent?

Defendants insist the 8/25/2010 QBD is valid, but admit they have no personal knowledge of its creation or execution, so what exactly do we know?

Emails attached to Plaintiff's federal petition and affidavit show Plaintiff telling Defendant Carole Brunsting she spoke to their Mother on the phone the day after the October 25, 2010 phone conference[2], and asked about this August 25, 2010 QBD and what it purports, and that Nelva insisted she did no such thing. Nelva followed that conversation with a hand written note regarding Amy and Anita's claims of being co-trustees for the Plaintiffs' Personal Asset Trusts saying "not true". (Exhibit A)[3]

Nelva's hand written notecard states:

> *"So I heard you were concerned that any money you receive after I 'leave this mortal coil' will be put in a trust and Anita would have to deal it out.*
>
> *This not true. You'll will get whatever share is yours. If you don't know how to manage money by now it's too late."*

Substantial Evidence is Already Before the Court

The Record clearly shows 3 distinctly different "true and correct copies" of the 8/25/2010 QBD, all bearing the likeness of a Nelva signature, a Candace Freed signature and the image of Freed's notary seal, but the three "true and correct copies" do not share the same image of Nelva's signature.

1. In Anita's 156 page objection filed December 5, 2014 the QBD appears at pdf pages 96 through 132 with signature page 37 at p132 bearing bates stamp P229. (Exhibit B_1)
2. In Carole's 133 page objection filed Feb. 17, 2015 the QBD appears at pdf pages 97 through 133 with signature page 37 appearing at p133 bearing Bates stamp P192. (Exhibit B_2)

---

[2] Affidavit attached to Curtis original federal complaint Exhibit P-8 filed with this court 02102015:1527:P0074

[3] This exhibit was attached to the petition filed in the federal court on February 27, 2012 as Plaintiff Exhibit 16 made a part of the record of this court Feb. 9, 2015 at pages 66 & 67 in Document #BT-2015-45555

3. Curtis original federal court complaint, affidavit and exhibits were made a part of the probate court record on February 9, 2015. In the 601 page pdf document the August 25, 2010 "Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Testamentary Power of Appointment under Living Trust Agreement" (QBD) appears at pdf pages 552 through 588 with signature page 37 at p588. (Exhibit B_3)

Plaintiff Curtis obtained Candace Freed's notary logs for August 25, 2010 (Exhibit C). These pages show a notary log book that does not conform to Tex. Gov't Code §406.014.

Based upon the obvious inability of the Defendants to agree as to what "version" of this mysterious 8/25/2010 QBD is the one "true and correct" version, and given that none of them claim personal knowledge of its creation or signing, and given that the notary logs are unusual and no certifiable copy of an "original" 8/25/2010 QBD has been introduced into evidence, certainly there are genuine questions raised as to a material fact regarding the instrument.

It would necessarily follow that questions surrounding the existence of the instrument would precede ancillary inquiries into the validity of the instrument's authenticity, precede questions addressing the improper purposes the instrument attempts to accomplish, precede inquiries into the opacities created from the instrument's attempted amalgamation of incompatible powers, and precede any discussion of the instrument's attempt to improperly merge incompatible trusts.

Defendants' Background Statement

Defendants' Motion seeks to mischaracterize the breach of fiduciary and conspiracy to steal the family inheritance suits as merely a "family dispute". These suits are more properly characterized under the civil law and the laws of equity as fiduciary relationship actions. The questions surrounding Defendants' actions would also seem to invoke Texas Penal Code considerations, and the fact that Plaintiffs and Defendants are siblings is a secondary premise, having no immediate evidentiary value.

Defendants' Motion relates the first background part as:

> *"Elmer and Nelva created the Brunsting Family Living Trust on or about October 10, 1996. The trust was restated on January 12, 2005 (the "Family Trust") Elmer and Nelva served as trustees of the Family Trust until 2008, when Elmer lost the ability to handle his financial affairs and Nelva served as trustee alone. In 2008, Nelva appointed Carl and Anita to serve as successor co-trustees"*

Defendants are asking the Court to assume facts that are not in evidence and consistently skip from the 2005 restatement to some other place in time. In this instance they skip to the alleged July 1, 2008 appointment (Exhibit D), never once having mentioned the 2007 Amendment. (Exhibit E)

The July 1, 2008 Appointment of Successor Trustees

Defendants' Motion claims:

> *"This litigation started more than thirty-eight (38) months ago. Plaintiffs had sufficient time for discovery in this suit and the three (3) other actions related to the 8/25/10 QBD".*

The disclosure CD received from the Defendants at the federal injunction hearing April 9, 2013 (more than a year after the federal suit was filed) contained Bates #'s BRUNSTING000001 - BRUNSTING 004922. Defendants claimed they had disclosed and accounted for everything, while Plaintiff continued to allege that known assets of the trust remained unaccounted for, and that true and correct copies of all trust documents in Defendants' possession had not yet been disclosed.

Normally 38 months would be more than ample time for litigants to exchange disclosures and discovery. Despite the fact that Anita's June 4, 2015 interrogatory replies claim it had already been disclosed, it was not until June 25, 2015, the day before Defendants' no-evidence motion was filed, that the Defendants finally responded to Plaintiff's continued requests for disclosure of the alleged 2008 appointment instrument. Defendants even rely on the instrument to assert at page 2 of their Motion:

> *"In 2008, Nelva appointed Carl and Anita to serve as successor co-trustees."*

The claim that Nelva appointed Anita to serve as successor co-trustee with Carl in 2008 is a fact question in dispute, as under the terms of the 2005 Restatement Nelva held no such power. Nelva's power to remove trustees was limited to those she had individually selected. (See Article IV Page 4-2 (Bates P240) Attached as Exhibit F).

De jure, De facto, or Usurper?

In the 2007 Amendment Amy was removed as a successor co-trustee with Carl and replaced by Candace. If Carl or Candace failed to serve the alternate was to be Frost Bank.

Prior to making that change Nelva emailed Candace asking if she would be willing to serve as co-trustee with Carl stating that she thought Candace had a better relationship with her siblings. (Exhibit G)

The 2007 Amendment was the first and only amendment to the trust signed by both Elmer and Nelva Brunsting. After the incapacitation or death of one of the founders, the trust could only be amended by a court of competent jurisdiction. The July 1, 2008 instrument was only signed by Nelva, clearly indicates that Elmer was incompetent, and therefore is invalid.

The trustees for the irrevocable decedent's trust at the death of Elmer Brunsting would be those named by both Elmer and Nelva in the 2007 Amendment to the family Trust, and prior to Elmer's death there were no individual trustee appointments to be changed by Nelva alone.

