

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **A question I forgot to ask**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 24 Jul 2015 10:11:58 -0500

This was in your email of 7/7/15 to me about the illegal recordings. I never got back with you about this. Remind me what account you are talking about.

The next file BRUNSTING 5838.wav contains a change date of 4/22/2011.
This is the date of the funny bank account U/A 11/22/2011 I previously
mentioned has always bothered me.
This doesn't help relieve that "What's wrong with this picture" feeling.

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Joinder**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Mon, 1 Apr 2013 08:21:57 -0500

I don't know about Nelva's reservations about Harris county, so I can't speak to that. Maybe you are referring to some type of desire to avoid probate. If that is the case, she and Elmer—as well as their children—would have been much better served by going through probate proceedings rather than going the Vacek and Freed crazy trust route. But I can certainly understand trying to follow the wishes of someone who isn't around to make those wishes known anymore. And I am certainly not going to say there aren't pitfalls in state court, as well as federal court. This state has been ravaged by tort reform. I think you will even find defense lawyers who will attest to that.

Federal question jurisdiction will certainly solve diversity issues, but you won't be in a position of being able to make them carry the burden of proof anymore. It sounds like you have some juicy proof so you probably don't care about that, and forgery certainly needs to be addressed.

Unfortunately, one of the things tort reform has bolstered in this state is privity. Our appellate courts cling to it like a baby clings to its blanket—even though most states have not. There have been a lot of compelling cases that have shot holes in the justification for the doctrine, but it hasn't gone anywhere. Our appellate court—especially our supreme court just doesn't change the law in the direction of anything that will allow more causes of action to be asserted.

This whole document alteration and creation routine is mind boggling. Do you believe Amy is the one behind this? I understand she has some computer skills that might have given her the knowledge to try this. How would they think they could get away with even forging Candy's signature???

My take on Carole—especially after seeing her in action in her deposition—is that she would walk around the truth to embrace a lie.

My logical perspective on combining things is I just don't see the advantage to having one judge decide everything about these cases. Even if you were dealing with a great judge who you were comfortable was going to make sound decisions, you would be limiting your options.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, April 01, 2013 12:12 AM
Subject: Re: Joinder

Bobbie,

Thank you for your gut reaction thoughts.

I would however agree to disagree. I understand that Carl pollutes diversity but I am looking at forgery in conjunction with securities transactions and that's a federal question. Nelva didn't want this in Harris county and that's what Candy is listening to.

I also understand the DTPA theories on privity and again I agree to disagree. This case shoots holes in that doctrine and undermines every justification for it. Conflicts run thick in this one.

I have researched his background and read some of his rulings and I reserve any opinion on Judge Hoyt (kinda have to say that). You are more than welcome to object to Candy's application for Joinder or Judge Hoyt on what ever ground you see fit. I appreciate your action is at law and you have the burden of proof, but Candy is in equity and the rules are different. If Judge Hoyt doesn't understand the distinctions between law and equity I'm sure Candy will join in your objection.

I also understand the burden of proof on the application for injunction is very high. Candy has already met that burden with admissions exceptions they can't talk their way out of. I have more than one reason for my actions and it doesn't matter whether the injunction is issued or not, as I have already shifted liability for any further injury to the bank and securities agents. Those people want this injunction!

I will have a summary report on the information I received from you in a day or two. It was a gold mine. Even Candy's signature was forged by Anita on the Exxon document dated 06/08/2011. On page 81 of the 7.5.12 Production.pdf there is a document that Candy had never seen before and did not sign.

Also on page 63 of the 7.5.12 Production.pdf there is a document that Carole allegedly signed showing 1325 stocks. Her depo says she didn't know how much because she didn't open the envelope until September. All of these things cannot be true, but then that's Carole?

I would appreciate a look at anything else you have except I don't need to see the lying Carole deposition video.

I don't make any decisions, Candy asks the questions and I do my best to find an answer. If you have a logistical perspective suggesting joinder to be disadvantageous to your common causes I would like to hear about it that I may brief my principal on your concerns.

Rik

On 3/31/2013 5:40 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

Just a few thoughts on some of this stuff you sent me. You can't remove my case against the lawyers to your proceeding in federal court. Even if you could, it would wreck your diversity jurisdiction. And just so you know—I will object mightily to having our case in Ken Hoyt's court. I also believe the only people who are going to qualify as consumers of the lawyers' services under the DTPA are Elmer & Nelva—and now, of course, Anita and Amy. And I think the judge is going to place the burden of proof on the injunction elements on Candy in the injunction setting—even if on the merits, they have the burden of proof on self-dealing transactions. Maybe I am wrong, but I think you will be disappointed in the outcome if you show up and say you don't have to prove anything for purposes of obtaining the preliminary injunction.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 12:06 PM

Subject: Joinder

I will be digesting this information as well. FYI here is my draft on Joinder and my notes on privity. Note the sweet twist on standing! I want to stay in a position of not having to prove anything. Candy cannot litigate this action for myriad of reasons and I do not want to attempt to venture in as next friend or private attorney general if I have any other option.

Are you available for a special appearance on the 9th? I expect to file my joinder by mail on Monday and the rumor mill has it they will object to Candy appearing by phone. We can be there but it wouldn't be cost effective.

Thank you Bobby

I look forward to a very productive union.

From: Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
To: Rik Munson <blowintough@att.net>
Sent: Thu, March 28, 2013 9:41:32 AM
Subject: Fw: Documents requested from you and your deposition

Here is the email exchange about Carole's bank records.

— Original Message —

From: Carole Brunsting
To: MMcCutchen@millsshirley.com ; Bobbie Bayless
Cc: ZandraFoley
Sent: Thursday, August 30, 2012 10:15 PM
Subject: Re: Documents requested from you and your deposition

that was a reimbursement to me for out of pocket expenses

--- On Wed, 8/29/12, Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com> wrote:

From: Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject: Re: Documents requested from you and your deposition
To: "Carole Brunsting" <cbrunsting@sbcglobal.net>, MMcCutchen@millsshirley.com
Cc: "ZandraFoley" <zfoley@thompsoncoe.com>
Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2012, 10:52 PM

And what is your response to the second question in the first email below?

— Original Message —

From: Carole Brunsting
To: MMcCutchen@millsshirley.com ; Bobbie Bayless
Cc: ZandraFoley
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 10:05 PM
Subject: Re: Documents requested from you and your deposition

These transactions are online payments for the Blue Bonnet Credit card statement made by my Mother. I do not have copies of any statement but was told those had already been provided.

--- On Tue, 8/28/12, Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com> wrote:

From: Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject: Re: Documents requested from you and your deposition
To: "Carole Brunsting" <cbrunsting@sbcglobal.net>, MMcCutchen@millsshirley.com
Cc: "ZandraFoley" <zfoley@thompsoncoe.com>
Date: Tuesday, August 28, 2012, 4:11 PM

Also, another question I forgot to include in the last email. There are other withdrawals from the account on which I would like more information. On 1/18/11, 1/21/11, 3/14/11, and 5/26/11 there are withdrawals called "Cardmember Serv Des". Are these credit card payments? If so, I assume you have the credit statements being paid.

— Original Message —

From: Bobbie Bayless
To: Carole Brunsting ; MMcCutchen@millsshirley.com
Cc: ZandraFoley
Sent: Tuesday, August 28, 2012 3:35 PM
Subject: Re: Documents requested from you and your deposition

After reviewing records for the joint account that you had with your mother, I have a some questions.

1. The first statement you obtained was the statement covering the period of 1/14/11-2/10/11. There is a beginning balance on that statement so it isn't the first one for the account. Do you have the earlier statements, going back to when the account was opened? Since I don't know when it was opened, I don't know how many statements are not included.
2. Beginning at least by the time of the statement covering the period from 8/17/11-9/15/11, there are online transfers out of the

| | | | account into a checking account ending in the numbers 2839. Whose account ends in 2839, and what were those transfers for?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: letters of engagement, res judicata and some funny**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Mon, 13 Jul 2015 11:04:13 -0500

Rik--If you have mentioned this somewhere in the past, I guess I didn't focus on it enough to realize you were thinking I could actually take on Candy's representation. I still represent Carl through Drina, and I can't also represent Candy. That would be the case even if Candy could pay me.

I agree there are some good findings in the injunction order, but you have to have a final judgment to be able to claim res judicata, so I don't think it goes that far.

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie Bayless
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 10:35 AM
Subject: letters of engagement, res judicata and some funny

I was thinking we should probably have a proposed agreement on the executor appointment if it goes the way we think it should.

If Candy gets the appointment she would like you to continue under the terms of your contract with the former executor except we don't have advance money for fee's and would want the litigation to pay for itself. We are absolutely against the trust suffering any further economic devastation. As far as we can see the executor at this stage is nothing but a figurehead on a post and Candy's appointment under a dependent administration is the simple most cost effective and expedient solution. We also need consolidation under one roof. That should ease the judges mind. We could move meaningfully forward and wrap this all up in rather short order I think.

There are a few things I would like to point out that are rather amusing.

We have res Judicata from the federal courts. The Johnny-Come-Lately attorney's don't have a clue. Their clients were there but apparently weren't all there.

Let's take it fact step at a time:

Amy filed a perjured affidavit into the USDC on March 6, 2012 claiming personal assets trusts (PAT's) had been set up for the five heirs "as is the case for Candace"

Bernard Mathews was the subject of a federal Rule 11 motion identifying his knowing fraud upon the court but it was internal and doesn't appear in the record of the court.

At the injunction hearing Hoyt asked George Vie about the PAT's and George admitted they had not been "setup" yet

When Hoyt asked why not, Vie blamed the federal litigation and Hoyt kicked him to the curb so George started blaming the District Court suit against Vacek & Freed and Hoyt again kicked him to the curb.

In their objections to distributions and in all of their pleadings they claim to have done nothing wrong and only acted properly until Carl and Candy filed suit! In their No-evidence motion and in the answers to interros they claim honorable intentions and blame the litigation for their failure to perform their fiduciary duties.

That's nothing but a smokescreen for retaliation.

Read the injunction, they were ordered to deposit income received into an appropriate beneficiary account and that does not mean putting it into the decedents trust bank account and paying exorbitant taxes on it.

The record also reflects that the defendants have failed to provide the records requested by the plaintiff as required by Article IX-(E) of the Trust. Nor is there evidence that the Trustee has established separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required under the Trust, even though more than two years has expired since her appointment. In light of what appears to be irregularities in the documents and the failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust, the Court ENJOINS the Trustee(s) and all assigns from disbursing any funds from any Trust accounts without prior permission of the Court. However, any income received for the benefit of the Trust beneficiary is to be deposited appropriately in an account. However, the Trustee shall not borrow funds, engage in new business ventures, or sell real property or other assets without the prior approval of the Court. In essence, all transactions of a financial nature shall require pre-approval of the Court, pending a resolution of disputes between the parties in this case.

There it is! The federal court found 1) the trustees had failed to provide records requested by the plaintiff as required; 2) failed to establish separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required; 3) found irregularities in the documents and 4) found failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust! All this on the very day suits were first filed in probate.

None-the-less Amy's objection continues to claim:

"Allegations against Amy are essentially a sham" and "None of Carl or Candace's claims in the 401-Proceeding or the District Court Action have merit."

They were ordered to fund the personal asset accounts with the income and there is no excuse for their retaliatory posture. The decedents and survivors trusts are not beneficiaries!

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: more than meets the eye**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 22 Aug 2013 10:41:53 -0500

This is all very unfortunate. I, of course, represent Carl, and I have more than enough to keep me busy on that front, but I don't see how much can be accomplished by my participation in anything anyway if what I say is going to be ignored. I believe it is a mistake to pursue the federal case, but I don't have to live with the results--Candy does.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie Bayless"
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:04 AM
Subject: more than meets the eye

Your dissent has been noted. but more of it is detracting. Candy will move forward and that effort is well underway. There is nothing anyone can do about her intentions or her decisions. You will only distance her with suggestions that she dismiss this case.

George admits they do not have proof of notices and cannot rebut the presumption of constructive fraud. They also failed to prove their claims of propriety when ordered to do so.

Do you want to participate in preparing the motions that will be presented to Hoyt and the discussions regarding the progression of filings on the road to summary judgment or do just want to live with the results?

Do not be fooled by pro se posturing... George is asleep at the wheel and we like him that way.

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Motion for Protective Order**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 18 Jul 2015 20:52:08 -0500

I don't know what this means.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 7:07 PM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

its all goof stuff!

On 7/18/2015 1:35 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I understand. I tried to soften it, but I can try to do more.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 3:02 PM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

On 7/17/2015 4:33 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I am not at all finished with this. I haven't even looked at the last revisions my secretary made before she left, so if something doesn't make sense, that is why. One problem is that I am still trying to decide what emails to attach. I want to show the judge how compelling the story is, but if I attach too much, it will get her side-tracked from the issue of the illegal recordings. I also am not sure I have all the facts quite right or chronologically in sinc—especially as to Candy.

I am also still trying to decide if there is any other relief I want to be ordered. So, I am going to be working on it more this weekend. We obviously won't be able to address it on Tuesday, but I want to send it to the associate judge on Monday so the judge will have it to read before Tuesday. My excuse will be that I want to see if they will agree to hear it on August 3. Once I get this on file, the pleading that asks for damages for all this—separate and apart from the discovery relief—needs to be finished up and filed.

Once again, I sent this in a pdf because we do our stuff in wordperfect. I would appreciate any thoughts you care to give me on it. I also may need to call Candy this weekend for clarification on some of the facts that I am representing as relating to her.

I have not gotten to it yet but Candy says' the facts are dead on. She is a little sensitive in being portrayed in an unglamorous light due to a position assumed on bad information and poorly placed trust. She said something about foot notes. I will read it later today

I am looking at Vacek's opposition motion now

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Motion for Protective Order**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sun, 19 Jul 2015 09:52:04 -0500

Thanks. There is still something about it that bothers me..something I feel like I am not getting across plainly enough for this judge.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Sunday, July 19, 2015 9:23 AM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

What I means is that its a well drafted motion that hits the nail on the head.

On 7/18/2015 6:52 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

I dont know what this means.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 7:07 PM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

its all goof stuff!

On 7/18/2015 1:35 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I understand. I tried to soften it, but I can try to do more.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 3:02 PM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

On 7/17/2015 4:33 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I am not at all finished with this. I haven't even looked at the last revisions my secretary made before she left, so if something doesn't make sense, that is why. One problem is that I am still trying to decide what emails to attach. I want to show the judge how compelling the story is, but if I attach too much, it will get her side-tracked from the issue of the illegal recordings. I also am not sure I have all the facts quite right or chronologically in sinc—especially as to Candy.

