#### NO. 412,249-401

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, et al	§	IN PROBATE COURT
	§	
v.	§	NUMBER FOUR (4) OF
	§	
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, et al	§	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

# CO-TRUSTEES' FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO EXCLUDE TESTIMONY/EVIDENCE, FOR SANCTIONS AND/OR FOR THIRD CONTEMPT AS TO CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS

#### TO THE HONORABLE JUDGES HORWITZ AND COMSTOCK:

AMY RUTH BRUNSTING ("Amy") and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING ("Anita") (the "Co-Trustees"), in their individual capacities and as the co-trustees of The Brunsting Family Living Trust a/k/a The Restatement of The Brunsting Family Living Trust (the "Trust") file this their <u>First</u> <u>Supplemental Motion to Exclude Testimony/Evidence, for Sanctions and/or For Third Contempt</u> <u>As To Candace Louise Curtis</u> (the "Supplemental Motion").

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Originally, Co-Trustees sought "death penalty sanctions" based on Curtis's repeated, habitual disregard for the Orders of this Court (and others). There is now an additional, non-sanctioned-based reason for excluding Curtis from trial (and/or any other future proceedings). Specifically, by operation of the Trust, Curtis forfeited her interest in the Trust. Thus, her status is one of a nullity. Curtis has no right, under the Trust or at law, to be heard in this matter. In other words, Curtis lacks standing, capacity, and/or any other basis for further participation in this matter, other than a right to be heard regarding the merits of this Supplemental Motion and to appeal a final judgment to be entered in this case.

# II. SUMMARY OF FILINGS & PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND PERTAINING TO MOTION TO EXCLUDE

Regarding the requested exclusion of testimony/evidence, and in addition to this

Supplemental Motion, the following documents are before the Court:

- 1. Co-Trustees' Motion to Exclude Testimony/Evidence, for Sanctions and/or For Third Contempt As To Candace Louise Curtis, including Exhibits A D (filed on or about February 21, 2022)(the "Motion");
- 2. Curtis's Response to Motion to Exclude Evidence, Sanctions and/or Contempt with Motion to Set Aside Orders for Want of Jurisdiction and Failure to Resolve Bill of Review First, and its attachments (filed on or about February 23, 2022);
- 3. Co-Trustees' Reply to Curtis's Response to Motion to Exclude Testimony/Evidence, for Sanctions including Exhibits E I (filed on or about February 24, 2022)(the "Reply");
- 4. Curtis's Sur-Reply to Defendant's Reply to Plaintiff's Response to Motion to Exclude, for Sanction and Contempt and its attachments (filed on or about February 25, 2022); and
- 5. Co-Trustees' Response to Curtis's Sur-Reply Regarding Co-Trustees' Motion to Exclude, including Exhibit J (filed on or about February 25, 2022) (the "Response to Sur-Reply").

The Motion was set to be heard by the Court on February 25, 2022, in conjunction with the

Pre-Trial Conference scheduled for that same day. Prior to the Motion being heard, the parties

learned that Co-Trustees' Motion for Summary Judgment had been granted as to Curtis. See

Exhibit K. As a result, Co-Trustees passed the hearing on the Motion, reserving the right to reset

it for consideration. See Exhibit L

#### III. ARGUMENT AND ANALYSIS

As the Court's file will reflect, the Co-Trustees filed their Motion for Summary Judgment ("MSJ") on November 5, 2021. Curtis responded. The MSJ was subsequently set for hearing as to Curtis only. Prior to the hearing, which was to be held on December 14, 2021, the Court announced its intention to consider the MSJ via submission. Approximately two months later, on February 25, 2022, the Court announced its decision and the <u>Order Granting Co-Trustees' Motion</u>

for Summary Judgment as to Candace Louise Curtis Only (the "Summary Judgment Order") was

### signed. See Exhibits K & L

The Summary Judgment Order contains a finding that "Curtis has forfeited her interest as

a beneficiary of the Trust and/or the August 2010 QBD..." See Exhibit K [Emphasis Added].