This sound legal reasoning also applies to the invalidity of the alleged appointments dated August 25, 2010 and December 21, 2010, and the certificates of trust based thereon.

Defendants are not now and have never been de jure trustees for the irrevocable family or Decedent's Trust and defendant's motion disingenuously seeks to avoid any such deliberations.

Objection No. 2 Defendants' Motion is Disingenuous

Defendants improperly use their motion to advance irrelevant allegories. In Defendants' motion at page 3 they claim Plaintiff(s)' Petition(s) for Declaratory Judgment are ground in petty emotions:

> *"The chief change that prompted plaintiffs' challenge to the 8/25/10 QBD is that the co-trustees for Carl's and Candace's interest under the trust changed from: (1) Anita and Carl; to (2) Anita and Amy. Apparently, the change in co-trustees from Anita and Carl to Anita and Amy offends Carl and Candace"*

Defendants continue by contending that the focus of their Motion is very narrow and specific:

> *III. Argument & Authorities*
>
> *"This motion relates solely to plaintiffs challenges to the 8/25/10 QBD"*

Defendants make this claim while simultaneously using their Motion to advance a false thesis, to suggest false conclusions, to assume facts, to falsely claim honorable intentions, and to make numerous assertions about other matters already settled in plaintiff's favor or remaining in dispute, as if those matters were settled and established in defendant's favor.

Defendants' go on to downplay the significance of their Trojan horse as negligible:

> *"For plaintiffs, the sole impact is the change in co-trustees from: (1) Anita and Carl; to (2) Anita and Amy"*

The evidence will, in fact, show the alleged change was from Carl and Candace to Anita and Amy, that the alleged change was improper and that the intended impact on Plaintiff(s) is the one stated in Anita's December 5, 2014 "Response to Candace's Motion for Distribution of Trust Funds".

On page 1 at item 4 Anita says:

> *"4. If the Court finds the in terrorem clause is enforceable, then Candace and Carl have no right to any distribution from the trust".*

In recent interrogatories and requests for fiduciary disclosures returned by Amy Brunsting June 25, 2015, Curtis asks a series of questions regarding the fiduciaries' distribution standards. The questions were taken directly from the Northern Trust Company web site informational area. Defendant's response to the inquiry they renumbered as 15 is telling:

> *"15. What circumstances should or should not exist prior to a distribution from "the trust"?*
>
> *RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as unintelligible. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (i.e., before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague.*
>
> *Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, currently, with respect to Candace, the Court must resolve Candace's claims and allegations in the pending lawsuit and, in particular, Candace's allegation that the no contest provisions in the trust instruments are unenforceable, prior to a distribution"*

Is it trustees burdened with the fiduciary duties of loyalty and utmost good faith owed to beneficiaries Carl and Candace who are making these claims, or is it conflicted co-beneficiaries who seek to stifle inquiry into illicit conduct? The answer should be obvious.

The manifest impact of this alleged successor trustee "change" is alterations to the trust that could not be done under terms of the trust; actions prohibited by law and by the trust that have been performed and acts required by the terms of the trust that have not been performed and the negative impact of this "change" on the trust has been absolute economic devastation.

Objection No. 3 Defendants' Motion is Vague and Productive Only of Confusion

Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis objects to Defendants Amy and Anita Brunsting's Joint Motion for No-Evidence Partial Summary Judgment, on the ground that the Motion is vague and misleading.

Relevant to Defendants' Motion, two separate lawsuits were brought by two different plaintiffs, in two different courts, 14 months apart, with separate and distinct claims, notwithstanding the fact that both Plaintiffs' claims involve the same parties, acts and events, or that there are other related lawsuits involving additional defendants and claims.

Defendants' Motion makes numerous assertions while failing to distinguish between the plaintiffs, the lawsuits, or the pleadings, attempting to create some sort of egocentric mélange. This same amalgamation methodology of ambiguity is a fundamental defect of the 8/25/2010 QBD addressed in Curtis' Petition for Declaratory Judgment, but not mentioned in Defendants' Motion at all.

Plaintiffs are siblings not Siamese twins. The records and pleadings in one lawsuit cannot be juxtaposed as if they were the records and pleadings in the other. Using the term "plaintiffs" as a reference, without distinguishing the particular plaintiff, the particular case, or citing to the specific pleadings to which Defendants Amy and Anita Brunsting jointly refer, has created nothing but opacities.

The Proper Party, Case and Declaratory Judgment Distinctions

Plaintiff Carl Henry Brunsting filed suit against Amy, Anita and Carole Brunsting in the Harris County Probate Court, individually and as Executor for the estates of Nelva and Elmer Brunsting, seeking declaratory judgment and accounting, on the same day a hearing was held on Curtis' application for injunction in the federal court, April 9, 2013.

Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis filed suit against Amy and Anita for breach of fiduciary, in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on February 27, 2012, not raising any issues relating to the 8/25/10 QBD.

Plaintiff Curtis' pleadings in the federal court did not seek declaratory judgement until May 9, 2014, when she filed her first amended petition. Under the federal rules a plaintiff can only amend a complaint with leave of the Court, and only on an application showing the assent of opposing counsel, or a statement detailing efforts to obtain the assent of the parties and

expressing the reasons for plaintiff's inability to do so. This is all in the public record and Plaintiff Curtis would respectfully ask the Court to take Judicial Notice of the Federal Record.[4]

The amendment to Curtis' federal complaint was part of a stipulation approved by Defendants' counsel, as stated in the application for the Court's leave to amend. The stipulation involved a number of concessions and conditions exemplified by: 1) an application for leave to amend; 2) the Amended Complaint; and 3) Plaintiff's Motion for Remand to this Court.

The stipulation for remand involved amending the complaint to: 1) add necessary Party Carole Brunsting; 2) add involuntary Plaintiff Carl Brunsting, thus polluting the diversity required by 28 USC §1332; and 3) the addition of declaratory judgment claims. The remand also included keeping the federal injunction in full force and effect as a condition of the remand.

The petitions for declaratory judgment added by Curtis' first amended petition do not mirror the petitions for declaratory judgment brought by Carl Brunsting.

SUMMARY OF PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS' NO-EVIDENCE MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Defendants seek to trivialize several lawsuits involving conspiracy to steal the family inheritance, fraud, breach of fiduciary, co-mingling, self-dealing, and other secreted acts, as if such claims represent challenges to a single document and, more absurdly, a sibling rivalry motivated by petty emotions.