I am also still trying to decide if there is any other relief I want to be ordered. So, I am going to be working on it more this weekend. We obviously won't be able to address it on Tuesday, but I want to send it to the associate judge on Monday so the judge will have it to read before Tuesday. My excuse will be that I want to see if they will agree to hear it on August 3. Once I get this on file, the pleading that asks for damages for all this—separate and apart from the discovery relief—needs to be finished up and filed.

Once again, I sent this in a pdf because we do our stuff in wordperfect. I would appreciate any thoughts you care to give me on it. I also may need to call Candy this weekend for clarification on some of the facts that I am representing as relating to her.

I have not gotten to it yet but Candy says' the facts are dead on. She is a little sensitive in being portrayed in an unglamorous light due to a position assumed on bad information and poorly placed trust. She said something about foot notes. I will read it later today

I am looking at Vacek's opposition motion now

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Motion for Protective Order**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 18 Jul 2015 15:35:50 -0500

I understand. I tried to soften it, but I can try to do more.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, July 18, 2015 3:02 PM
Subject: Re: Motion for Protective Order

On 7/17/2015 4:33 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I am not at all finished with this. I haven't even looked at the last revisions my secretary made before she left, so if something doesn't make sense, that is why. One problem is that I am still trying to decide what emails to attach. I want to show the judge how compelling the story is, but if I attach too much, it will get her side-tracked from the issue of the illegal recordings. I also am not sure I have all the facts quite right or chronologically in sinc—especially as to Candy.

I am also still trying to decide if there is any other relief I want to be ordered. So, I am going to be working on it more this weekend. We obviously won't be able to address it on Tuesday, but I want to send it to the associate judge on Monday so the judge will have it to read before Tuesday. My excuse will be that I want to see if they will agree to hear it on August 3. Once I get this on file, the pleading that asks for damages for all this—separate and apart from the discovery relief—needs to be finished up and filed.

Once again, I sent this in a pdf because we do our stuff in wordperfect. I would appreciate any thoughts you care to give me on it. I also may need to call Candy this weekend for clarification on some of the facts that I am representing as relating to her.

I have not gotten to it yet but Candy says' the facts are dead on. She is a little sensitive in being portrayed in an unglamorous light due to a position assumed on bad information and poorly placed trust. She said something about foot notes. I will read it later today

I am looking at Vacek's opposition motion now

From Candace Curtis <occurtis@sbcglobal.net>
Subject **Re: My signed waiver**
To Bobbie G Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Date Tue, 2 Aug 2016 17:52:10 +0000 (UTC)

Thank you Bobbie.

Best regards,

Candace

On Tuesday, August 2, 2016 10:35 AM, Bobbie G Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com> wrote:

I have attached my signed waiver. The original will go out to you in today's mail.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sun, 18 Aug 2013 14:45:32 -0500

I think the CD is being mailed to Candy. It was mailed to me, but obviously it gets to me sooner. He sent it because I told him I wanted the documents I gave to West—including his letters to West explaining things. His response was he would send it to all the beneficiaries. When I didn't get it and followed up, he said they were just going to produce everything again because they didn't want to go to the trouble to find the last number of something they sent us and figure out what wasn't in there. Now that I have seen the documents, it is clear they didn't send West everything I had them copy in Galveston, and I am not sure they even gave him all the financial info they had already given me. At any rate, it is a pain in the butt, because now I have to go to their new numbering system and try to compare it to the old one and see what is new.

I think the last thing anyone wants is for Judge Hoyt to be allowed to partition the Iowa farm property. He just wants to make this all go away as quickly as possible—at least that is what he seemed to say in that last hearing. What is the concern about dismissing the federal case and getting away from that guy before he causes more harm than good through final rulings that Amy and Anita will then claim bar further litigation of some or all of their wrongdoing? And even if you think his rulings won't survive appeal, I would be shocked if he would grant a stay while that appeal is proceeding. If not, and if the 5th Circuit won't do that either, the ability to tie up Anita and Amy's portions of the trust to repay the losses to Candy and Carl that they have caused with be seriously jeopardized. Assuming we can get the same injunction in place in state court—which I think we can, even if Anita and Amy won't agree to it—what could possibly be the benefit of keeping the case going in Hoyt's court? Hoyt is going to fight you every step of the way about broadening this case. He said as much in that last hearing. That is a real problem for everyone but Anita and Amy.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 9:41 AM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

No, we did not receive a copy of any explanatory letters and we have not received any additional CD documents. Please review the following communication with Mr. Vie who is apparently asleep at the wheel.

Dear Mr. Vie,
Pursuant to Rule 15(a)(2), this communication shall stand as my formal request for your written consent to amend the complaint in the above-referenced action.

In order for me to consider and respond intelligently, I need not know something about the proposed amendment. Are you seeking to join parties (if so, who) or amend and add claims (if so, what claims)? If you have a proposed amendment, could you forward it?

Please provide this information or the proposed pleading and I will respond for your certificate of conference.

While we are discussing the case, do you have any interest in mediation or some other alternative dispute resolution method before the hearing, or perhaps in connection with the hearing scheduled for the first week of September? Possibilities include just this case, or a larger mediation to include the other cases.

Second, it seems necessary to begin proceedings regarding the farm property if we are to wind up this Trust as the Court desires. Are you interested or agreeable to a partition of the farm, either by agreement with the other beneficiaries or a judicial action to partition filed in Iowa? I think Judge Hoyt would have to approve a motion for the Trust to undertake expenses for a partition of the farm.

Please let me know your position regarding these matters, and forward information on your proposed motion to amend.

George W. Vie III
Licensed in Hawai'i and Texas
Board Certified (Texas), Civil Appellate Law

Mills Shirley LLP
One City Centre
1021 Main Street, Suite 1950
Houston, Texas 77002
Direct Tel 713.571.4232 | 713.571.4218
Fax 713.893.6095

http://www.millsshirley.com/professionals/George_Vie/

On 8/17/2013 4:02 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have received a disk from Anita and Amy's attorney which contains the documents he supposedly gave to West. It appears to have some new documents on it that I haven't seen and there is a new set of numbers on these—presumably for their production to West. I did not receive any of the communications he had with West, although I asked for them. I assume you guys have never been provided with those. On explanatory letter is even referenced in West's Report.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sun, 18 Aug 2013 15:14:38 -0500

Here is an example of something interesting on the new cd from Vie. This is the pitiful excuse for receipts to back up their disbursements from the trust, but it includes an invoice from Mathews. There is a lot of involvement with Vacek and Freed, an almost 2 hour phone call with Carole, etc., etc., but what is the most interesting to me is that the last entry confirms my suspicions—that Anita and Amy fired him because he wanted them to turn the info on the trusts over voluntarily.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 2:45 PM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

I think the CD is being mailed to Candy. It was mailed to me, but obviously it gets to me sooner. He sent it because I told him I wanted the documents I gave to West—including his letters to west explaining things. His response was he would send it to all the beneficiaries. When I didn't get it and followed up, he said they were just going to produce everything again because they didn't want to go to the trouble to find the last number of something they sent us and figure out what wasn't in there. Now that I have seen the documents, it is clear they didn't send West everything I had them copy in Galveston, and I am not sure they even gave him all the financial info they had already given me. At any rate, it is a pain in the butt, because now I have to go to their new numbering system and try to compare it to the old one and see what is new.

I think the last thing anyone wants is for Judge Hoyt to be allowed to partition the Iowa farm property. He just wants to make this all go away as quickly as possible—at least that is what he seemed to say in that last hearing. What is the concern about dismissing the federal case and getting away from that guy before he causes more harm than good through final rulings that Amy and Anita will then claim bar further litigation of some or all of their wrongdoing? And even if you think his rulings won't survive appeal, I would be shocked if he would grant a stay while that appeal is proceeding. If not, and if the 5th Circuit won't do that either, the ability to tie up Anita and Amy's portions of the trust to repay the losses to Candy and Carl that they have caused with be seriously jeopardized. Assuming we can get the same injunction in place in state court—which I think we can, even if Anita and Amy won't agree to it—what could possibly be the benefit of keeping the case going in Hoyt's court? Hoyt is going to fight you every step of the way about broadening this case. He said as much in that last hearing. That is a real problem for everyone but Anita and Amy.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 9:41 AM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

No, we did not receive a copy of any explanatory letters and we have not received any additional CD documents.
Please review the following communication with Mr. Vie who is apparently asleep at the wheel.

Dear Mr. Vie,

Pursuant to Rule 15(a)(2), this communication shall stand as my formal request for your written consent to amend the complaint in the above-referenced action.

In order for me to consider and respond intelligently, I need not know something about the proposed amendment. Are you seeking to join parties (if so, who) or amend and add claims (if so, what claims)? If you have a proposed amendment, could you forward it?

Please provide this information or the proposed pleading and I will respond for your certificate of conference.

While we are discussing the case, do you have any interest in mediation or some other alternative dispute resolution method before the hearing, or perhaps in connection with the hearing scheduled for the first week of September? Possibilities include just this case, or a larger mediation to include the other cases.

Second, it seems necessary to begin proceedings regarding the farm property if we are to wind up this Trust as the Court desires. Are you interested or agreeable to a partition of the farm, either by agreement with the other beneficiaries or a judicial action to partition filed in Iowa? I think Judge Hoyt would have to approve a motion for the Trust to undertake expenses for a partition of the farm.

Please let me know your position regarding these matters, and forward information on your proposed motion to amend.

George W. Vie III
Licensed in Hawai'i and Texas
Board Certified (Texas), Civil Appellate Law

Mills Shirley LLP
One City Centre
1021 Main Street, Suite 1950
Houston, Texas 77002
Direct Tel 713.571.4232 | 713.571.4218
Fax 713.893.6095

http://www.millsshirley.com/professionals/George_Vie/

On 8/17/2013 4:02 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have received a disk from Anita and Amy's attorney which contains the documents he supposedly gave to West. It appears to have some new documents on it that I haven't seen and there is a new set of numbers on these—presumably for their production to West. I did not receive any of the

communications he had with West, although I asked for them. I assume you guys have never been provided with those. On explanatory letter is even referenced in West's Report.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sun, 18 Aug 2013 15:39:09 -0500

And don't miss the entry in Mathews' bill on 4/3/12 that says "Further revision on schedules related to changes required by bank account disclosures."

This really needs to be away from Hoyt and under one umbrella so that Anita, Amy, and Carole have to account for what they did. Hoyt has already said he is going to resist doing anything except dividing what is left. Even if you can somehow convince him that isn't good enough, he is going to make your life miserable if you try to make him do more—and in the process potentially do real damage to the existing claims. Maybe my view is colored too much from having been in his court on other cases, but I just don't see any benefit to being over there, and I really don't see any benefit that outweighs the potential harm.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 3:14 PM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

Here is an example of something interesting on the new cd from Vie. This is the pitiful excuse for receipts to back up their disbursements from the trust, but it includes an invoice from Mathews. There is a lot of involvement with Vacek and Freed, an almost 2 hour phone call with Carole, etc., etc., but what is the most interesting to me is that the last entry confirms my suspicions—that Anita and Amy fired him because he wanted them to turn the info on the trusts over voluntarily.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 2:45 PM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

I think the CD is being mailed to Candy. It was mailed to me, but obviously it gets to me sooner. He sent it because I told him I wanted the documents I gave to West—including his letters to West explaining things. His response was he would send it to all the beneficiaries. When I didn't get it and followed up, he said they were just going to produce everything again because they didn't want to go to the trouble to find the last number of something they sent us and figure out what wasn't in there. Now that I have seen the documents, it is clear they didn't send West everything I had them copy in Galveston, and I am not sure they even gave him all the financial info they had already given me. At any rate, it is a pain in the butt, because now I have to go to their new numbering system and try to compare it to the old one and see what is new.

I think the last thing anyone wants is for Judge Hoyt to be allowed to partition the Iowa farm property. He just wants to make this all go away as quickly as possible—at least that is what he seemed to say in that last hearing. What is the concern about dismissing the federal case and getting away from that guy before he causes more harm than good through final rulings that Amy and Anita will then claim bar further litigation of some or all of their wrongdoing? And even if you think his rulings won't survive appeal, I would be shocked if he would grant a stay while that appeal is proceeding. If not, and if the 5th Circuit won't do that either, the ability to tie up Anita and Amy's portions of the trust to repay the losses to Candy and Carl that they have caused with be seriously jeopardized. Assuming we can get the same injunction in place in state court—which I think we can, even if Anita and Amy won't agree to it—what could possibly be the benefit of keeping the case going in Hoyt's court? Hoyt is going to fight you every step of the way about broadening this case. He said as much in that last hearing. That is a real problem for everyone but Anita and Amy.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Sunday, August 18, 2013 9:41 AM
Subject: Re: New stuff from Anita and Amy

No, we did not receive a copy of any explanatory letters and we have not received any additional CD documents. Please review the following communication with Mr. Vie who is apparently asleep at the wheel.

Dear Mr. Vie,

Pursuant to Rule 15(a)(2), this communication shall stand as my formal request for your written consent to amend the complaint in the above-referenced action.

In order for me to consider and respond intelligently, I need not know something about the proposed amendment. Are you seeking to join parties (if so, who) or amend and add claims (if so, what claims)? If you have a proposed amendment, could you forward it?

Please provide this information or the proposed pleading and I will respond for your certificate of conference.

While we are discussing the case, do you have any interest in mediation or some other alternative dispute resolution method before the hearing, or perhaps in connection with the hearing scheduled for the first week of September? Possibilities include just this case, or a larger mediation to include the other cases.

Second, it seems necessary to begin proceedings regarding the farm property if we are to wind up this Trust as the Court desires. Are you interested or agreeable to a partition of the farm, either by agreement with the other beneficiaries or a judicial action to partition filed in Iowa? I think Judge Hoyt would have to approve a motion for the Trust to undertake expenses for a partition of the farm.

Please let me know your position regarding these matters, and forward information on your proposed motion to amend.

George W. Vie III
Licensed in Hawai'i and Texas
Board Certified (Texas), Civil Appellate Law

Mills Shirley LLP
One City Centre
1021 Main Street, Suite 1950
Houston, Texas 77002
Direct Tel 713.571.4232 | 713.571.4218
Fax 713.893.6095

http://www.millsshirley.com/professionals/George_Vie/

On 8/17/2013 4:02 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have received a disk from Anita and Amy's attorney which contains the documents he supposedly gave to West. It appears to have some new documents on it that I haven't seen and there is a new set of numbers on these—presumably for their production to West. I did not receive any of the communications he had with West, although I asked for them. I assume you guys have never been provided with those. On explanatory letter is even referenced in West's Report.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Not Candy's case**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Mon, 13 Jul 2015 12:21:39 -0500

I don't think there is much chance of this judge appointing Candy to replace Carl, but if she does, you definitely need to make other arrangements for her representation.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 12:11 PM
Subject: Not Candy's case

As the trial of Carl and Candy's suits are consolidated it would be of little benefit to merge representation on that issue but perhaps there would be a conflict with representing her as executor that I am unaware of. If that is the case I will have to make other arrangements.