The "forfeiture finding" is consistent with the terms of the Trust. By way of example but not

limitation, at Article XI, Section C, the Trust, in relevant part, states:

Founders do not want to burden this trust with the costs of a litigated proceeding to resolve questions of law or fact unless the proceeding is originated by the Trustee or with the Trustee's written permission. Any person, agency or organization who shall originate (or who shall cause to be initiated) a judicial proceeding to construe or contest this trust instrument, or any will which requires distribution of property to this trust, or to resolve any claim or controversy in the nature of reimbursement, or seeking to impress a constructive or resulting trust, or alleging any other theory which, if assumed as true, would enlarge (or originate) a claimant's interest in this trust or in the Founders' estates, without the Trustee's written permission, shall forfeit any amount to which that person, agency or organization is or may be entitled ....

### See Exhibit L at Page 11-2 [Emphasis Added]

In the eyes of the Trust and by virtue of her vexatious conduct, and as confirmed by this Court, Curtis forfeited her interest in the Trust. As a matter of law Curtis no longer has any of the rights that she originally had under the Trust. In other words, Curtis lacks standing, capacity, and/or any other basis to participate further in this litigation, other than a right to be heard regarding the merits of this Supplemental Motion and to appeal a final judgment to be entered in this case.

This means that, except as provided in the preceding sentence, Curtis has no right to participate, be heard at trial, or introduce evidence; no right to pursue motion practice; and no right to offer testimony on any matter that is or may eventually be pending before the Court in this 401-proceeding, the base case, or any other ancillary or related proceeding before this Court in connection with the Trust, the Estate of Nelva Brunsting, and/or the death of Nelva Brunsting.

## IV. CONCLUSION & PRAYER

For the reasons addressed in the Co-Trustees' Motion, Reply and Response to Sur-Reply, Curtis's egregious, vexatious conduct supports the imposition of death penalty sanctions. Additionally and/or alternatively, for the reasons addressed in this Supplemental Motion, Curtis has no rights under the Trust or in this litigation. Any evidence, argument, testimony, or other effort in furtherance of her participation in this trial must be excluded from the record.

WHEREFORE, PREMISES CONSIDERED, Defendants, AMY RUTH BRUNSTING and ANITA KAY BRUNSTING request that:

- 1. This Court grant the relief requested in the Supplemental Motion; and
- 2. Grant/award the Co-Trustees such other and further relief at law and in equity to which either or both may be justly entitled, and/or as needed to effectuate the issues identified in this Supplemental Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

### **GRIFFIN & MATTHEWS**

1st Neal E. Spielman BY:

NEAL E. SPIELMAN Texas State Bar No. 00794678 nspielman@grifmatlaw.com 1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77079 281.870.1124 - Phone 281.870.1647 - Facsimile

ATTORNEYS FOR AMY BRUNSTING

AND

# THE MENDEL LAW FIRM, L.P.

<u>|s| Stephen A. Mendel</u> BY:

STEPHEN A. MENDEL Texas State Bar No. 13930650 1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 300 Houston, Texas 77079 O: 281-759-3213 F: 281-759-3214 E: steve@mendellawfirm.com

ATTORNEYS FOR ANITA BRUNSTING

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been sent on this 31<sup>st</sup> day of March 2022, to all counsel of record/pro se parties via E-file and/or direct e-mail.

Attorney for Candace Louise Curtis:

Candice L. Schwager Schwager Law Firm 1417 Ramada Drive Houston, Texas 77062 *Via E-Mail: candiceschwager@icloud.com* 

Attorneys for Anita Kay Brunsting:

Stephen A. Mendel (SBN 13930650) The Mendel Law Firm, L.P. 1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 104 Houston, Texas 77079 *Via E-Mail: steve@mendellawfirm.com* 

Attorneys for Carl Henry Brunsting:

Bobbie G. Bayless Bayless & Stokes 2931 Ferndale Houston, TX 77098 Via E-Mail: bayless@baylessstokes.com

Attorneys for Carole Ann Brunsting:

John Bruster Loyd

Jones, Gillaspia & Loyd, L.L.P. 4400 Post Oak Pkwy, Ste. 2360 Houston, TX 77027 *Via E-Mail: bruse@jgl-law.com* 

BY: <u>Ist Neal E. Spielman</u>

NEAL E. SPIELMAN