> *"Carl and Candace ("Plaintiffs") brought several proceedings alleging every conceivable means to challenge the 8/25/10 QBD"*

This statement of the record is a gross exaggeration. The 8/25/10 QBD is the object of two separate and distinct petitions for declaratory judgment, brought at dissimilar stages of separate proceedings by diverse plaintiffs.

The several lawsuits were by no means brought specifically to challenge the 8/25/10 QBD, as it is but a small piece in a much larger fraud mosaic.

[4] 4:12-cv-00592 Candace Louise Curtis v. Anita Kay Brunsting et al Case remanded to Harris County Probate Court No. 4. Kenneth M. Hoyt, presiding, Date filed: 02/27/2012, Date terminated: 05/15/2014, Date of last filing: 05/15/2014

LEX NON COGIT AD IMPOSSIBILIA

The respondent is not required to marshal its proof and need only point out evidence that raises a genuine fact question on the challenged elements."[5]

The absence of a reliable instrument in evidence forecloses Defendants' no-evidence challenge as improperly seeking to shift the burden of bringing forth evidence onto Plaintiff(s), who cannot be called upon to prove the non-existence of the asserted fact of its existence.

Plaintiff has shown substantially more than the marginal amount of evidence required to defeat Defendants' Motion. The burden of bringing forth evidence to establish the existence and validity of an 8/25/2010 QBD rests squarely upon these Defendants, who are the only proponents of the existence, validity and applicability of the instrument.

CONCLUSION

If one of the three exhibits of the 8/25/2010 QBD is a true and correct copy of an original wet signed document, what are the other two exhibits true and correct copies of?

If Nelva knowingly and willfully executed the 8/25/2010 QBD, why does she say in regard to what it purports "this not true"?

Why does the content of Candace Freed's Notary Log not conform to the requirements of Tex. Gov't Code §406.014, and why does it contain such unusual line/page anomalies?

If the 8/25/2010 QBD is benign, and merely changes trustee appointments as Defendants claim, why do they cling to it so dearly despite admitting no personal knowledge of its creation or execution?

Unless and until such an instrument can be physically produced and qualified as evidence with declaration as to the full chain of custody, the inquiries into whether Nelva signed the instrument and under what conditions are as moot as discussions of the applicability of the alleged instrument's content.

Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis herein affirms, under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of Texas that the foregoing statements are true and correct and based upon personal knowledge.

---

[5] TEX. R. CIV. P. 166a(i)

Furthermore, references to the record and the attached Exhibits are true and correct references and representations of the things to which they speak.

Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis has herein presented sufficient evidence in response to Defendants' Motion for No-Evidence Partial Summary Judgment to raise a genuine issue of a material fact. The Court should properly deny Defendants' Motion for the numerous reasons shown, and Plaintiff so moves the Court.

Plaintiff seeks the above judicial remedy and prays for an order for Defendants to pay all costs associated with hearings on their Motion, including Plaintiff's transportation, lodging, meals and legal costs.

Respectfully submitted,

Candace Louise Curtis
Plaintiff *pro se*
218 Landana Street
American Canyon CA 94503
Tel: 925-759-9020
occurtis@sbcglobal.net

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been sent on this 13th day of July 2015, to the following via e-service or email:

Bradley E. Featherston
The Mendel Law Firm, L.P.
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 104
Houston, Texas 77079
brad@meddellawfirm.com

Attorney for Anita Kay Brunsting

Neal E. Spielman
Griffin & Matthews
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77079
nspielman@grifmatlaw.com

Attorney for Amy Ruth Brunsting

Bobbie G. Bayless
Bayless & Stokes
2931 Ferndale
Houston, Texas 77098
bayless@baylessstokes.com

Attorney for Drina Brunsting,
Attorney in Fact for Carl Henry Brunsting

Darlene Payne Smith
Crain, Caton & James
Five Houston Center
1401 McKinney, 17th Floor
Houston, Texas 77010
dsmith@craincaton.com

Attorney for Carole Ann Brunsting



Candace L. Curtis

NO. 412,249-401

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS	§	**IN PROBATE COURT**
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	**NUMBER FOUR (4) OF**
	§	
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, ET AL	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	**HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' JOINT NO-EVIDENCE MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Having considered Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis' Response to Defendants' Joint No-Evidence Motion for Partial Summary Judgment the Court is of the opinion that plaintiff has met her burden and Defendants' No-Evidence Motion should properly be DENIED.

It is so ordered;

SIGNED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

_____
JUDGE PRESIDING

NO. 412,249-401

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS	§	**IN PROBATE COURT**
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	**NUMBER FOUR (4) OF**
	§	
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, ET AL	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	**HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO PRODUCE EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODE §§1002, 1003

Having considered Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis' Motion and Demand to Produce Evidence pursuant to Evidence Code §§1002, 1003, the Court finds just cause to question the efficacy of copies of trust instruments and that the Plaintiff's Evidence Code Motion should be GRANTED.

Defendants will not be allowed to introduce copies of trust instruments alleged to have been signed by Nelva Brunsting after the death of Elmer Brunsting on April 1, 2009 except by stipulation between the parties or the approval of the Court and must produce only the original instruments.

It is so ordered;

SIGNED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

_____
JUDGE PRESIDING

NO. 412,249-401

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS	§	**IN PROBATE COURT**
	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
V.	§	**NUMBER FOUR (4) OF**
	§	
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, ET AL	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	**HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS**

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS' JOINT NO-EVIDENCE MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION AND DEMAND TO PRODUCE EVIDENCE PURSUANT TO EVIDENCE CODE §§1002, 1003

Having considered Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis' Response to Defendants' No-Evidence Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and her Motion and Demand to Produce Evidence Pursuant to Evidence Code §§1002, 1003, the Court is of the opinion that plaintiff has met her burden and the Defendants' No-Evidence Motion should be DENIED.

The Court further finds just cause to question the efficacy of copies of trust instruments and that the Plaintiff's Evidence code §§1002, 1003 Motion should be GRANTED. Defendants will not be allowed to introduce any alleged copies of trust instruments alleged to have been signed by Nelva Brunsting after the death of Elmer Brunsting on April 1, 2009 and must produce only the original wet signed instruments.

It is so ordered;

SIGNED this _____ day of _____, 2015.

_____

JUDGE PRESIDING

EXHIBIT
A

Nelva Brunsing
13630 Pinerock Ln.
Houston, TX 77079

Candy Curtis,
1215 Victorian Way
Martinez, CA
94553

Wes: Sunday

Its almost 10 pm but I'm not sleepy and my computer wont cooperate tonite.

So I heard you were concerned that any money you receive after I "leave this mortal coil" will be put in a trust and Greta would have to deal it out.