Let me know.

We are booking flights and rooms for the August 3rd hearing.

On 7/13/2015 9:04 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

Rik--If you have mentioned this somewhere in the past, I guess I didn't focus on it enough to realize you were thinking I could actually take on Candy's representation. I still represent Carl through Drina, and I can't also represent Candy. That would be the case even if Candy could pay me.

I agree there are some good findings in the injunction order, but you have to have a final judgment to be able to claim res judicata, so I don't think it goes that far.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 10:35 AM
Subject: letters of engagement, res judicata and some funny

I was thinking we should probably have a proposed agreement on the executor appointment if it goes the way we think it should.

If Candy gets the appointment she would like you to continue under the terms of your contract with the former executor except we don't have advance money for fee's and would want the litigation to pay for itself. We are absolutely against the trust suffering any further economic devastation. As far as we can see the executor at this stage is nothing but a figurehead on a post and Candy's appointment under a dependent administration is the simple most cost effective and expedient solution. We also need consolidation under one roof. That should ease the judges mind. We could move meaningfully forward and wrap this all up in rather short order I think.

There are a few things I would like to point out that are rather amusing.

We have res Judicata from the federal courts. The Johnny-Come-Lately attorney's don't have a clue. Their clients were there but apparently weren't all there.

Let's take it fact step at a time:

Amy filed a perjured affidavit into the USDC on March 6, 2012 claiming personal assets trusts (PAT's) had been set up for the five heirs "as is the case for Candace"

Bernard Mathews was the subject of a federal Rule 11 motion identifying his knowing fraud upon the court but it was internal and doesn't appear in the record of the court.

At the injunction hearing Hoyt asked George Vie about the PAT's and Geaorge admitted they had not been "setup" yet

When Hoyt asked why not, Vie blamed the federal litigation and Hoyt kicked him to the curb so George started blaming the District Court suit against Vacek & Freed and Hoyt again kicked him to the curb.

In their objections to distributions and in all of their pleadings they claim to have done nothing wrong and only acted properly until Carl and Candy filed suit!

In their No-evidence motion and in the answers to interogs they claim honorable intentions and blame the litigation for their failure to perform their fiduciary duties.

That's nothing but a smokescreen for retaliation.

Read the injunction, they were ordered to deposit income received into an appropriate beneficiary account and that does not mean putting it into the decedents trust bank account and paying exorbitant taxes on it.

The record also reflects that the defendants have failed to provide the records requested by the plaintiff

as required by Article IX-(E) of the Trust. Nor is there evidence that the Trustee has established separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required under the Trust, even though more than two years has expired since her appointment.

In light of what appears to be irregularities in the documents and the failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust, the Court ENJOINS the Trustee(s) and all assigns from disbursing any funds from any Trust accounts without prior permission of the Court. However, any income received for the benefit of the Trust beneficiary is to be deposited appropriately in an account. However, the Trustee shall not borrow funds, engage in new business ventures, or sell real property or other assets without the prior approval of the Court. In essence, all transactions of a financial nature shall require pre-approval of the Court, pending a resolution of disputes between the parties in this case.

There it is! The federal court found 1) the trustees had failed to provide records requested by the plaintiff as required; 2) failed to establish separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required; 3) found irregularities in the documents and 4) found failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust! All this on the very day suits were first filed in probate.

None-the-less Amy's objection continues to claim:

"Allegations against Amy are essentially a sham" and "None of Carl or Candace's claims in the 401-Proceeding or the District Court Action have merit."

They were ordered to fund the personal asset accounts with the income and there is no excuse for their retaliatory posture. The decedents and survivors trusts are not beneficiaries!

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: OK**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Mon, 13 Jul 2015 17:25:03 -0500

I don't believe you ever gave me any names to call, but a couple of people called me. Sorry, but I didn't write their names down and I can't recall them.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 4:57 PM
Subject: OK

Do you recall the name of the attorney I had call you about the case in May or early June... Jim ????

On 7/13/2015 10:21 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I don't think there is much chance of this judge appointing Candy to replace Carl, but if she does, you definitely need to make other arrangements for her representation.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 12:11 PM
Subject: Not Candy's case

As the trial of Carl and Candy's suits are consolidated it would be of little benefit to merge representation on that issue but perhaps there would be a conflict with representing her as executor that I am unaware of. If that is the case I will have to make other arrangements.

Let me know.

We are booking flights and rooms for the August 3rd hearing.

On 7/13/2015 9:04 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

Rik--If you have mentioned this somewhere in the past, I guess I didn't focus on it enough to realize you were thinking I could actually take on Candy's representation. I still represent Carl through Drina, and I can't also represent Candy. That would be the case even if Candy could pay me.

I agree there are some good findings in the injunction order, but you have to have a final judgment to be able to claim res judicata, so I don't think it goes that far.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, July 13, 2015 10:35 AM
Subject: letters of engagement, res judicata and some funny

I was thinking we should probably have a proposed agreement on the executor appointment if it goes the way we think it should.

If Candy gets the appointment she would like you to continue under the terms of your contract with the former executor except we don't have advance money for fee's and would want the litigation to pay for itself. We are absolutely against the trust suffering any further economic devastation. As far as we can see the executor at this stage is nothing but a figurehead on a post and Candy's appointment under a dependent administration is the simple most cost effective and expedient solution. We also need consolidation under one roof. That should ease the judges mind. We could move meaningfully forward and wrap this all up in rather short order I think.

There are a few things I would like to point out that are rather amusing.

We have res Judicata from the federal courts. The Johnny-Come-Lately attorney's don't have a clue. Their clients were there but apparently weren't all there.

Let's take it fact step at a time:

Amy filed a perjured affidavit into the USDC on March 6, 2012 claiming personal assets trusts (PAT's) had been set up for the five heirs "as is the case for Candace"

Bernard Mathews was the subject of a federal Rule 11 motion identifying his knowing fraud upon the court but it was internal and doesn't appear in the record of the court.

At the injunction hearing Hoyt asked George Vie about the PAT's and George admitted they had not been "setup" yet. When Hoyt asked why not, Vie blamed the federal litigation and Hoyt kicked him to the curb so George started blaming the District Court suit against Vacek & Freed and Hoyt again kicked him to the curb.

In their objections to distributions and in all of their pleadings they claim to have done nothing wrong and only acted properly until Carl and Candy filed suit!

In their No-evidence motion and in the answers to interrogatories they claim honorable intentions and blame the litigation for their failure to perform their fiduciary duties.

That's nothing but a smokescreen for retaliation.

Read the injunction, they were ordered to deposit income received into an appropriate beneficiary account and that does not mean putting it into the decedents trust bank account and paying exorbitant taxes on it.

The record also reflects that the defendants have failed to provide the records requested by the plaintiff as required by Article IX-(E) of the Trust. Nor is there evidence that the Trustee has established separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required under the Trust, even though more than two years has expired since her appointment.

In light of what appears to be irregularities in the documents and the failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust, the Court ENJOINS the Trustee(s) and all assigns from disbursing any funds from any Trust accounts without prior permission of the Court. However, any income received for the benefit of the Trust beneficiary is to be deposited appropriately in an account. However, the Trustee shall not borrow funds, engage in new business ventures, or sell real property or other assets without the prior approval of the Court. In essence, all transactions of a financial nature shall require pre-approval of the Court, pending a resolution of disputes between the parties in this case.

There it is! The federal court found 1) the trustees had failed to provide records requested by the plaintiff as required; 2) failed to establish separate trusts for each beneficiary, as required; 3) found irregularities in the documents and 4) found failure of the Trustee to act in accordance with the duties required by the Trust! All this on the very day suits were first filed in probate.

None-the-less Amy's objection continues to claim:

“Allegations against Amy are essentially a sham” and “None of Carl or Candace's claims in the 401-Proceeding or the District Court Action have merit.”

They were ordered to fund the personal asset accounts with the income and there is no excuse for their retaliatory posture. The decedents and survivors trusts are not beneficiaries!

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: P.S.**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 22 Aug 2013 10:48:38 -0500

You're welcome.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie Bayless"
Sent: Thursday, August 22, 2013 10:33 AM
Subject: P.S.

Thank you for the CD's.

I think there may be other bonds "missing" (like H bonds)

We did not add or even mention the conflict check parties but I did speak with the fraud department for each back in December and again in January. I included this case number and copies of the several signature pages indicating possible forgery. I also included the stock numbers and this case number in my SEC complaints...

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: P.S. You're awesome!**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Tue, 14 Jul 2015 19:25:43 -0500

It is ridiculous, but it indicates people have already realized they needed explanations.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 6:58 PM
Subject: P.S. You're awesome!

>I have Candy properly briefed and found little resistance to the flow. She
>will be expecting a 3rd party executor to be appointed but will oppose the
>trust paying for it... funding it perhaps... In any event consolidation is
>good and I have prepared her to expect a new scheduling order. As a kid,
>one of the things I really liked at Disney Land was Mr. Toads Wild Ride.
>How apropos.
>
> What kind of recording machine was it found on?
> Sony? Lol
>
>

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Production v Protective Order**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 1 Aug 2015 20:04:03 -0500

Sorry for my delayed response. I have been out of town today. I really don't get it. They clearly think the best defense is a good offense, but that is, in my humble opinion, the wrong approach under the circumstances. Although they know we have a weak judge and they are probably counting on that to continue. One of the most amazing parts is their claim is that the person they were planning to seek a guardianship for could have not only provided effective consent but could even have been the one to hook up the equipment.

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie G Bayless
Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 10:47 PM
Subject: Production v Protective Order

The objection theme is Aristotelian syllogistic logic which is circular and unresolvable and thus not logical at all. For every proposition there are only four possibilities; true, false, both true and false, meaningless. I think they just demonstrated the later.

"Drina provides no evidence that both parties to the conversations did not consent to the recordings,"

It is not the victims burden to show consent was absent. It is defendants burden to show the recordings meet a statutory exception to the electronic communications provisions and if they are saying there was consent the burden is on them. BUT WAIT! We need to get the Guinness Book people out here because I'm sure its another "we say she said" and "we say he said".

There is a presumption of impropriety attaching to certain kinds of acts which demand a bringing forth of evidence of legitimacy. Drina doesn't have to prove she or Carl didn't consent to the wiretapping of her private telephone conversations with him and cannot be called upon to prove the negative existence of a fact when the very claim that the recordings were illegally obtained is prima facia evidence of the fact placing the burden of bringing forth evidence of consent squarely upon the shoulders of the defendants in the same way possession of narcotics is prima facia illegal requiring proof of authorization to avoid arrest. In the same way defendants attempt to confuse the unlimited obligations of fiduciary disclosures with the limited obligations under the rules of pretrial discovery they now attempt to confuse pretrial discovery with the malicious disclosure of illegally intercepted electronic communications.

The position of conflicting interests counsel have put themselves in by accepting those illegal recordings in the first instance and by disseminating them to third parties in the second instance couldn't be more obvious in hindsight not to mention the matter puts opposing counsel in the awkward position of being a witness against his client in a criminal action.

"With respect to the information Drina seeks regarding the recordings, Drina provides no reason why she would be unable to obtain such information through normal discovery channels such as interrogatories or deposition."

They disclose the stuff by putting it in the mail the same day they file a no-evidence motion claiming 38 months is more than enough time to have completed discovery and then claim "Drina provides no reason why she would be unable to obtain such information through normal discovery channels" when normal discovery channels have been exhausted to no avail as defendants themselves and the matter in point continue to prove.

Two of the recordings disclosed were edited from a larger master recording and that editing occurred substantially more recently than when the initial recordings were made. It can be presumed from the available information that the recordings were made by a voice activated voice recorder and not an answering machine and that the device used was the Sony purchased for that purpose and attached to the telephone phone line at or about the time that would have intercepted all calls to and from that phone and not just those between Carl and Drina Brunsting.

The master recording would also likely include the regular phone conversations Candace had with her mother from California requiring the consent of both parties as well as possible conversations with doctors and clergy and other protected communications. The recording times provided by the manufacturer for the internal 2GB memory in the Sony ICDPX312D Digital Voice Recorder, depending upon the speed setting is:

HQ Mono: 22.3 Hours
SP Mono: 33.5 Hours
LP Mono: 89.5 Hours
SLP Mono: 536 Hours

"With respect to the first recording between Carl and Nelva, there is no evidence that Nelva did not consent to the recording."

"There is no evidence to support the allegation, In short, Drina has not proven that both her and Carl did not consent to the recordings at the time they were made."

"Yet now, we have Drina taking efforts to suppress exculpatory evidence. The evidence Drina seeks to hide constitutes evidence that adds context and color to decisions made and actions taken."

What I'm hearing is that defendants want to use illegally obtained and maliciously motivated recordings to add *context and color* to what is already clear in black and white. What was done to the trust and with its assets could not be done under the law of the trust or under the Texas Property code and adding color and texture is not going to mitigate or ameliorate that fact. It isn't disclosure under the rules of pre-trial discovery that is at issue. What is at issue is the inappropriate handling and dissemination of recordings illegally intercepted from electronic communications. The obvious intent behind those illegally obtained recordings cannot be minimized as if it were rebuttal evidence to an irrelevant fact question in an as of yet non-existent civil action. What possible relevance can the content of a

wife's private conversation with her intended estate theft victim husband possibly have on the lawfulness of improper trust modifications manufactured by Anita and Candace Freed?

You don't have to enter into any kind of agreement and I wouldn't even consider it. Interception, and/or possession and/or dissemination of illegal wire tap recordings is prima facie unlawful and the burden of proving the recording meet one of the exceptions to the wire tap statutes is on them not you. It is also worth noting that the recordings were made 7 months after the 8/25/2010 QBD had already disenfranchised Carl and Candy.