That not true. Jaill will get whatever share is yours. If you don't know how to manage Money by now its too late.

I'm on at your quote a bit of the time now. Even sleep with it. The hum of the motor is rather soothing.

Had about 30 on at teachers the evening. Dino took care of doing the goodies out.

Our weather is still gorgeous but so very dry. Glad I'm not a farmer. Iowa farmers are doing better.

I'm watching the Braves series. Looks like your guys are winning.

Aren't those odds pretty? Could get them for me.

pea)



Someday I'm going to get a lap desk. I guess I'm too lazy to sit at the desk. I usually write while watching TV at nite.

Wish I had your lovely handwriting. I started out left handed but my 1st gr. teacher made me write right handed so I ~~have~~ learned how.

Hallmark
STATIONERY
CNT3025
© HALLMARK LICENSING, INC.
MADE IN U.S.A.
Hallmark.com

I can't even read my own writing.)

Bye now. Love, Mother

EXHIBIT
B

ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that any such provisions are amended hereby.

EXECUTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Beneficiary

ACCEPTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Trustee

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

This instrument was acknowledged before me on August 25, 2010, by NELVA E. BRUNSTING, in the capacities stated therein.

Notary Public, State of Texas

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that any such provisions are amended hereby.

EXECUTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

Nelva E. Brunsting

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Beneficiary

ACCEPTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

Nelva E. Brunsting

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Trustee

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

This instrument was acknowledged before me on August 25, 2010, by NELVA E. BRUNSTING, in the capacities stated therein.



Candace Lynne Kunz Freed

Notary Public, State of Texas

ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that any such provisions are amended hereby.

EXECUTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Beneficiary

ACCEPTED and effective on August 25, 2010.

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Trustee

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

This instrument was acknowledged before me on August 25, 2010, by NELVA E. BRUNSTING, in the capacities stated therein.

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

Notary Public, State of Texas

EXHIBIT
P-40_p37
USCA5 399

EXHIBIT
C

VACEK & FREED, PLLC

ALBERT E. VACEK, JR.*
SUSAN S. VACEK
CANDACE L. KUNZ-FREED
PAUL J. BROWER
JULIE A. MATHIASON
BERNARD L. MATHEWS, III, *Of Counsel*
*Board Certified Estate Planning and Probate Law
Texas Board of Legal Specialization

11777 Katy Freeway, Suite 300 South
Houston, Texas 77079

(281) 531-5800
1-800-229-3002

Telefax (281) 531-5885
E-mail Address: consult@vacek.com

January 15, 2013

Mr. Rik Munson
218 Landana St.
American Canyon, CA 94503

Dear Mr. Munson:

Per your request, enclosed are copies of my notary pages for book entries dated August 25, 2010 and December 21, 2010. The additional pages you request for dates June 1, 2010 through April 15, 2012 total 24 pages. Please remit the exact fee of $12.00 for these additional pages, if you so request them. You will need to once again provide a self-addressed return envelope for these additional copies.

Finally, you will find a check for $8.00 payable to you for the return of the money order you previously submitted, less the cost of the four pages included herein. I am unable to hold these funds on account.

Sincerely,

Candace L. Kunz-Freed

Candace L. Kunz-Freed

CLF/sp
Enclosures

	Notarization Date/Time	Document Date	Type of Notarization	Name of Signer	Signer's Signature	Signer's Address and Telephone Number
161	11/22/10	11/22/10		Shelley Gates	X Shelley Gates	14311 Islandwoods Dr, Houston TX 77095
162	11/24/10	11/24/10		Floy Stockdick	X Floy Stockdick	6011 Franz Katy, TX 77493
163	11/24/10	11/24/10		Roseanne Lopez	X Roseanne Lopez	6005 Franz Katy, TX 77493
164	12/1/10	12/1/10		Dr. C.V. Beghtol	X CV Beghtol	11454 Valley Spring Houston TX 77043
165	12/9/10	12/9/10		M. Chan	X M Chan	21326 Rachelle Ln Houston/Katy TX 77458
166	12/14/10	12/14/10		Irene Kovar	X Irene Kovar	
167	12/21/10	12/21/10		Nelva Brunsting	X Nelva E. Brunsting	13630 Pinerock Houston TX 77079
168	12/21/10	12/21/10		Anita Brunsting	X Anita Brunsting	203 Bloomingdale Cir Victoria, TX 77904
169	12/22/10	12/22/10		Herbert C. McKay	X Herbert C. McKay	8010 Raff St. Houston, Texas
170	12/29/10	12/29/10		Kyung Jacobs	Kyung Jacobs	8326 Ash Garden Ct. Houston, TX 77083
171	12/30/10	12/30/10		J.W. Burns	X J.W. Burns	10806 Inwood Hou. TX 77042
172	1/03/11	1/03/11		Kyung Jacobs	X Kyung Jacobs	8326 Ash Garden Ct. Houston, TX 77083
173	1/26/11	1/26/11		John Sutherland	X John G. Sutherland	415 Coachman Lane Hou TX 77024
174	1/26/11	1/26/11		Ellen Sutherland Dodd	X Ellen Sutherland Dodd	Podere Binacco 58020 Scarlino (GR) Italy
175	1/26/11	1/26/11		Karen Lee Cook	X Karen Lee Cook	3210 Deer Trail Bryan TX 77807
176	2/9/11	2/9/11		M. Chan	X M Chan	21326 Rose Hollow Ln Katy TX 77450

Type of Identification (☐ D.L. ☐ I.D. Card ☐ Personally Known ☐ Credible Witness ☐ Passport ☐ Other)	Description of Document, Additional Information, or Comments	Fee	Signer's Right Thumbprint	
ersonal Knowledge	HIPAA → PAT TRUSTEES DESIGNATION OF SUCCESSOR TEE Certi. of Tr.	$ ~~0~~	Top of Thumbprint 161	Top of Thumbprint 162
ersonal Knowledge	Qualified Benef. Design.	$		
ersonal Knowledge	Appt. of Succ Trustees Qualified Benef. Designation	$	Top of Thumbprint 163	Top of Thumbprint 164
rsonal Knowledge	Funding Pkg. COTS (ST) DT, LT (3) Med POA, HIPAA, QBD, APPT SUCC TEE GUID'S and AFF KNOWL.	$		
ersonal Knowledge	Amended Affidavit/Cert.	$	Top of Thumbprint 165	Top of Thumbprint 166
ersonal Knowledge	Appt. of Succ Tee Resignation documents.	$		
ersonal Knowledge	COT's (3) Acceptance as Succ Trustee	$	Top of Thumbprint 167	Top of Thumbprint 168
Personal Knowledge		$		
ersonal Knowledge	Beneficiary form for Chase IRA	$	Top of Thumbprint 169	Top of Thumbprint 170
ersonal Knowledge	Birth Certificate Correction	$		
P.K.		$	Top of Thumbprint 171	Top of Thumbprint 172
ersonal Knowledge	Farmers Insurance Claim Trustee Stmt for LT	$		
ersonal Knowledge	Resignation of Tee Med POA	$	Top of Thumbprint 173	Top of Thumbprint 174
ersonal Knowledge	Accept of Succ Co Tee COT; Delegation of Auth	$		
ersonal Knowledge	Accept of Succ Co Tee Accept of Delegation COT	$	Top of Thumbprint 175	Top of Thumbprint 176
Personal Knowledge	Funding (PMZ) Med POA; COT's (3) Deed HS, Deed other, Assign P/P.	$		

	Notarization Date/Time	Document Date	Type of Notarization	Name of Signer	Signer's Signature	Signer's Address and Telephone Number
129	7/20/10	7/20/10	in office	Robert Holmes	X Robert W Holmes	13218 Verbena Houston TX 77083
130	7/23/10	7/23/10	in office	Nancy Kanistanaux	X Nancy G. Kanistanaux	1873 Birchwood Dr. Okemos, MI 48864
131	7/27/10	7/27/10		Carol L. Nayes	X Carol L. Nayes	5206 Summerfield Ln Spring, TX 77379
132	7/27/10	7/27/10		Karen Renee Nayes	X Karen Renee Nayes	13819 CADY COURT HOUSTON, TX 77077
133	7/27/10	7/27/10		Lisa Hanney	X Lisa Hanney	5706 Lone Cedar Kingwood, TX 77345
134	8/3/10	8/3/10	in office	Laurie Goodbold	X Laurie Goodbold	8148 Willow Forest Dr. Tomball TX 77375
135	8/10/10	8/10/10	" "	" "	Laurie Goodbold	" "
136	8/17/10	8/17/10		Irene R. Goddard	X Irene R. Goddard	1510 Breezy Bend Katy TX 77494
137				Fred Ben Himburg	Fred Ben Himburg	
138				Patricia Rhea Mullins	Patricia Rhea Mullins	
139				Suzan Faye Stringer	Suzan Faye Stringer	
140				Phyllis Himburg Delaro	Phyllis Himburg Delaro	
141	8/25/10			Nelva Brunsting	X Nelva E. Brunsting	13630 Piping Rock Houston TX 77079
142	8/26/10			Betty Jean Barney	X Betty Jean Barney	8915 Opelika Houston TX 77080
143	9/8/10			Mark R. Yarbrough	X Mark R. Yarbrough	4101 Monterey Oaks Blvd #1221 Austin TX 78749
144	9/8/10			Jeffrey J. Yarbrough	X Jeffrey J. Yarbrough Jr	2617 Piping Rock Tr. Austin TX 78748

Type of Identification ☐ D.L. ☐ I.D. Card ☐ Personally Known ☐ Credible Witness ☐ Passport ☐ Other	Description of Document, Additional Information, or Comments	Fee	Signer's Right Thumbprint	
Personal Knowledge	Merrill Lynch DT Merrill Lynch ST	$	Top of Thumbprint 129	Top of Thumbprint 130
		$		
Personal Knowledge	COT for Noyes FLT	$	Top of Thumbprint 131	Top of Thumbprint 132
Personal Knowledge	COT for Noyes FLT	$		
Personal Knowledge	COT for Noyes Family living trust	$	Top of Thumbprint 133	Top of Thumbprint 134
~~COTS(8)~~ Personal Knowledge	COTS(8) Funding Bks.	$		
" "	Funding forms	$ —	Top of Thumbprint 135	Top of Thumbprint 136
Personal Knowledge	Funding Bk.	$		
		$	Top of Thumbprint 137	Top of Thumbprint 138
		$		
		$	Top of Thumbprint 139	Top of Thumbprint 140
		$		
P.K.		$	Top of Thumbprint 141	Top of Thumbprint 142
Personal Knowledge	QBD, COTS(3) MEDPOA, DGPOA, APPT SUCC TEE DEED.	$		
Personal Knowledge CC	SS4 COTS Aff of Heir Mtr. Vehicle (2)	$	Top of Thumbprint 143	Top of Thumbprint 144
Personal Knowledge	SS4 Aff. Heirship for Mtr. Veh (2)	$		

EXHIBIT
D

7/1/08

Appt of Suc. Trustees

APPOINTMENT OF SUCCESSOR TRUSTEES

WHEREAS, NELVA ERLEEN BRUNSTING, also known as NELVA E. BRUNSTING, is a Founder of the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996, as amended, (the "Trust Agreement"); and,

WHEREAS, Pursuant to Article IV, Section B, of the Brunsting Family Living Trust entitled "Our Successor Trustees," an original Trustee will have the right to appoint his or her own successor or successors to serve as Trustees in the event that such original Trustee ceases to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, as well as specify conditions relevant to such appointment; and,

WHEREAS, ELMER H. BRUNSTING is no longer able to manage his financial affairs, as is evidenced by the physicians' letters attached. Therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section B, of the Brunsting Family Living Trust Agreement, the remaining original Trustee, NELVA E. BRUNSTING, continues to serve alone

WHEREAS, the said NELVA E. BRUNSTING is desirous of her right as original Trustee to designate, name and appoint her own successors to serve as Trustees in the event that she ceases to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, as well as specify conditions of such appointment;

NOW, THEREFORE, KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS:

NELVA E. BRUNSTING makes the following appointment:

IF I, NELVA E. BRUNSTING, fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, then the following individuals will serve as successor Co-Trustees:

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING shall each have the authority to appoint his or her own successor Trustee by appointment in writing.

If a successor Co-Trustee should fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, then the remaining successor Co-Trustee shall serve alone. However, if neither successor Co-Trustee is able or willing to serve, then CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS shall serve as sole successor Trustee. In the event CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS is unable or unwilling to serve, then THE FROST NATIONAL BANK shall serve as sole successor Trustee.

In order to maintain the integrity of the Trust Agreement and to meet my estate planning desires and goals, my Trustees shall comply with the directive set forth below to assure compliance with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) of 1996.