On 7/31/2015 10:24 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

fyi—I included Candy on this. I also included the new temporary administrator on it.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)

To: [Brad Featherston](#) ; [Alex Covey](#) ; [Candace Curtis](#) ; [Darlene Smith](#) ; [Lori A. Walsh](#) ; [Neal Spielman](#)

Cc: galester@sbcglobal.net

Sent: Friday, July 31, 2015 12:22 PM

Subject: Carl's Requests for Production/Motion for Protective Order

Brad has called me expressing concern that Carl's Requests for Production to Anita, Amy and Carole are somehow at odds with Carl's Motion for Protective Order. I don't believe that to necessarily be the case, but since Brad has raised the issue, I thought it wise to make my position clear. Carl's Requests for Production require the items to be produced to me. Brad's position seems to be that normal practice is to provide the items I requested to the other parties in the case, but there is nothing normal about this situation. Moreover, Carl's Motion for Protective Order makes it clear that Carl is asking that the recordings not be provided to anyone but me. Anyone who discloses the content of those recordings to anyone other than the parties who were recorded or their counsel will be acting at their own peril. That peril seems pretty well defined considering the fact that Tex. Penal Code 16.02 states that act if violated by anyone who:

(1)intentionally intercepts, endeavors to intercept, or procures another person to intercept or endeavor to intercept a wire, oral, or electronic communication;

(2)intentionally discloses or endeavors to disclose to another person the contents of a wire, oral, or electronic communication if the person knows or has reason to know the information was obtained through the interception of a wire, oral, or electronic communication in violation of this subsection;

(3)intentionally uses or endeavors to use the contents of a wire, oral, or electronic communication if the person knows or is reckless about whether the information was obtained through the interception of a wire, oral, or electronic communication in violation of this subsection

Moreover, Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code 123.002 states:

(a) A party to a communication may sue a person who:

(1) intercepts, attempts to intercept, or employs or obtains another to intercept or attempt to intercept the communication;

(2) uses or divulges information that he knows or reasonably should know was obtained by interception of the communication

I am happy to discuss it further with anyone who doesn't understand our position on this issue.

I also want to take this opportunity to let everyone know that I intend to take the depositions of caregivers who were employed to care for Nelva and who also had contact with Carl during the relevant periods. I would anticipate that to take approximately 2 days, so please provide me with two days on which you would be available for those depositions during the period from 8/15/15 to 9/15/15.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Recordings Received today from Anita's Counsel**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 2 Jul 2015 13:00:37 -0500

Yes, I am still a bit shocked actually.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, July 02, 2015 12:40 PM
Subject: Re: Recordings Received today from Anita's Counsel

On 7/1/2015 6:28 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

These recordings I got today and that have also been mailed to Candy I assume contain phone conversations between Carl and Drina while Carl was staying at Nelva's when Drina threw her back out trying to lift him. I don't see how there could have been any consent for these recordings, but I thought I should see what Candy knows about them. I assume it was part of the plan to get a guardianship over Carl and exclude Drina as a guardian. I don't think these do that. They don't show anything but the frustration of a caregiver trying to get here very sick husband to fight for his recovery, but I don't know how they are going to deal with the lack of consent for the recordings, so if Candy knows anything about them, it would be helpful to know it.

And never mind that I asked for recordings back when I did the presuit discovery long ago and didn't get anything.

That would be a violation of the federal wire communications and privacy acts and I think would be a felony if I recall. I know because I was accused of violating the act for about five minutes based upon a transcription of a recording until I showed them the recording was obviously made in a public parking lot and not on the phone. Doh!

I have the postal notice and will go get that pkg now!

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Safe deposit Box**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 29 Mar 2013 13:07:00 -0500

How were they able to go to a safe deposit box after the funeral if it had been closed two days before Nelva died? I was under the impression that any new box that was opened was in Victoria. I am assuming they went to a box at the Houston bank, right? Does Candy remember what was in the box they went to.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Friday, March 29, 2013 6:35 AM
Subject: Safe deposit Box

Closed November 9, 2011, two days before Nelva died. Candy went to the bank with Anita after the funeral... and went into the safe deposit box. People at bank knew Anita on site.

Candy is reluctant to pin the tail on the donkey but I like to call a spade a spade. I didn't just file SEC complaints. I filed a notary complaint against Freed. There is no doubt in my mind that Carl and Candy are the trustees.

Here's something I found humorous. Anita is so stupid that when she forged Nelva's signature on the December 21, 2010 resignation and appointment of successor trustee document she used a digital image for Nelva's signatures (probably snipped from a check) but the dumb cow also used a digital image for her own signature. It's probably the signature stamp she uses at the college.

I found the same jive with Candace's notary log. It was digitally altered.

Since Adobe Systems Incorporated owns the patent on the portable document format (pdf) I uploaded selected digital documents from the October 23, 2010 pdf attachments to Adobe technical support for analysis using Adobe key code 1118-1507-7229-6441-XXXX-XXXX.

I later called Adobe's corporate offices in San Jose California for a top level analysis and after a series of interactions by phone I received a second confirmation. The pertinent signature pages on these pdf documents were stamped with a floating digital image in Adobe Acrobat, printed and then rescanned back into pdf files. Because the digital images (signature looking) lay on a separate layer and do not embed you could use your mouse to move it out of the way. So... they had to print and rescan it so the floating signature image would no longer float.

I would have never looked at the documents from a digital technical view if I hadn't picked up the hard copy page 37 and noticed the anomaly. In my mind I should have noted that anomaly but had not, so I went to page 399 of the Record on Appeal to find the page 37 that I was looking at was indeed one I had not seen before.

Note page 9-2 of the Young Family Trust (Parr Trust) as compared to page 9-2 of the Brunsting Family Trust. It's what I call the gifters plug-n-play.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: screening for antisocial morons and JANSON**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 23 Jul 2015 10:59:03 -0500

I thought maybe she was just mispronouncing Munson. That is interesting that she thought you might be a reporter. Is Janson here in Houston? There have been some stories in the press about the probate courts before, but the scope has always been pretty limited and they never resulted in any reform that I could tell. You probably know about my big mess in Probate Court 2 over the Alpert Trust cases. We had to lobby for a change in recusal laws to get Judge Wood recused and then I ended up in a mandamus fight with Judge Guy Herman over that—which I won. But then Herman just went to the same legislator who had sponsored our recusal reform and got it gutted in the next legislative session. It is pretty frustrating.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 10:29 AM
Subject: screening for antisocial morons and JANSON

When I was in Ukiah a few years ago there was a lawsuit brought by someone who applied for an available job with the Ukiah PD. He wasn't hired because he scored too high on the intelligence test. The PD said that was their policy because they were afraid he would become bored with the job and the applicant lost his challenge to their decision. That's right, he was intelligent and they just could not have that quality in a police uniform. Ambitious? Its my life's work. The masses have never changed anything. Change has always been forced by poor slobs like me who have been cursed with the heavy burden but gifted with the strength to carry it. My hero's have always been people like John Lilburn.

I also know who Janson is. Butts asked if my name was Janson and I just said no. Well Janson turns out to be an investigative reporter that has been causing some grief and concern snooping about and talking with the families of victims. There has been a lot of noise over the Guardianship thing. I don't know how informed you are but estateofdenial.com and a host of other sites have popped up and these people are sharing information and getting organized.

Exposure is the only answer to government actor corruption. This might explain reluctance to enter rulings but when they are required reluctance is not an option.

On 7/22/2015 8:42 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

That's a pretty ambitious project. I totally get the part about it being about funding, and corruption definitely seems to be everywhere, but what I don't understand is how it jumps from that to this level of police officers killing so many people who haven't really done anything. I am not sure that can be blamed of the focus having moved to funding or even on the corruption itself. It is like there is no screening of these people before they are allowed into law enforcement. Or maybe it is even worse than that and they are screening **for** people with violent tendencies.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:20 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

The project I was working on to expose the institutionalized corruption that is the source of these events. they are not lone, isolated events. They are constant and unbelievable. So many tragedies because most police officers in today's society are not involved in law enforcement at all. Its all about funding. That's why Sandra was stopped at the onset. I've spent almost 20 years figuring out this racketeering scheme. That's what I should have been working on instead of this childish fraud theft menagerie. I'm on mailing lists. I get these stories every day. I'm not saying I could have saved anyone in particular but people need to know what its really about. read Fant and then Read Hein v North Carolina. What a crock of shit. That Lawyer Fischer said "probable cause" a thousand times but never once said "crime". It's called ask the wrong question get the wrong answer. intentionally generating lousy case law. This is what got me to study law to begin with and my work here is not done. That's all. This is domestic terrorism by definition. What a sickness.

On 7/22/2015 4:18 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

What the hell is he talking about??? I know about the Sandra Bland tragedy, but what is all this crap about how he could have saved her, etc???

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as

Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No if's, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest. Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al., v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?

That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Service addresses for Carole?**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 6 Apr 2013 15:01:45 -0500

Thanks. I wonder if she might also have been trying to find out something for Anita and Amy about your hearing next week?

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Saturday, April 06, 2013 2:32 PM
Subject: Re: Service addresses for Carole?

Candy says she works at a location near her moms house. Carole lies about everything so there is no telling. She called Candy Wednesday evening and Candy talked about the weather. We now suspect there may have been an attempt to serve her and she called to see if Candy knew anything.

Maybe call reception and ask for her by name, or Call personnel at corporate and ask which location she works at.

Carole has a Blackberry issued from work. The number is 281-881-1917.

Good luck

From: Bobbie Bayless <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
To: Rik Munson <blowintough@att.net>
Sent: Sat, April 6, 2013 10:02:29 AM
Subject: Service addresses for Carole?

I am assuming I may have to try to serve Carole at her work since she tends to ignore these things and will presumably just not come to the door at home. I know she works at Cameron, but they have more than one location. Do you have any idea where she actually is during her work day?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Settlement**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>, "Candace Curtis" <occurtis@sbcglobal.net>
Date Mon, 12 Aug 2013 15:58:15 -0500

I think everyone has to be in one case to get this thing resolved, and I don't see how everyone can be in the federal case—nor has Hoyt indicated he would allow it. I, for one, don't want to be in Hoyt's court. I would like to propose that everyone agree to the same freeze now in place through an order in the case pending in state court in exchange for a dismissal of the case in Hoyt's court. Then let's tee it up where Carole is already a party. Hoyt is going to create nightmares for everyone and he is not going to be easy to deal with in the process.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Candace Curtis](#) ; [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 9:42 AM
Subject: Settlement

I have reviewed the information and:

We have managed to wrest control of the trust away from the Harpies and they can no longer use it as their slush fund. They had a chance to prove up and failed miserably and worse...

It's time to discuss exactly what your common objectives are.

NOTE: federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. If you settle for a stipulated agreement... WHEN, not if the harpies fail to hold up their end you will have to bring a suit to enforce it and I'm not big on that. That means only a judgment will suffice and that leaves 3 options.

Trial on the merits, defendants make an offer in the form of a judgment and summary judgment. Please don't hesitate to correct me if I have a wheel on the curb as I've never been down this road before.

The constructive fraud/breach of fiduciary is ripe for summary judgment but I worry about putting the cart before the horse. We are in a position to drag out all of the evidence that will send these rats to prison.

Hoyt already ruled that we are entitled to it.

The Harpies have vitiated everything they have touched and since Freed aided and abetted the whole affair the chain of control is broken. There are no valid trust documents.

We will have to add Carole to the list of defendants and I think it would be advantageous to join all the parties under one roof. Is there a strategic advantage to maintaining separate suits?

Bottom line: What will it take to settle this portion? Are they too stuck on stupid for us to be thinking logically about settling this? They have only two choices. They roll over or we roll over them. There is nothing we can do to prevent criminal prosecution but we can walk away as is.

You want to make a Christmas list?

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Thanks Bobbie will do.**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 23 Jul 2015 10:03:43 -0500

Thanks you very much for that. I do try to do the right thing, and it doesn't always get recognized. And considering some of the things I have seen in Candy's emails about lawyers in general, I appreciate it even more.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:59 AM
Subject: Thanks Bobbie will do.

I also have to say i have a lot of respect for you even if I don't appear to show it. You're OK.

On 7/23/2015 7:55 AM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

The hearings on the motions for summary judgment are definitely off on 8/3. Of course, it is up to Candy about whether she is there for Tino's deposition. Considering the fact that this judge will not make a decision on anything, I am not sure whether I want to have the hearing on my Motion for Protective Order, but I sure as hell wanted the judge to read it. Hopefully, I have accomplished that now. I don't think there is any reason for Candy to have to come in just for that motion though even if I do go forward with it on 8/3/15. So, I think you can get rid of you 8/3 reservations and hold those for another time.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2015 9:24 AM
Subject: Re: Fw: 412249 Brunsting Order Appointing Temporary Administrator Pending Contest

Yea I have a problem with the second class citizen thing. It's just my life's project has been to unravel this sickness. I have it figured out but trying to stay alive after raising these kinds of issues has troubled me all along. I was once personal assistant to a high powered attorney who went on to become the federal public defender and later a prosecutor and a federal judge. He told me "You know it doesn't matter if your right".

Jerry Spense told me there wasn't enough of him left to pick it up but that someone should. What disturbed me most about Sandra's case is what she told her mother just before her death that she knew her purpose in life was to go back to Texas and do something to stop the injustice. Many people try to dismiss me as a nut case because they don't understand what I am saying. All you know about me is what you have seen in this litigation and that doesn't tell you who I am at all.

I know this game. I know it intricately. It is nothing but a massive color of law extortion racketeering fraud. Sandra died because of someones retirement investment fund with some other sickness thrown in but that's what precipitated the police contact. I don't believe anyone in California can debate me on national TV. Bring on your best appellate judges, your golden boy prosecutors or your ace lawyers. It is a criminal enterprise and I'll take all comers. I want to push this envelope but I need to do it in a way that will not find me dead. that's the trick! that's all I'm saying about Sandra. This is my pet project in service of the society I live in. We can still save others like Sandra and i have have to try.

As to the dialog with Neal and Brad, what is going on with that? It looks to me like fish going belly up in the pond. You want to discuss it off the record give me a call. What is critical ius that we know ASAP so mwe can change our reservations as we are already booked for the august 3, hearing.

Candy doesn't think she needs to be there for Tino's deposition or the hearing on your protective order motion.

On 7/22/2015 4:27 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I guess you saw that I am such a second class citizen that I wasn't even on the email distributing the order. I just don't know what the problem is with that court, but it worries me.

— Original Message —

From: [Comstock, Clarinda \(Probate Courts\)](#)
To: [nspielman@grifmatlaw.com](#) ; ['Bobbie G Bayless'](#)
Cc: [brad@mendellawfirm.com](#) ; [dsmith@craincaton.com](#) ; [occurtis@sbcglobal.net](#) ; ['Kathleen Tanner Beduze'](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 3:29 PM
Subject: RE: 412249 Brunsting Order Appointing Temporary Administrator Pending Contest

Ms. Bayless,
My apologies for inadvertently dropping your name off of the distribution list.
Clarinda Comstock
Associate Judge
Harris County Probate Court Four
7th Floor, 201 Caroline
Houston, TX 77002
713-368-6767

From: Neal Spielman [<mailto:nspielman@grifmatlaw.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 3:26 PM
To: 'Bobbie G Bayless'
Cc: Comstock, Clarinda (Probate Courts); brad@mendellawfirm.com; dsmith@craincaton.com; occurtis@sbcglobal.net; 'Kathleen Tanner Beduze'
Subject: FW: 412249 Brunsting Order Appointing Temporary Administrator Pending Contest

Bobbie –
Please review the email below and the attachment just received from Judge Comstock.