1. Successor Trustee Required to Provide an Authorization For Release of Protected Health Information

Each successor Trustee (or Co-Trustee) shall be required to execute and deliver to the Co-Trustee (if any) or next successor Trustee an "Authorization for Release of Protected Health Information" pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") and any other similarly applicable federal and state laws, authorizing the release of said successor's protected health and medical information to said successor's Co-Trustees (if any) and to all alternate successor Trustees (or Co-Trustees) named under this document or any subsequent documents signed by the Founders, to be used only for the purpose of determining in the future whether said successor has become incapacitated (as defined in the Trust Agreement).

If said successor is already acting in the capacity of Trustee (or Co-Trustee) and fails to so execute and deliver such Authorization within thirty (30) days of actual notice of said requirement, or if an event has occurred which triggers said successor's power to act but said successor has not yet begun to act in said capacity and fails to so execute and deliver such Authorization within thirty (30) days of actual notice of said requirement, then for purposes of the Trust Agreement, said successor shall be deemed incapacitated.

"Actual notice" shall occur when a written notice, signed by the Co-Trustees (if any) or next successor Trustee, informing said successor of the need to timely execute and deliver an authorization as set forth above (and, in the case where said successor has not yet begun to act, informing him or her of the event that has triggered said successor's power to act), is (i) deposited in the United States mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the last address of said successor known to the Co-Trustees or next successor Trustee or (ii) hand delivered to said successor, provided such delivery is witnessed by a third party independent from the Co-Trustees or next successor Trustee within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code Sections 672(c) and 674(c) and said witness signs a statement that he or she has witnessed such delivery.

2. Obtain the Release of Protected Health Information

The Trustee is empowered to request, receive and review any information, verbal or written, regarding Founder's physical or mental health, including, but not limited to, protected health and medical information, and to consent to their release or disclosure. The Founder has signed on this same date or an earlier date an "Authorization For Release of Protected Health Information," in compliance with HIPAA, immediately authorizing the release of any and all health and medical information to the Trustee (or next successor Trustee, even if not yet acting) for the purposes of determining the Founder's incapacity (or for other stated purposes therein).

In the event said authorization cannot be located, is by its own terms no longer in force or is otherwise deemed invalid in whole or in part, the Founder hereby grants the Trustee (or next successor Trustee, even if not yet acting) the power and authority, as Founder's legal representative, to execute a new authorization on Founder's behalf, immediately authorizing the release of any and all health and medical information for the purpose of determining the Founder's incapacity (and for the purpose of carrying out any of the Trustee's powers, rights, duties and obligations under this agreement), naming the Trustee (or next successor Trustee even if not yet acting) as the Founder's "Personal Representative," "Authorized Representative" and "Authorized Recipient."

3. Determination of "Incompetence" or "Incapacity"

For purposes of the Trust Agreement, and notwithstanding any other conflicting provisions contained in the Trust Agreement or any previous amendments thereto, the term "incompetency" and/or "incapacity" shall mean any physical or mental incapacity, whether by reason of accident, illness, advanced age, mental deterioration, alcohol, drug or other substance abuse, or similar cause, which in the sole and absolute discretion of the Trustee makes it impracticable for a person to give prompt, rational and prudent consideration to financial matters and, if said disabled person is a Trustee (including an appointed Trustee who has yet to act), (i) a guardian of said person or estate, or both, of said person has been appointed by a court having jurisdiction over such matters or (ii) two (2) attending physicians of said person, who are licensed to practice and who are not related by blood or marriage to such person, have stated in writing that such incompetency or incapacity exists.

If said disabled person is a Trustee (including an appointed Trustee who has yet to act), upon the court determination of the person's competency or capacity or upon the revocation of the writings of the two (2) attending physicians above or upon written determination of competency or capacity to give prompt, rational and prudent consideration to financial matters by two (2) other attending physicians, who are licensed to practice and who are not related by blood or marriage to such person, subject to written notice being given to the then acting successor Trustee, the original Trustee (including an appointed Trustee who has yet to act) removed for "incompetency" or "incapacity" shall be reinstated as Trustee.

Any third party may accept physicians' writings as proof of competency or capacity or incompetency or incapacity as set forth above without the responsibility of further investigation and shall be held harmless from any loss suffered or liability incurred as the result of good faith reliance upon such writings.

In addition to any "Authorization for Release of Protected Health Information" executed by the Founder, the Founder hereby voluntarily waives any physician-patient privilege or psychiatrist-patient privilege and authorizes physicians and psychiatrists to examine them and disclose their physical or mental condition, or other

personal health or medical information, in order to determine their competency or incompetency, or capacity or incapacity, for purposes of this document. Each person who signs this instrument or an acceptance of Trusteeship hereunder does, by so signing, waive all provisions of law relating to disclosure of confidential or protected health and medical information insofar as that disclosure would be pertinent to any inquiry under this paragraph. No Trustee shall be under any duty to institute any inquiry into a person's possible incompetency or incapacity (such as, but not limited to, by drug testing), but if the Trustee does so, the expense of any such inquiry may be paid from the Trust Estate of said person's trust or, if no such trust exists, the Trust Estate of the Trust.

It is the Founder's desire that, to the extent possible, a named successor Trustee be able to act expeditiously, without the necessity of obtaining a court determination of a Founder's incapacity or the incapacity of a preceding appointed successor Trustee (including if that preceding appointed successor Trustee has not yet acted). Therefore, if an Authorization for Release of Protected Health Information executed by a Founder, or an appointed successor Trustee (even if not yet acting), or by a "personal representative" or "authorized representative" on behalf of a Founder or such an appointed successor Trustee, is not honored in whole or in part by a third party such that physicians' writings cannot be obtained as necessitated by this subparagraph, then the Trust Protector named under the Trust Agreement (if any), or if there is no such Trust Protector provided under the Trust Agreement then the next succeeding Trustee (even if not yet acting) who is independent, that is not related to or subordinate to, said Founder or such appointed successor Trustee within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code Section 672(c), may declare in writing said Founder or such appointed successor Trustee to be incapacitated; provided, however, the Trust Protector or next succeeding Trustee making such declaration shall have first made good faith efforts to obtain the physicians' writings described above, and the provisions above relating to reinstatement upon two (2) physicians' written determination of competency or capacity shall continue to apply.

In the event the Trust Agreement does not provide for an Independent Trustee as set forth in the above paragraph, such an Independent Trustee shall be elected by a majority vote of the then current adult income beneficiaries of the trust (or by the legal guardians of all minor or disabled current income beneficiaries) and such Independent Trustee shall not be related to nor subordinate to any of the beneficiaries participating in the said vote within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code 672(c). In the event that there are only two (2) beneficiaries, one of which is acting as Trustee, the remaining beneficiary may appoint such an Independent Trustee who is neither related to nor subordinate to such beneficiary as those terms are defined in and within the meaning of Internal Revenue Code 672(c).

The Founder has signed on this same date or on an earlier date an "Authorization for Release of Protected Health Information," in compliance with HIPAA, immediately authorizing the release of health and medical information to the Trustee (or next

successor Trustee, even if not yet acting), so the Trustee may legally defend against or otherwise resist any contest or attack of any nature upon any provision of the Trust Agreement or amendment to it (or defend against or prosecute any other legal matter within his or her powers set forth in the Trust Agreement). In the event said authorization cannot be located, is by its own terms no longer in force or is otherwise deemed invalid or not accepted in whole or in part, the Founder hereby grants the Trustee (or next successor Trustee, even if not yet acting) the power and authority, as the Founder's legal representative to execute a new authorization on the Founder's behalf, even after Founder's death, immediately authorizing the release of any and all health and medical information for the purpose of determining the Founder's incapacity (and for the purpose of carrying out any of the Trustee's powers, rights, duties and obligations under the Trust Agreement naming the Trustee (or next successor Trustee, even if not yet acting) as the Founder's "Personal Representative," "Authorized Representative" and "Authorized Recipient."

This Appointment of Successor Trustees is effective immediately upon execution of this document by the Founder, with the said successor Trustees to act at such times and in such instances as provided in the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996, as amended.

All other provisions contained in the Brunsting Family Living Trust October 10, 1996, as amended, are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that any such provisions are amended hereby or by previous amendments or appointments still in effect.

WITNESS MY HAND on July 1, 2008.

Nelva E. Brunsting
NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Original Trustee

THE STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

This instrument was acknowledged before me on July 1, 2008 NELVA E. BRUNSTING, as Founder and Original Trustee.

Candace Lynne Kunz-Freed
Notary Public, State of Texas

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

2/24/10 Cert of Trust

CERTIFICATE OF TRUST

The undersigned Founder hereby certifies the following:

1. This Certificate of Trust refers to a joint revocable living trust agreement executed by ELMER HENRY BRUNSTING, also known as ELMER H. BRUNSTING, and NELVA ERLEEN BRUNSTING, also known as NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Founders and original Trustees. The full legal name of the subject trust was:

   ELMER H. BRUNSTING or NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Trustees, or the successor Trustees, under the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST dated October 10, 1996, as amended.

2. ELMER H. BRUNSTING, died on April 1, 2009. Therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section B, of the Brunsting Family Living Trust Agreement, the remaining original Trustee, NELVA E. BRUNSTING, continues to serve alone.

3. For purposes of asset allocation, transfer of property into the trust, holding title to assets, and conducting business for and on behalf of the trust, the full legal name of the said trust shall now be known as:

   NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Trustee, or the successor Trustees, under the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST dated October 10, 1996, as amended.

   The tax identification number of the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST is 481-30-4685.

4. Pursuant to that certain Appointment of Successor Trustees dated July 1, 2008, if the remaining original Trustee fails or ceases to serve as Trustee by reason of death, disability or for any reason, then the following individuals will serve as successor Co-Trustees:

   CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING

   CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING shall each have the authority to appoint his or her own successor Trustee by appointment in writing.

   If a successor Co-Trustee should fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, then the remaining successor Co-Trustee shall serve alone. However, if neither successor Co-Trustee is able or willing to serve, then CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS shall serve as sole successor Trustee. In the event CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS is unable or unwilling to serve, then THE FROST NATIONAL BANK shall serve as sole successor Trustee.

5. The Trustee under the trust agreement is authorized to acquire, sell, convey, encumber, lease, borrow, manage and otherwise deal with interests in real and personal property in the trust name. All powers of the Trustee are fully set forth in Article XII of the trust agreement.

6. The trust has not been revoked and there have been no amendments limiting the powers of the Trustee over trust property.

7. No person or entity paying money to or delivering property to any Trustee shall be required to see to its application. All persons relying on this document regarding the Trustees and their powers over trust property shall be held harmless for any resulting loss or liability from such reliance.

A copy of this Certificate of Trust shall be just as valid as the original.

The undersigned certifies that the statements in this Certificate of Trust are true and correct and that it was executed in the County of Harris, in the State of Texas, on February 24, 2010.

Nelva E. Brunsting

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Trustee

STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

The foregoing Certificate of Trust was acknowledged before me on February 24, 2010, by NELVA E. BRUNSTING, as Founder and Trustee.

Witness my hand and official seal.

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

Candace Lynne Kunz Freed

Notary Public, State of Texas

2/24/10 EHB Dec Trust - Cert of Trust

CERTIFICATE OF TRUST
FOR THE
ELMER H. BRUNSTING **DECEDENT'S TRUST**

The undersigned Founder hereby certifies the following:

1. This Certificate of Trust refers to a joint revocable living trust agreement executed by ELMER HENRY BRUNSTING, also known as ELMER H. BRUNSTING, and NELVA ERLEEN BRUNSTING, also known as NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Founders and original Trustees. The full legal name of the original trust was:

   ELMER H. BRUNSTING or NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Trustees, or the successor Trustees, under the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST dated October 10, 1996, as amended.

2. ELMER H. BRUNSTING died on April 1, 2009. Therefore, pursuant to Article IV, Section B, of the Brunsting Family Living Trust agreement, the remaining original Trustee, NELVA E. BRUNSTING, continues to serve alone.

3. The BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST authorized the creation of the subsequent irrevocable trust known as the ELMER H. BRUNSTING **DECEDENT'S TRUST**. For purposes of asset allocation, transfer of property into the Decedent's Trust, holding title to assets, and conducting business for and on behalf of the trust, the full legal name of the Decedent's Trust shall now be known as:

   NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Trustee, or the successor Trustees, of the ELMER H. BRUNSTING DECEDENT'S TRUST dated April 1, 2009, as established under the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST dated October 10, 1996, as amended.

   The tax identification number of the ELMER H. BRUNSTING **DECEDENT'S TRUST** is 27-6453100. The Trust is irrevocable and no longer qualifies as a grantor trust.

   An acceptable abbreviation for account titling is as follows:

   NELVA E. BRUNSTING, Tee of the ELMER H. BRUNSTING DECEDENT'S TR dtd 4/1/09, as est UTD 10/10/96.

4. Pursuant to that certain Appointment of Successor Trustees dated July 1, 2008, if the said NELVA E. BRUNSTING, the surviving original Trustee, fails or ceases to serve as Trustee by reason of death, disability or for any reason, then the following individuals will serve as successor Co-Trustees:

   CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING shall each have the authority to appoint his or her own successor Trustee by appointment in writing.