Neal
Neal E. Spielman
Griffin & Matthews
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77079
281-870-1124 - telephone
281-870-1647 - telefax
nspielman@grifmatlaw.com

Please take a moment to visit our website at www.grifmatlaw.com

To comply with IRS regulations, we advise you that any discussion of Federal tax issues in this e-mail was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used by you (i) to avoid penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) to promote, market or recommend to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

This communication may be protected by the attorney/client privilege and may contain confidential information intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Griffin & Matthews. Any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail without consent of the originator is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify Melissa Niles by telephone at 281.870.1124. If you are not one of the addressees on this e-mail, the information contained in this e-mail is not intended for you, and please delete this e-mail immediately.

From: Comstock, Clarinda (Probate Courts) [<mailto:Clarinda.Comstock@prob.hctx.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 3:16 PM
To: brad@mendellawfirm.com; nspielman@grifmatlaw.com; dsmith@craincaton.com; occurtis@sbcglobal.net; Kathleen Tanner Beduze
Subject: 412249 Brunsting Order Appointing Temporary Administrator Pending Contest

Counsel:
Attached is a draft Order appointing Greg Lester as the Temporary Administrator Pending Contest pursuant to yesterday's agreement.
Please review this order carefully and contact me via email to all parties regarding any changes or concerns you might have.
Judge Butts stated on the record yesterday that this review would be on a short fuse, so please respond within the next 24 hours.
An order will be signed by the end of the day tomorrow.
I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,
Clarinda Comstock
Associate Judge
Harris County Probate Court Four
7th Floor, 201 Caroline
Houston, TX 77002
713-368-6767

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Tue, 7 Jul 2015 18:23:13 -0500

There were definitely some points that sounded like they had been edited to remove stuff.

Is there any way to determine--other than by the email date the date or properties of the video recordings?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie Bayless"
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:44 PM
Subject: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder

>2 of the recordings have a change date of 2/27/2015. Copying a file from
>one medium to another or from one directory or computer to another does not
>alter its change date. It will change the created date only.
>
> If you look at the properties for the first two .wav files they show a
> change date of February 27, 2015.
> This indicates to me that these are segments taken from larger recordings
> excerpted on that change date.
>
> The next file BRUNSTING 5838.wav contains a change date of 4/22/2011. This
> is the date of the funny bank account U/A 11/22/2011 I previously
> mentioned has always bothered me.
> This doesn't help relieve that "What's wrong with this picture" feeling.
>
> The last one appears to be native as created at or about the time of its
> change date 3/21/2011.
>
> All of the .msg files have a change date of March 18, 2015
>
> The CD is labeled 6/25/2015
> The file folder for the emails .msg files was created "July 25, 2015"
>
> The CD was mailed the same day the motion for no-evidence partial summary
> Judgment was filed 6/26/2015.
>
> Looking at the device:
> The receipt dated March 17, 2011 (Brunsting004570) shows one ICD-PX312
> digital voice recorder purchased at Best Buy in Houston
> The same Bates Document bears a 2nd receipt from Radio Shack for a 4200223
> 3' 1/8" M-M PATCH CABLE
>
> The Sony ICD-PX312 digital voice recorder has a 72 hour battery life and a
> USB AC power adaptor AC-U501AD.
> It has a built in 2GB memory and an SD expansion slot up to 16GB which is
> a lot of MP3 recording time.
>
> It's capable of voice activation and could have been left connected to the
> phone in listening mode 24/7
>
> https://docs.sony.com/release/specs/ICDPX312D_mksp.pdf
>
> The fact that its digital makes it impossible to tell how many hours of
> recordings it collected but this is some serious stuff!
>
>
>

>
>
>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 8 Jul 2015 12:57:11 -0500

I have some calls in to criminal lawyers to get their input on how best to handle this. I want to raise bloody hell in the pending case, but I have to be able to do that without using the recordings themselves.

I think my mind has turned to mush because I can't remember whether we ever got the specific documents on the transfers of the Chevron stock. I see the information in the Master's Report, but that is pretty general information, so we must have gotten something more specific before. Do you remember getting anything on that? I have put in my pleadings, for example, that they came from the Survivor's Trust. But there isn't anything that specific in the Master's Report. But I see from the Master's Report that Anita also got 135 shares of Chevron stock. I don't believe I realized that--I thought that was all to grandkids. Do you have Chevron transfer docs?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 9:19 PM
Subject: Re: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder

>I am unable to determine anything the way the data is presented. Perhaps
>someone with more technical savvy could do so but I have not as of yet
>managed. The problem I'm having is that these are illegally obtained wire
>recordings. Merely having possession implicates the holder and I am pissed.
>These came U.S. Mail and I signed for them. These recordings have to be
>reported and I need to divest the copies I received to law enforcement.

>
> Is Houston Texas a haven for refugee's of natural selection or what?
> Are they diabolically brilliant, exceedingly stupid or possessed of the
> same ritualistic confidence that produced sloppy digital forgeries?

>
>
>
>
>
>

> On 7/7/2015 4:23 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>> There were definitely some points that sounded like they had been edited
>> to remove stuff.

>>
>> Is there any way to determine--other than by the email date the date or
>> properties of the video recordings?

>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"
>> Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:44 PM
>> Subject: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder

>>
>>>> 2 of the recordings have a change date of 2/27/2015. Copying a file from
>>>> one medium to another or from one directory or computer to another does
>>>> not alter its change date. It will change the created date only.

>>>>
>>>> If you look at the properties for the first two .wav files they show a
>>>> change date of February 27, 2015.

>>>> This indicates to me that these are segments taken from larger
>>>> recordings excerpted on that change date.

>>>>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 15 Jul 2015 13:44:41 -0500

This recording device seems like a weird choice to record telephone calls. You certainly know more about these things than I do, but how would they have connected it to the phone? Are you thinking that is what the patch cable from RadioShack was for?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie Bayless"
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:44 PM
Subject: The Audio Recordings & the Recorder

>2 of the recordings have a change date of 2/27/2015. Copying a file from
>one medium to another or from one directory or computer to another does not
>alter its change date. It will change the created date only.
>
> If you look at the properties for the first two .wav files they show a
> change date of February 27, 2015.
> This indicates to me that these are segments taken from larger recordings
> excerpted on that change date.
>
> The next file BRUNSTING 5838.wav contains a change date of 4/22/2011. This
> is the date of the funny bank account U/A 11/22/2011 I previously
> mentioned has always bothered me.
> This doesn't help relieve that "What's wrong with this picture" feeling.
>
> The last one appears to be native as created at or about the time of its
> change date 3/21/2011.
>
> All of the .msg files have a change date of March 18, 2015
>
> The CD is labeled 6/25/2015
> The file folder for the emails .msg files was created "July 25, 2015"
>
> The CD was mailed the same day the motion for no-evidence partial summary
> Judgment was filed 6/26/2015.
>
> Looking at the device:
> The receipt dated March 17, 2011 (Brunsting004570) shows one ICD-PX312
> digital voice recorder purchased at Best Buy in Houston
> The same Bates Document bears a 2nd receipt from Radio Shack for a 4200223
> 3' 1/8' M-M PATCH CABLE
>
> The Sony ICD-PX312 digital voice recorder has a 72 hour battery life and a
> USB AC power adaptor AC-U501AD.
> It has a built in 2GB memory and an SD expansion slot up to 16GB which is
> a lot of MP3 recording time.
>
> It's capable of voice activation and could have been left connected to the
> phone in listening mode 24/7
>
> https://docs.sony.com/release/specs/ICDPX312D_mksp.pdf
>
> The fact that its digital makes it impossible to tell how many hours of
> recordings it collected but this is some serious stuff!
>
>
>
>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: The Master's Invoice**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 9 Aug 2013 11:26:21 -0500

Actually, that is what is sealed. I received a copy this morning from Defendants' counsel. I learned yesterday from West that he was directed to email it to Vie but to mail it to Candy. I will forward it to you.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Friday, August 09, 2013 11:16 AM
Subject: Re: The Master's Invoice

On 8/8/2013 3:28 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have downloaded the Master's Report but he filed his invoice under seal. He tells me he sent a copy to you and to the Defendants' counsel. If so, can you send me his invoice? Thanks.

I will do so. We should receive a copy but I don't think that is what is sealed.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: The OJ Simpson parade**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 31 Jul 2015 11:12:51 -0500

They don't seem to be able to stop themselves from heading it in that direction. I guess the 3rd time is the charm in terms of Anita and Amy finally finding the perfect lawyers for what they want to do.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 11:11 PM
Subject: The OJ Simpson parade

It's simple. Look at it that way. The presumption is that privacy has not been waived. One cannot prove the nonexistence of a fact. If Carl and Drina file a complaint they don't have to prove they didn't give consent they only have to aver it. The burden of bringing forth competent evidence that one party to the conversation consented is on Brad and that will require evidence of either written or recorded consent. "We say mommy said" and "we say Carl said" is getting to be a pretty tired old horse.

There is a civil side and a criminal side. If you file a police report they have more to lose by playing games than they have to gain by talking smack. If you don't file a criminal complaint they just keep shucking and jiving with impunity. You don't tell them you filed a criminal complaint. You just do it.

On 7/30/2015 4:31 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

Well, Drina may have been premature in her reaction to Brad's first call, but he never disappoints in the end. Brad's position now is that there is a fact issue about whether there was consent of one of the parties to the conversations. In terms of the conversation with Nelva, he says Nelva consented to it, and in terms of the conversations between Drina and Carl, they are going to say that Carl consented to them. I asked him if he really believed Carl was in a position to consent to anything at that point in his life, and he said, "I don't know. You tell me." I think they may hope to make Carl's capacity an issue again by making us be the ones to say that Carl had no capacity to consent to the recordings. But, of course, that was a time much closer to Carl's illness and he wasn't bringing any lawsuits then. And, of course, that also works both ways. They have to stop arguing about Carl's capacity if they want to say he consented to the recordings.

BTW—I don't know if you were in the courtroom when the associate judge said at the last hearing that the judge won't sign the order we presented on Candy's Motion to Show Authority without having an evidentiary hearing.

I told Brad I would not agree to the 2 week extension, so he plans to just file objections and not produce anything until the judge clarifies things. He also said, "You know the judge is going to want everyone to agree to something." So, he is proposing a joint agreed protective order that says everyone agrees the recordings won't be disclosed to anyone other than the parties to this case, and the judge will determine later whether there was consent and whether they are admissible. I don't see how we can agree to anything like that. But I also think that this judge will have a hard time ever being able to make a heavy duty determination about anything.

The only way we are ever going to be able to hope to get any more information out of them about the extent of the recordings is if they produce them, but I think I intend to stick to my guns about them being only produced to me. Brad also said he couldn't do anything about getting anything back from anyone who got it before he got involved in the case, although he said he might be able to get Anita to do an itemization of what she got and from whom, as well as who she gave it to.

Even if the judge acts like she is actually going to make a decision on consent to the recordings, she will, at the very least, want to hear evidence about it. So, that most likely brings us back to trying to find Tino, because the sisters are going to lie their butts off.

Just so there is no confusion, I am going to send an email around to everyone tomorrow about how, notwithstanding my request for production, my position is that the recordings are not to be disclosed to anyone other than me. I am sure that everyone, except Carl and Candy, has had them all along anyway. I am inclined to ask for potential dates for Tino's deposition at the same time. The question is whether we should try to line up the depositions of other caregivers also, in case we can't locate Tino.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: This is so heinous**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 08:58:48 -0500

It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they have revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am still too outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there are more that they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even appear to be complete.

I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina could get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal with her back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This is also the basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments Nelva's caregivers should be considered distributions to Carl from the trust.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM
Subject: This is so heinous

- > Texas Penal Code §16.02
- >
- > In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating the
- > wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by an
- > injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002
- > Damages §123.004
- >
- > Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his right of
- > privacy and I think some criminal statutes.
- >
- > This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is fortuitous.
- > Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know she was
- > stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.
- >
- > Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings or
- > the only ones they were willing to reveal?
- >
- > The receipt for the recorders is Brunsting004570 March 17, 2011
- >
- >
- >
- >
- >

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 22 Jul 2015 22:42:08 -0500

That's a pretty ambitious project. I totally get the part about it being about funding, and corruption definitely seems to be everywhere, but what I don't understand is how it jumps from that to this level of police officers killing so many people who haven't really done anything. I am not sure that can be blamed of the focus having moved to funding or even on the corruption itself. It is like there is no screening of these people before they are allowed into law enforcement. Or maybe it is even worse than that and they are screening **for** people with violent tendencies.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:20 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

The project I was working on to expose the institutionalized corruption that is the source of these events. they are not lone, isolated events. They are constant and unbelievable. So many tragedies because most police officers in today's society are not involved in law enforcement at all. Its all about funding. That's why Sandra was stopped at the onset. I've spent almost 20 years figuring out this racketeering scheme. That's what I should have been working on instead of this childish fraud theft menagerie. I'm on mailing lists. I get these stories every day. I'm not saying I could have saved anyone in particular but people need to know what its really about. read Fant and then Read Hein v North Carolina. What a crock of shit. That Lawyer Fischer said "probable cause" a thousand times but never once said "crime". It's called ask the wrong question get the wrong answer. intentionally generating lousy case law. This is what got me to study law to begin with and my work here is not done. That's all. This is domestic terrorism by definition. What a sickness.

On 7/22/2015 4:18 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

What the hell is he talking about??? I know about the Sandra Bland tragedy, but what is all this crap about how he could have saved her, etc???

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No ifs, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law

enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest. Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al., v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?

That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 22 Jul 2015 18:18:59 -0500

What the hell is he talking about??? I know about the Sandra Bland tragedy, but what is all this crap about how he could have saved her, etc???

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie G Bayless
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No if's, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest. Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al., v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?

That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino**
To "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>, "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 22 Jul 2015 18:21:38 -0500

Sorry, I shouldn't have called it crap. My bad, but I didn't follow what you were saying about how you could have been involved, and I was on a call with another attorney who doesn't want to produce stuff. When I read my reply again it didn't even make sense. I don't understand what you were involved in that has anything to do with Sandra Bland.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:18 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

What the hell is he talking about??? I know about the Sandra Bland tragedy, but what is all this crap about how he could have saved her, etc???

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No if's, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest. Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al., v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?
That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 22 Jul 2015 18:54:05 -0500

Ok. Now that I am not trying to have two conversations at once, I am going to do a better job of responding to this email. Sorry again for the brain fog before.

As to Tino, I would need at least that amount of time to get him served with a subpoena anyway—assuming I can find him. I have a land line for him so I am going to try again this weekend to see if I can get him to answer the phone. I got a woman before—presumably his mother—who pretended to not speak English but managed to take my name and number. Drina has also been sending him texts. I tried email addresses I was able to find in my Lexis search on but they all bounced. The first part of next week, I plan to try to get potential dates from all the other people.

As to the hearing, it did go pretty much as it had to, but it bothers me how that judge just doesn't seem to even understand the facts of the case sometimes. I don't remember if I told you this, but Neal kept saying when called me today that Zandra said Carole was nodding her head in agreement with Neal and not with the Darlene stand in that was there. He seemed to think that was a great thing and that he will be able to control Carole or she will come over to his side or something. She was nodding her head with him because he was being an idiot and the Darlene stand in was actually trying to be reasonable at times—something Darlene would never have done.

As to the part about Sandra Bland, it is a horrible, horrible tragedy—the likes of which seem to be happening more and more. But how are you saying you could have saved her? I didn't understand what you were saying you had stopped doing to help Candy or how that could have saved Sandra Bland. I remember the Tommy Yancy story. Were you somehow involved in that? And I really didn't understand the stuff about your medically assisted interrogation, etc. That sounds like a movie script. except they probably couldn't make that up. Does this have something to do with when you were ill recently?

I certainly know about the Ferguson issues, but I am no civil rights expert and I didn't know about the Fant cases.

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie G Bayless
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No if's, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting."

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest.

Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al, v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?

That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino contact info**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Tue, 14 Jul 2015 19:22:49 -0500

I am not sure we can trust Robert to be as honest about what he knows.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 6:43 PM
Subject: Re: Tino contact info

We have the same number for Tino but we also have this number for Robert 281 382 9451

On 7/14/2015 2:33 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I thought I had an email address for him also, but I can't get that to work either.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 4:08 PM
Subject: Tino contact info

Rik—I have spoken with Brad so as to satisfy my conferencing requirements before filing my discovery motion and supplemental pleadings about this wiretap stuff. He seemed pretty surprised by my attitude about this, and didn't seem to be aware of the penal code provisions or the Texas Civil Wiretap Act. He claims the recordings were just found on an answering machine at Nelva's house. Of course, there are so many holes with that story that I don't know where to begin.

I have tried to call Tino to discuss this with him before calling the Special Crimes Bureau at the DA's office, but I got a recording that said the person I called wasn't taking messages right now. The number I called was 713-503-4795. Do you have any other contact info for Tino?

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino contact info**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 15 Jul 2015 07:36:39 -0500

Good point. I will try anything at this point.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2015 7:13 AM
Subject: Re: Tino contact info

I WAS THINKING ROBERT MAY KNOW HOW TO GET A HOLD OF TINO. THAT'S ALL.

On 7/14/2015 5:22 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

I am not sure we can trust Robert to be as honest about what he knows.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 6:43 PM
Subject: Re: Tino contact info

We have the same number for Tino but we also have this number for Robert 281 382 9451

On 7/14/2015 2:33 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I thought I had an email address for him also, but I can't get that to work either.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 4:08 PM
Subject: Tino contact info

Rik—I have spoken with Brad so as to satisfy my conferencing requirements before filing my discovery motion and supplemental pleadings about this wiretap stuff. He seemed pretty surprised by my attitude about this, and didn't seem to be aware of the penal code provisions or the Texas Civil Wiretap Act. He claims the recordings were just found on an answering machine at Nelva's house. Of course, there are so many holes with that story that I don't know where to begin.

I have tried to call Tino to discuss this with him before calling the Special Crimes Bureau at the DA's office, but I got a recording that said the person I called wasn't taking messages right now. The number I called was 713-503-4795. Do you have any other contact info for Tino?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Tino contact info**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Tue, 14 Jul 2015 16:33:19 -0500

I thought I had an email address for him also, but I can't get that to work either.

— Original Message —

From: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)

To: [Rik Munson](#)

Sent: Tuesday, July 14, 2015 4:08 PM

Subject: Tino contact info

Rik—I have spoken with Brad so as to satisfy my conferencing requirements before filing my discovery motion and supplemental pleadings about this wiretap stuff. He seemed pretty surprised by my attitude about this, and didn't seem to be aware of the penal code provisions or the Texas Civil Wiretap Act. He claims the recordings were just found on an answering machine at Nelva's house. Of course, there are so many holes with that story that I don't know where to begin.

I have tried to call Tino to discuss this with him before calling the Special Crimes Bureau at the DA's office, but I got a recording that said the person I called wasn't taking messages right now. The number I called was 713-503-4795. Do you have any other contact info for Tino?

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Two items for disclosures**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 30 Jul 2015 08:08:55 -0500

Drina has reacted to a call I received from Brad yesterday as if it is blackmail--in other words that Brad has threatened to send more recordings around, and that isn't correct. I sent out a request for production to all three of them that included requests for all recordings they made. That was a request that had to go out on 7/3/15, based on the deadlines in the current docket control order that cut off discovery on 8/3/15. That was actually before this whole recording thing got totally flushed out--at least in my mind--because I didn't even get Brad's cd until 7/1/15. So, there is some merit to his quandry, because I have asked him to produce all the recordings he has. Subsequently, as I got my arms around this more, I filed the Motion for Protective Order.

Brad called me, claiming at least, that he wasn't sure responses to my request for production should be sent around to everyone--as they normally would be. He requested an extension for everyone of 2 weeks, claiming they wanted that because my Motion for Protective Order is set on the same day the responses are due. I don't intend to agree to that 2 week extension, and I intend to make it clear that, notwithstanding my request for production, he should not be sending recordings to anyone but me as the Motion for Protective Order requests. Of course, he is an idiot not to just deal with it that way, but he is not making any kind of threat. Nor is he making any kind of demand about doing something if I don't give him the extension he is asking for.

Drina, understandably so, believes everything they do is poorly motivated and wrong. That is understandable because they haven't don't much of anything right or for the right reasons. Nevertheless, this is not Brad making any kind of threat. This is Brad proactively trying not to compound his wrong by responding to my request for production in a normal fashion. That may be all for show, and it is pretty stupid if he really doesn't know how that should be handled without direction from the court, but there was nothing about the message he left me that threatened to disseminate more recordings. I guess I presented the nature of Brad's call pretty poorly when I reported on it to Drina, because she has reacted to it as if Brad made some kind of threat--which he did not.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Thursday, July 30, 2015 6:47 AM
Subject: Re: Two items for disclosures

> There were several payments to that account and they were mentioned in the
> Masters report as not having statements available at the time for some
> unknown reason. I just sent one example to show how the payments were
> listed.
>
> The new Administrator needs a lay person overview pointing out the
> Hurrah's and the activities that followed each. I'm working on that.
>
>
> According to Drina Brad is making threats about disseminating more
> recordings. I think the guy belongs in jail with his client and If I was
> Drina I wouldn't hesitate to file a police report. This indicates Brad
> knows more about the recordings than he claims and that we are right that
> they excerpted those recordings for a larger disk. Those recordings have
> no value in a civil action but they are evidence of illegal intercept of
> electronic communications and that is a second degree felony with a medium

> severity meaning 6 years + or - depending on the arguments. No he is
> threatening to release other recordings obviously in his possession.
>
> In my view you have your foot on their neck and if it was my foot I would
> step on it real hard!
> No one cares whats on those recordings. The fact that they exist is what's
> significant.

>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>

> On 7/29/2015 4:34 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>> I agree that is probably Anita's BofA credit card, but I thought there
>> were more payments than just one on that.

>>
>> I want to say at some point we figured out the account ending in 6643 was
>> Carole's personal account, but I will have to go back and look for that.
>> I would have thought it would have been in the master's report. Maybe it
>> was based on a conversation with Anita and Amy's prior lawyer.

>>
>> I had a long chat with the temporary administrator today. He doesn't
>> have a clue yet what is going on, but it is a lot to get your arms
>> around. I am sending him a bunch of stuff. Zandra Foley only moved the
>> summary judgment hearing in her case to 9/11/15--instead of taking it off
>> the docket entirely. That was not my understanding of what the agreement
>> was, and Lester wasn't too impressed with that either.

>>
>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"
>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"
>> Sent: Wednesday, July 29, 2015 8:25 AM
>> Subject: Two items for disclosures

>>
>>
>>> 1st
>>> Where are the B of A credit card statements that were not available for
>>> the Master's report?
>>> We think that's Anita's credit card that she didn't account for in her
>>> April 5, 2012 spreadsheets and thus withheld from the Master. We would
>>> like to see those statements so we know the trust paid for trust
>>> business.

>>>
>>> 2nd
>>> There is one reference to an account never mentioned anywhere else and
>>> we finally located where we saw it. That is a savings account ending in
>>> 6643. We need to see the account statements for that savings account.
>>>
>>> Edward Jones was not really productive. The notes were produced from a
>>> Database and thus the client name field is current not what existed at
>>> the time of the event. The statements verify that. The files are
>>> password protected so I couldn't combine all the files into one large
>>> one for convenient context sensitive searching.

>>>
>>> As far as Sandra is concerned her family hired Cannon Lambert out of
>>> Chicago. It's a huge profile case so he is probably getting buried with
>>> people trying to contact him. My concern is that his focus will be too
>>> localized on this one event when the underlying cause is the same as in
>>> Yancy. Fant et al., gets close to a description of the problem but still
>>> misses the mark by focusing on the symptoms and not the root causes. I
>>> now know who all the lawyers are for Fant, Bland and Yancy and I have
>>> already written a petition for declaratory judgement for the federal
>>> courts that I'm sending out.

>>>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 09:22:36 -0500

Are you saying that you believe or know that there were videos taped at the hospital????

If so, what do you know about it?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:17 AM
Subject: Videos taped at hospital

> Phone calls taped at Nelva's home.

>

>

> On 7/3/2015 6:58 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>> It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they have
>> revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am still too
>> outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there are more that
>> they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even appear to be
>> complete.

>>

>> I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at
>> Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina could
>> get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal with her
>> back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This is also the
>> basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments Nelva's caregivers
>> should be considered distributions to Carl from the trust.

>>

>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"

>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM

>> Subject: This is so heinous

>>

>>

>>> Texas Penal Code §16.02

>>>

>>> In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating the
>>> wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by an
>>> injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002
>>> Damages §123.004

>>>

>>> Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his right of
>>> privacy and I think some criminal statutes.

>>>

>>> This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is fortuitous.
>>> Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know she was
>>> stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.

>>>

>>> Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings or
>>> the only ones they were willing to reveal?

>>>

>>> The receipt for the recorders is Brunsting004570 March 17, 2011

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>
>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 10:02:35 -0500

What disclosures cd are you talking about? I haven't seen any videos?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:36 AM
Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

> Video's were taken at the hospital. They are on the disclosures CD. I
> haven't looked at anything myself but Candy read something out loud
> written by Carole about the video's. They were apparently taken after
> Carole saw Carl naked and thought he was malnourished or something and
> took him back to the hospital. The first email says she wasn't sending
> them to Candy.

>

> I am wondering if all this isn't part of dragging Carole into it. She made
> the videos and probably the phone recordings.

>

> This stuff really shook Candy up. I don't think I've seen her in such a
> state since the day she finally had to admit the trio was trying to steal
> her inheritance.

>

>

>

>

>

> On 7/3/2015 7:22 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>> Are you saying that you believe or know that there were videos taped at
>> the hospital????

>>

>> If so, what do you know about it?

>>

>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:17 AM

>> Subject: Videos taped at hospital

>>

>>

>>> Phone calls taped at Nelva's home.

>>>

>>>

>>> On 7/3/2015 6:58 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>> It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they have
>>>> revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am still too
>>>> outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there are more that
>>>> they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even appear to be
>>>> complete.

>>>>

>>>> I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at
>>>> Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina
>>>> could get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal
>>>> with her back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This is
>>>> also the basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments Nelva's
>>>> caregivers should be considered distributions to Carl from the trust.

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"

>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM

>>>> Subject: This is so heinous

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> Texas Penal Code §16.02

>>>>>

>>>>> In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating the
>>>>> wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by an
>>>>> injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002

>>>>> Damages §123.004

>>>>>

>>>>> Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his right

>>>>> of

>>>>> privacy and I think some criminal statutes.

>>>>>

>>>>> This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is

>>>>> fortuitous.

>>>>> Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know she

>>>>> was

>>>>> stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.

>>>>>

>>>>> Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings or

>>>>> the only ones they were willing to reveal?

>>>>>

>>>>> The receipt for the recorders is Brunsting004570 March 17, 2011

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 10:21:50 -0500

OMG. I hadn't even looked at the emails yet. I had been focusing on the audiotapes and assuming we already had all the emails. These are wrong on so many levels--both legal and moral.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:10 AM
Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

> Attached to the emails starting with Brunsting 5822.msg

> look at the larger messages

>

> On 7/3/2015 8:02 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>> What disclosures cd are you talking about? I haven't seen any videos?

>>

>>

>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:36 AM

>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>

>>

>>> Video's were taken at the hospital. They are on the disclosures CD. I
>>> haven't looked at anything myself but Candy read something out loud
>>> written by Carole about the video's. They were apparently taken after
>>> Carole saw Carl naked and thought he was malnourished or something and
>>> took him back to the hospital. The first email says she wasn't sending
>>> them to Candy.

>>>

>>> I am wondering if all this isn't part of dragging Carole into it. She
>>> made the videos and probably the phone recordings.

>>>

>>> This stuff really shook Candy up. I don't think I've seen her in such a
>>> state since the day she finally had to admit the trio was trying to
>>> steal her inheritance.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> On 7/3/2015 7:22 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>> Are you saying that you believe or know that there were videos taped at
>>>> the hospital????

>>>>

>>>> If so, what do you know about it?

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:17 AM

>>>> Subject: Videos taped at hospital

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> Phone calls taped at Nelva's home.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> On 7/3/2015 6:58 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>>>> It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they have
>>>>>> revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am still

>>>>>> too outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there are more
>>>>>> that they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even appear to be
>>>>>> complete.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at
>>>>>> Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina
>>>>>> could get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal
>>>>>> with her back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This is
>>>>>> also the basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments Nelva's
>>>>>> caregivers should be considered distributions to Carl from the trust.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>>>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"

>>>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM

>>>>>> Subject: This is so heinous

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Texas Penal Code §16.02

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating the
>>>>>>> wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by an
>>>>>>> injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002
>>>>>>> Damages §123.004

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his right
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> privacy and I think some criminal statutes.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is
>>>>>>> fortuitous.