If a successor Co-Trustee should fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, then the remaining successor Co-Trustee shall serve alone. However, if neither successor Co-Trustee is able or willing to serve, then CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS shall serve as sole successor Trustee. In the event CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS is unable or unwilling to serve, then THE FROST NATIONAL BANK shall serve as sole successor Trustee.

5. The Trustee under the trust agreement is authorized to acquire, sell, convey, encumber, lease, borrow, manage and otherwise deal with interests in real and personal property in the trust name. All powers of the Trustee are fully set forth in Article XII of the trust agreement.

6. The trust has not been revoked and there have been no amendments limiting the powers of the Trustee over trust property.

7. No person or entity paying money to or delivering property to any Trustee shall be required to see to its application. All persons relying on this document regarding the Trustees and their power over trust property shall be held harmless for any resulting loss or liability from such reliance.

A copy of this Certificate of Trust shall be just as valid as the original.

The undersigned certifies that the statements in this Certificate of Trust are true and correct and that it was executed in the County of Harris, in the State of Texas, on February 24, 2010.

Nelva E. Brunsting

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Trustee

THE STATE OF TEXAS §
§
COUNTY OF HARRIS §

The foregoing Certificate of Trust was acknowledged before me on February 24, 2010, by NELVA E. BRUNSTING as Founder and Trustee.

Witness my hand and official seal.

Candace Kunz Freed

Notary Public, State of Texas

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

EXHIBIT
E

FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE RESTATEMENT TO
THE BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST

ELMER H. BRUNSTING and NELVA E. BRUNSTING, the Founders of the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996 as restated on January 12, 2005, hereby amend the said Trust, as follows, to-wit:

1. The said trust entitled "The Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996" is hereby amended so that any and all references to "ANITA RILEY" shall be to "ANITA BRUNSTING". Said correction is incorporated herein as a part of the Brungsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996 for all purposes.

2. Article IV, Section B of the said Trust entitled "Our Successor Trustees" is hereby amended so that from henceforth Article IV, Section B is replaced in its entirety with the Article IV, Section B set forth in Exhibit "A" attached hereto and incorporated herein as a part of the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996, as restated on January 12, 2005, for all purposes.

3. All amendments set forth in this instrument are effective immediately upon execution of this document by the Founders.

4. All other provisions contained in the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996 as restated on January 12, 2005, are hereby ratified and confirmed and shall remain in full force and effect except to the extent that any such provisions are amended hereby.

WITNESS OUR HANDS this the 6th day of September, 2007.

ELMER H. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Trustee

NELVA E. BRUNSTING,
Founder and Trustee

THE STATE OF TEXAS
COUNTY OF HARRIS

This instrument was acknowledged before me on the 6th day of September, 2007, by ELMER H. BRUNSTING and NELVA E. BRUNSTING, as Founders and Trustees.

Notary Public, State of Texas

CANDACE LYNNE KUNZ FREED
NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF TEXAS
MY COMMISSION EXPIRES
MARCH 27, 2011

EXHIBIT "A"

Article IV

Our Trustees

Section B. Our Successor Trustees

Each of the original Trustees will have the right to appoint their own successor or successors to serve as Trustees in the event that such original Trustee ceases to serve by reason of death, disability or for any reason, and may specify any conditions upon succession and service as may be permitted by law. Such appointment, together with any specified conditions, must be in writing.

If an original Trustee does not appoint a successor, the remaining original Trustee or Trustees then serving will continue to serve alone.

If both of the original Trustees fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any reason without having appointed a successor or successors, then the following individuals or entities will serve as Co-Trustees:

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING and CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS shall each have the authority to appoint his or her own successor Trustee by appointment in writing.

If a successor Co-Trustee should fail or cease to serve by reason of death, disability or for any other reason, then the remaining successor Co-Trustee shall serve alone. However, if neither successor Co-Trustee is able or willing to serve, then THE FROST NATIONAL BANK shall serve as sole successor Trustee.

Successor Trustees will have the authority vested in the original Trustees under this trust document, subject to any lawful limitations or qualifications upon the service of a successor imposed by any Trustee in a written document appointing a successor.

A successor Trustee will not be obliged to examine the records, accounts and acts of the previous Trustee or Trustees, nor will a successor Trustee in any way or manner be responsible for any act or omission to act on the part of any previous Trustee.

EXHIBIT
F

A successor Trustee will not be obliged to examine the records, accounts and acts of the previous Trustee or Trustees, nor will a successor Trustee in any way or manner be responsible for any act or omission to act on the part of any previous Trustee.

Section C. No Bond is Required of Our Trustees

No one serving as Trustee will be required to furnish a fiduciary bond as a prerequisite to service.

Section D. Resignation or Removal of Our Trustees

We may each remove any Trustee we may have individually named as our respective successors. Any appointee serving or entitled to serve as Trustee may resign at any time and without cause, and the instructions in this trust will determine who the successor will be. All removals or resignations must be in writing.

In the event that no Trustee is remaining who has been designated in this trust, a majority of all adult income beneficiaries and the legal guardians of all minor or disabled beneficiaries of the trust shares created hereunder shall have the power to appoint any corporate or banking institution having trust powers as the successor Trustee. Such power shall be exercised in a written instrument in recordable form which identifies this power, identifies the successor Trustee, contains an acceptance of office by such successor Trustee and identifies the effective time and date of such succession.

A majority of all adult beneficiaries and the legal guardians of all minor or disabled beneficiaries who are then entitled to receive distributions of income from the trust, or distributions of income from any separate trust created by this document, may only remove any corporate or institutional Trustee then serving, the notice of removal to be delivered in writing to the said Trustee.

If such beneficiaries shall fail to appoint a successor corporate or institutional Trustee, the selection of a successor to the Trustee will be made by a court of competent jurisdiction.

Section E. Affidavit of Authority to Act

Any person or entity dealing with the trust may rely upon our Affidavit of Trust, regardless of its form, or the affidavit of a Trustee or Trustees in substantially the following form:

EXHIBIT
G

From: Nelva Brunsting
To: Candy Curtis
Date: Saturday, July 28, 2007 7:16:21 AM

Hi: I have a question for you Candy. Would you be willing to serve as co-trustee with Carl? Amy is on there now but I'm going to take her off because I don't think she is stable enough. I'll think of a good excuse so she won't get her feelings hurt. It might entail a trip or two when the time comes(doesn't that sound ominous???!!) but you would b paid for your traveling expenses. I think you have a better relationship with your siblings than she. Let me know.