>>>>>>> Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know she
>>>>>>> was

>>>>>>> stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings
>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>> the only ones they were willing to reveal?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> The receipt for the recorders is Brunsting004570 March 17, 2011

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 10:31:04 -0500

Did Candy know Carole had done this videotaping of Carl in the hospital--or anywhere for that matter?

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:10 AM
Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

> Attached to the emails starting with Brunsting 5822.msg

> look at the larger messages

>

> On 7/3/2015 8:02 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>> What disclosures cd are you talking about? I haven't seen any videos?

>>

>>

>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:36 AM

>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>

>>

>>> Video's were taken at the hospital. They are on the disclosures CD. I
>>> haven't looked at anything myself but Candy read something out loud
>>> written by Carole about the video's. They were apparently taken after
>>> Carole saw Carl naked and thought he was malnourished or something and
>>> took him back to the hospital. The first email says she wasn't sending
>>> them to Candy.

>>>

>>> I am wondering if all this isn't part of dragging Carole into it. She
>>> made the videos and probably the phone recordings.

>>>

>>> This stuff really shook Candy up. I don't think I've seen her in such a
>>> state since the day she finally had to admit the trio was trying to
>>> steal her inheritance.

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>>

>>> On 7/3/2015 7:22 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>> Are you saying that you believe or know that there were videos taped at
>>>> the hospital????

>>>>

>>>> If so, what do you know about it?

>>>>

>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:17 AM

>>>> Subject: Videos taped at hospital

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> Phone calls taped at Nelva's home.

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>> On 7/3/2015 6:58 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>>>> It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they have

>>>>>> revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am still

>>>>>> too outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there are more

>>>>>> that they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even appear to be
>>>>>> complete.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at
>>>>>> Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina
>>>>>> could get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal
>>>>>> with her back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This is
>>>>>> also the basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments Nelva's
>>>>>> caregivers should be considered distributions to Carl from the trust.

>>>>>>

>>>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>>>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"

>>>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM

>>>>>> Subject: This is so heinous

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Texas Penal Code §16.02

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating the
>>>>>>> wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by an
>>>>>>> injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002
>>>>>>> Damages §123.004

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his right
>>>>>>> of
>>>>>>> privacy and I think some criminal statutes.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is
>>>>>>> fortuitous.

>>>>>>> Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know she
>>>>>>> was

>>>>>>> stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings
>>>>>>> or
>>>>>>> the only ones they were willing to reveal?

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> The receipt for the recorders is Brunsting004570 March 17, 2011

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 11:08:46 -0500

Carole is in this deeper than even I realized, and--looking at the dates on these emails--for even longer than I realized. What I can't figure out is why they are even giving us these now. They obviously create legal problems for them because of the illegality, but maybe they just don't get that. They also clearly lead to the conclusion that there are other recordings--and emails--that don't help them so they haven't provided those.

I think Tino's deposition may need to be taken. And the discovery I was planning to send out today is going to need to be reworked to address this new information. We need to make this a big piece of what goes on at the hearing on 7/21. The question is what is the best vehicle to do that.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:55 AM
Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

> They never shared any of this. The first email Carole says she wasn't
> sending it to Candy because Candy didn't know Carl was back in the
> hospital.
> When Candy started asking for validation they started to clam up. The more
> she pushed the more they stonewalled. That's when Candy started getting a
> clue something was not as it was being represented.

>
> On 7/3/2015 8:31 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>> Did Candy know Carole had done this videotaping of Carl in the
>> hospital--or anywhere for that matter?

>>
>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"
>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:10 AM
>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>
>>> Attached to the emails starting with Brunsting 5822.msg
>>> look at the larger messages

>>>
>>> On 7/3/2015 8:02 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>>>> What disclosures cd are you talking about? I haven't seen any videos?

>>>>
>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"
>>>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:36 AM
>>>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>>>> Video's were taken at the hospital. They are on the disclosures CD. I
>>>>> haven't looked at anything myself but Candy read something out loud
>>>>> written by Carole about the video's. They were apparently taken after
>>>>> Carole saw Carl naked and thought he was malnourished or something and
>>>>> took him back to the hospital. The first email says she wasn't sending
>>>>> them to Candy.

>>>>>
>>>>> I am wondering if all this isn't part of dragging Carole into it. She
>>>>> made the videos and probably the phone recordings.

>>>>>

>>>>> This stuff really shook Candy up. I don't think I've seen her in such
>>>>> a state since the day she finally had to admit the trio was trying to
>>>>> steal her inheritance.

>>>>>
>>>>>
>>>>>

>>>>> On 7/3/2015 7:22 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>>>> Are you saying that you believe or know that there were videos taped
>>>>>> at the hospital????

>>>>>>

>>>>>> If so, what do you know about it?

>>>>>>

>>>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>>>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"

>>>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:17 AM

>>>>>> Subject: Videos taped at hospital

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> Phone calls taped at Nelva's home.

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>> On 7/3/2015 6:58 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

>>>>>>>> It really is heinous. I suppose we should be grateful that they
>>>>>>>> have revealed these, now years after they were requested, but I am
>>>>>>>> still too outraged to celebrate that fact. And yes, you know there
>>>>>>>> are more that they don't want us to see. Some of these don't even
>>>>>>>> appear to be complete.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> I don't think these were taped in the hospital. They were taped at
>>>>>>>> Nelva's house while Carl stayed there at their urging so that Drina
>>>>>>>> could get some sleep--because wasn't sleeping at night--and to deal
>>>>>>>> with her back which she had thrown out trying to lift Carl. This
>>>>>>>> is also the basis, at least in part, of the claim that payments
>>>>>>>> Nelva's caregivers should be considered distributions to Carl from
>>>>>>>> the trust.

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> To: "Bobbie Bayless"

>>>>>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 7:46 AM

>>>>>>>> Subject: This is so heinous

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> Texas Penal Code §16.02

>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>> In addition to subjecting you to criminal prosecution, violating
>>>>>>>>>> the
>>>>>>>>>> wiretapping law can expose you to a civil lawsuit for damages by
>>>>>>>>>> an
>>>>>>>>>> injured party. Texas Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 123.002
>>>>>>>>>> Damages §123.004

>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>> Filming Carl in the hospital required permission, violates his
>>>>>>>>>>> right of
>>>>>>>>>>> privacy and I think some criminal statutes.

>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>> This email was filed as an exhibit February 27, 2012 and is
>>>>>>>>>>>> fortuitous.

>>>>>>>>>>>>> Anita was stalking Nelva's bank activity and emails. Now we know
>>>>>>>>>>>>> she was

>>>>>>>>>>>>>> stalking and tapping Nelva's phone communications.

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> Where has all this information been? Are these the only recordings
>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> or

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>> the only ones they were willing to reveal?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Videos taped at hospital**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 3 Jul 2015 11:40:23 -0500

This certainly seems to be a pretty good explanation for why Carole got a lot of XOM stock 3 weeks later. I see the email about not sending it to Candy, but it says that was because Candy didn't know Carl was in the hospital. Any idea what any of that means? Carole showed an uncharacteristic amount of restraint not to boast at some point to Candy about having made these videos. I guess the XOM transfer worked sort of like duct tape over Carole's mouth.

----- Original Message -----

From: "Rik Munson"
To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:55 AM
Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

> They never shared any of this. The first email Carole says she wasn't
> sending it to Candy because Candy didn't know Carl was back in the
> hospital.
> When Candy started asking for validation they started to clam up. The more
> she pushed the more they stonewalled. That's when Candy started getting a
> clue something was not as it was being represented.

>
> On 7/3/2015 8:31 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>> Did Candy know Carole had done this videotaping of Carl in the
>> hospital--or anywhere for that matter?

>>
>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"
>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 10:10 AM
>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>
>>
>>> Attached to the emails starting with Brunsting 5822.msg
>>> look at the larger messages

>>>
>>> On 7/3/2015 8:02 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:
>>>> What disclosures cd are you talking about? I haven't seen any videos?
>>>>

>>>>
>>>> ----- Original Message ----- From: "Rik Munson"
>>>> To: "Bobbie G Bayless"
>>>> Sent: Friday, July 03, 2015 9:36 AM
>>>> Subject: Re: Videos taped at hospital

>>>>
>>>>> Video's were taken at the hospital. They are on the disclosures CD. I
>>>>> haven't looked at anything myself but Candy read something out loud
>>>>> written by Carole about the video's. They were apparently taken after
>>>>> Carole saw Carl naked and thought he was malnourished or something and
>>>>> took him back to the hospital. The first email says she wasn't sending
>>>>> them to Candy.

>>>>>
>>>>> I am wondering if all this isn't part of dragging Carole into it. She
>>>>> made the videos and probably the phone recordings.

>>>>>
>>>>> This stuff really shook Candy up. I don't think I've seen her in such
>>>>> a state since the day she finally had to admit the trio was trying to
>>>>> steal her inheritance.

>>>>>

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: We may as well start working together**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 28 Mar 2013 10:52:12 -0500

It would certainly seem that our interests are somewhat aligned.

I want to look at this better and digest what you have come up with. It looks like there is some overlap in what we have been investigating, but your computer expertise is a big help and something I don't have. Of course, Carl's position as personal representative for the estates eliminates some privity problems and allows inclusion of Elmer and Nelva's claims. I have attached Carole's deposition and the exhibits used at that deposition. I have a video of that and can also provide an e-transcript version of that if that is something you can use. I would probably need to send that on a disk to you. Just let me know where to send it if you are interested and if you want it send by overnight delivery.

We have some things that might be helpful to you, including the records we obtained from Computershare for the XOM accounts, the Bank of America records we obtained for the safe deposit box. We have some bank records also, like for Nelva's account that Carole signed on after Anita took over as trustee. I will need to send these things in separate emails because of the size. I could also include them on the disk with the video of Carole's deposition if you decide you want that.

I glanced briefly at your timeline and saw the notation about my having failed to sue Vacek & Freed on August 25, 2012, but what you could not have known is that they had entered into a tolling agreement. They refused to extend that tolling agreement and they were sued within the parameters established by the tolling agreement, so I can eliminate your concerns about those claims being foreclosed.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 9:42 AM
Subject: We may as well start working together

Candy will be having a party in the federal court and everyone will be cordially invited. My Joinder is written, I just haven't conformed it yet. My name is Rik Munson. I qualified as a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer (MCSE) in 1999.

Outlined below is nearly everything necessary to solving this puzzle without resort to interviewing any of the five Brunsting heirs. The only other information necessary is also digital, and includes only select email communications amongst the family to which Candy and/or Nelva were party.

Email communications amongst the Defendants, if any, would be damning. Just the switch logs would be enough to show the communication activity.

Every internet service provider (ISP) is assigned an IP address range (TCP/IP) by the internic (internet naming authority). Any IP address can be traced to the assigned Service provide by IP address range. The ISP can identify the user of that IP by DHCP lease assignment at any point in time.

Every electronic communication over the internet travels through a series of devices that includes routers and switches. Each switch maintains a log that is periodically backed up and archived.

The switch logs will tell you what IP address was used to manipulate EFT transactions, what credentials were used, etc. In a way it's just like a kid selling drugs using text messaging. There's no way you can hide what you did. You can bury the phone but the switch logs have all the messages.

- (1) SBCGlobal
 - Elmer/Nelva emails
 - Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records
- (2) Bank of America
 - Safe Deposit Box Access records

(2a) ISP for B of A

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

(3) Computershare Trading Corporation

USER ID used in Exxon and other transfers to Anita, when those credentials were created. Any physical documents submitted to effect control of assets held by Computershare Trading Corporation for Elmer, Nelva or the thrusts.

(3a) ISP for Computershare Trading Corporation

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

I filed online complaints with the FBI in this case and with the SEC. I don't care that they don't do anything with it. It's the fact of the complaint that counts and I'm not playing with my life.

The documents received from Amy and Anita are digital forgeries and one of the documents that Carl got from a lawyer that got it from Freed has a different digital signature looking image.

Nelva did not sign any of the documents dated August 25 or December 21, 2010 nor the one dated June 15, 2010. Defendants can't come up with wet signed originals and if they try to bring in new fakes they won't match the digital fakes they already gave us and they won't survive forensics. If they had the real deal why would they provide fakes in the first place?

I'm looking at RICO. I intend to stay in equity where the defendants have an affirmative duty to confess. If they want to argue privilege under discovery and lose they are in breach of fiduciary. Once Candy and Carl are re-established as the de jure trustees all the evidence is readily available without process. In fact, any temporary trustee can ferret out the facts.

This case is over and the defendants don't even know it yet. I know exactly where they will run and I'm already waiting for them. I sent a DTPA notice to Vacek and I hope he's having a good foolhardy laugh.

Before we get anywhere near there I will add Freed for aiding and abetting and she will run straight into my arms screaming "strict privity"... Come to papa!

These clowns have no idea what they are up against.

P.S. Candy needs to see Carole's Judas deposition.

Rik Munson

925-349-8348

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: We may as well start working together**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 28 Mar 2013 11:36:14 -0500

Here are the XOM documents, the safe deposit box records, and the production(which I bates numbered) from Carole, as well as bank statements and checks from Carole for the joint account with Nelva which came later. I will also forward to you the email exchange with Carole about these bank records and some questions I had.

You will notice on the safe deposit records that Carl's right to access was removed on 7/21/10 and Anita was substituted for Carl. You will also notice that Anita closed the box two days before Nelva died.

Carole is also going to be a defendant in our lawsuit, so I would appreciate it if Candy would not discuss our communications with her.

We also have additional documents produced by Anita and Amy's counsel—including other account statements, but I will wait to hear from you before I send anything else.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
To: [Rik Munson](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 10:52 AM
Subject: Re: We may as well start working together

It would certainly seem that our interests are somewhat aligned.

I want to look at this better and digest what you have come up with. It looks like there is some overlap in what we have been investigating, but your computer expertise is a big help and something I don't have. Of course, Carl's position as personal representative for the estates eliminates some privity problems and allows inclusion of Elmer and Nelva's claims. I have attached Carole's deposition and the exhibits used at that deposition. I have a video of that and can also provide an e-transcript version of that if that is something you can use. I would probably need to send that on a disk to you. Just let me know where to send it if you are interested and if you want it send by overnight delivery.

We have some things that might be helpful to you, including the records we obtained from Computershare for the XOM accounts, the Bank of America records we obtained for the safe deposit box. We have some bank records also, like for Nelva's account that Carole signed on after Anita took over as trustee. I will need to send these things in separate emails because of the size. I could also include them on the disk with the video of Carole's deposition if you decide you want that.

I glanced briefly at your timeline and saw the notation about my having failed to sue Vacek & Freed on August 25, 2012, but what you could not have known is that they had entered into a tolling agreement. They refused to extend that tolling agreement and they were sued within the parameters established by the tolling agreement, so I can eliminate your concerns about those claims being foreclosed.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 9:42 AM
Subject: We may as well start working together

Candy will be having a party in the federal court and everyone will be cordially invited. My Joinder is written, I just haven't conformed it yet. My name is Rik Munson. I qualified as a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer (MCSE) in 1999.

Outlined below is nearly everything necessary to solving this puzzle without resort to interviewing any of the five Brunsting heirs. The only other information necessary is also digital, and includes only select email communications amongst the family to which Candy and/or Nelva were party.

Email communications amongst the Defendants, if any, would be damning. Just the switch logs would be enough to show the communication activity.

Every internet service provider (ISP) is assigned an IP address range (TCP/IP) by the internic (internet naming authority). Any IP address can be traced to the assigned Service provide by IP address range. The ISP can identify the user of that IP by DHCP lease assignment at any point in time.

Every electronic communication over the internet travels through a series of devices that includes routers and switches. Each switch maintains a log that is periodically backed up and archived.

The switch logs will tell you what IP address was used to manipulate EFT transactions, what credentials were used, etc. In a way it's just like a kid selling drugs using text messaging. There's no way you can hide what you did. You can bury the phone but the

switch logs have all the messages.

(1) SBCGlobal

Elmer/Nelva emails

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

(2) Bank of America

Safe Deposit Box Access records

(2a) ISP for B of A

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

(3) Computershare Trading Corporation

USER ID used in Exxon and other transfers to Anita, when those credentials were created. Any physical documents submitted to effect control of assets held by Computershare Trading Corporation for Elmer, Nelva or the trusts.

(3a) ISP for Computershare Trading Corporation

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

I filed online complaints with the FBI in this case and with the SEC. I don't care that they don't do anything with it. It's the fact of the complaint that counts and I'm not playing with my life.

The documents received from Amy and Anita are digital forgeries and one of the documents that Carl got from a lawyer that got it from Freed has a different digital signature looking image.

Nelva did not sign any of the documents dated August 25 or December 21, 2010 nor the one dated June 15, 2010. Defendants can't come up with wet signed originals and if they try to bring in new fakes they won't match the digital fakes they already gave us and they won't survive forensics. If they had the real deal why would they provide fakes in the first place?

I'm looking at RICO. I intend to stay in equity where the defendants have an affirmative duty to confess. If they want to argue privilege under discovery and lose they are in breach of fiduciary. Once Candy and Carl are re-established as the de jure trustees all the evidence is readily available without process. In fact, any temporary trustee can ferret out the facts.

This case is over and the defendants don't even know it yet. I know exactly where they will run and I'm already waiting for them. I sent a DTPA notice to Vacek and I hope he's having a good foolhardy laugh.

Before we get anywhere near there I will add Freed for aiding and abetting and she will run straight into my arms screaming "strict privity"... Come to papa!

These clowns have no idea what they are up against.

P.S. Candy needs to see Carole's Judas deposition.

Rik Munson
925-349-8348

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: We may as well start working together**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sun, 31 Mar 2013 19:28:02 -0500

Maybe I just don't know how to find it, but I don't seem to be able to access your SEC complaint. Can you send that to me. Also, do you have some kind of report from Adobe about the altered documents? If so, can you send that to me as well? I am going back and looking at some of these documents, but I need to check and see if I can download your ROA so I can be sure I am looking at the same documents you are describing. Did they send the ROA to you on a disk or did they send you an email link for it? Have you thought about being an expert witness for Candy at her injunction hearing.

— Original Message —

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 9:42 AM
Subject: We may as well start working together

Candy will be having a party in the federal court and everyone will be cordially invited. My Joinder is written, I just haven't conformed it yet. My name is Rik Munson. I qualified as a Microsoft Certified Systems Engineer (MCSE) in 1999.

Outlined below is nearly everything necessary to solving this puzzle without resort to interviewing any of the five Brunsting heirs. The only other information necessary is also digital, and includes only select email communications amongst the family to which Candy and/or Nelva were party.

Email communications amongst the Defendants, if any, would be damning. Just the switch logs would be enough to show the communication activity.

Every internet service provider (ISP) is assigned an IP address range (TCP/IP) by the internic (internet naming authority). Any IP address can be traced to the assigned Service provide by IP address range. The ISP can identify the user of that IP by DHCP lease assignment at any point in time.

Every electronic communication over the internet travels through a series of devices that includes routers and switches. Each switch maintains a log that is periodically backed up and archived.

The switch logs will tell you what IP address was used to manipulate EFT transactions, what credentials were used, etc. In a way it's just like a kid selling drugs using text messaging. There's no way you can hide what you did. You can bury the phone but the switch logs have all the messages.

- (1) SBCGlobal
Elmer/Nelva emails
Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records
- (2) Bank of America
Safe Deposit Box Access records
- (2a) ISP for B of A
Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records
- (3) Computershare Trading Corporation

USER ID used in Exxon and other transfers to Anita, when those credentials were created. Any physical documents submitted to effect control of assets held by Computershare Trading Corporation for Elmer, Nelva or the thrusts.

(3a) ISP for Computershare Trading Corporation

Switch logs for electronic access & remote IP address records

I filed online complaints with the FBI in this case and with the SEC. I don't care that they don't do anything with it. It's the fact of the complaint that counts and I'm not playing with my life.

The documents received from Amy and Anita are digital forgeries and one of the documents that Carl got from a lawyer that got it from Freed has a different digital signature looking image.

Nelva did not sign any of the documents dated August 25 or December 21, 2010 nor the one dated June 15, 2010. Defendants can't come up with wet signed originals and if they try to bring in new fakes they won't match the digital fakes they already gave us and they won't survive forensics. If they had the real deal why would they provide fakes in the first place?

I'm looking at RICO. I intend to stay in equity where the defendants have an affirmative duty to confess. If they want to argue privilege under discovery and lose they are in breach of fiduciary. Once Candy and Carl are re-established as the de jure trustees all the evidence is readily available without process. In fact, any temporary trustee can ferret out the facts.

This case is over and the defendants don't even know it yet. I know exactly where they will run and I'm already waiting for them. I sent a DTPA notice to Vacek and I hope he's having a good foolhardy laugh.

Before we get anywhere near there I will add Freed for aiding and abetting and she will run straight into my arms screaming "strict privity"... Come to papa!

These clowns have no idea what they are up against.

P.S. Candy needs to see Carole's Judas deposition.

Rik Munson

925-349-8348

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: We will be in Houston April 9**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Fri, 29 Mar 2013 13:15:56 -0500

I am just now seeing this one. I am not sure what you mean about it becoming a "not so special appearance," but I can't be there. It certainly should be interesting, but I don't think it would be a good idea for me to be there—even if I could be.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Thursday, March 28, 2013 7:40 PM
Subject: We will be in Houston April 9

Hoyt denied request for phone appearance and we will be coming to Houston for April 9. I will have my application for Joinder filed by then and maybe Hoyt will rule on it at the hearing. I would like you to be there and maybe it will become a not so special appearance after all.

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: Without legal authority my ass**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 1 Aug 2015 20:17:24 -0500

Thanks so much for this. I am going to be working on this most of tomorrow, and this looks very helpful. They are idiots, but a weak judge could be their best friend.

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie Bayless
Sent: Saturday, August 01, 2015 2:18 PM
Subject: Without legal authority my ass

There is plenty of precedent for everything but Brad's bar card - T

SEC v. Galleon Management Case 1:09-cr-01184-RJH Document 43 filed 01/27/2010 attached

http://dealbook.nytimes.com/2010/01/28/can-the-sec-get-the-galleon-wiretaps/?_r=0

The FBI obtained wiretap recordings legally but the Securities Exchange Commission was unable to get the wiretap recordings from the FBI for use in a parallel civil case. The SEC was also unsuccessful in compelling civil discovery from the defendants who had received the wiretap recordings from the Justice Department as part of the criminal prosecution. The signed protective order in that case is attached.

The distinction here is that the recordings at issue are the property of Carl and Drina Brunsting and not the defendants and they were illegally intercepted and disseminated. These lawyers are such low morals slob that I want their bar cards hanging like shrunken heads above the entrance to my hut. Brad is both civilly liable and criminally culpable for aiding and abetting and disseminating these recordings and then defending them as legal. I like to put on my little red clown nose when I act like that so my stupidity won't look so out of place.

Counsel claims information and belief and that has to come from somewhere. To rebut the presumption that the recordings were illegally intercepted electronic communications Anita will have to testify about her possession of those recordings and any knowledge she has about the master recording the tracks were edited from as recent as February 27, 2015. We will need to see the device used to intercept those communications and the media the excerpts were edited from on February 27, 2015 (exactly 3 years to the day Candy first filed her federal petition and four months before they were disclosed) to see if the device and the media match.

Brad is an idiot and a low morals slob who deserves to have it broken off in him on this one. His pleading alone constitutes an additional felony.

18 U.S. Code § 2515 - Prohibition of use as evidence of intercepted wire or oral communications

Whenever any wire or oral communication has been intercepted, no part of the contents of such communication and no evidence derived therefrom may be received in evidence in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof if the disclosure of that information would be in violation of this chapter.

18 U.S. Code § 2520 - Recovery of civil damages authorized

(a) In General.— Except as provided in section 2511 (2)(a)(ii), any person whose wire, oral, or electronic communication is intercepted, disclosed, or intentionally used in violation of this chapter may in a civil action recover from the person or entity, other than the United States, which engaged in that violation such relief as may be appropriate.

(b) Relief.— In an action under this section, appropriate relief includes—

- (1) such preliminary and other equitable or declaratory relief as may be appropriate;
- (2) damages under subsection (c) and punitive damages in appropriate cases; and
- (3) a reasonable attorney's fee and other litigation costs reasonably incurred.

(c) Computation of Damages.—

(1) In an action under this section, if the conduct in violation of this chapter is the private viewing of a private satellite video communication that is not scrambled or encrypted or if the communication is a radio communication that is transmitted on frequencies allocated under subpart D of part 74 of the rules of the Federal Communications Commission that is not scrambled or encrypted and the conduct is not for a tortious or illegal purpose or for purposes of direct or indirect commercial advantage or private commercial gain, then the court shall assess damages as follows:

(A) If the person who engaged in that conduct has not previously been enjoined under section 2511 (5) and has not been found liable in a prior civil action under this section, the court shall assess the greater of the sum of actual damages suffered by the plaintiff, or statutory damages of not less than \$50 and not more than \$500.

(B) If, on one prior occasion, the person who engaged in that conduct has been enjoined under section 2511 (5) or has been found liable in a civil action under this section, the court shall assess the greater of the sum of actual damages suffered by the plaintiff, or statutory damages of not less than \$100 and not more than \$1000.

(2) In any other action under this section, the court may assess as damages whichever is the greater of—

- (A) the sum of the actual damages suffered by the plaintiff and any profits made by the violator as a result of the violation; or
- (B) statutory damages of whichever is the greater of \$100 a day for each day of violation or \$10,000.

(d) Defense.— A good faith reliance on—

- (1) a court warrant or order, a grand jury subpoena, a legislative authorization, or a statutory authorization;

- (2) a request of an investigative or law enforcement officer under section 2518 (7) of this title; or
- (3) a good faith determination that section 2511 (3) or 2511 (2)(i) of this title permitted the conduct complained of; is a complete defense against any civil or criminal action brought under this chapter or any other law.
- (e) Limitation.— A civil action under this section may not be commenced later than two years after the date upon which the claimant first has a reasonable opportunity to discover the violation.
- (f) Administrative Discipline.— If a court or appropriate department or agency determines that the United States or any of its departments or agencies has violated any provision of this chapter, and the court or appropriate department or agency finds that the circumstances surrounding the violation raise serious questions about whether or not an officer or employee of the United States acted willfully or intentionally with respect to the violation, the department or agency shall, upon receipt of a true and correct copy of the decision and findings of the court or appropriate department or agency promptly initiate a proceeding to determine whether disciplinary action against the officer or employee is warranted. If the head of the department or agency involved determines that disciplinary action is not warranted, he or she shall notify the Inspector General with jurisdiction over the department or agency concerned and shall provide the Inspector General with the reasons for such determination.
- (g) Improper Disclosure Is Violation.— Any willful disclosure or use by an investigative or law enforcement officer or governmental entity of information beyond the extent permitted by section 2517 is a violation of this chapter for purposes of section 2520 (a).

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Re: You are absolutely correct**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Thu, 23 Jul 2015 08:11:49 -0500

So, did you become involved in your previous area of endeavor because of your own problems with law enforcement run amuck or have you had problems with law enforcement run amuck because of your previous area of endeavor?

I guess if anything good can be said about the Sandra Bland tragedy—and it is hard to see even this as good—it is that the coverage of it has really gone viral. That seems to be happening more now when these horrible incidents happen and the people involved are tending to be removed from law enforcement. I hope it is a good sign for improvement overall that these things are no longer being swept under the rug and the assumption is not longer that the victim was at fault. But they do seem to keep happening, so just taking care of the incidents where the officers go too far unfortunately isn't going to fix the overall problem.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 11:53 PM
Subject: You are absolutely correct

It's a design. They intentionally hire antisocial personalities because no one with a conscience will do their bidding, my cousin just retired after 20 years on the force. He spent most of it at a desk because he wouldn't do what they wanted.

It has been a long hard road but I get it. I know how they keep it in house and how to step past it. I used to call myself the Teflon Cruiser because traffic tickets couldn't stick to me. A friend who was getting really screwed like the black folks in Ferguson asked me "What about the rest of us that don't have your skill? So, I started down this road and after awhile the pretext of legitimacy fell away and the rule of law was kicked to the curb without pretext. Government actors that no longer feel the need to masquerade their evil are a thing to be feared.

Yes i was talking about my illness in September October 2013. It does read like sci-fi or a Hollywood movie and that makes it awkward but I have the detailed billing statements showing what drugs they gave me and when.

I complained the whole time I was being terrorized. They had to tell the hospital it was a terrorist investigation. I can't think of any other reason they would get such cooperation. All my doctors were foreigners. I don't even know how in the world I ended up in that particular hospital. They didn't treat my medical condition. My brother is a doctor. He flew in from Seattle and took control of the situation and got me out of that coma after they had tried and failed twice. They were going to try one more time and then write me off. Candy wouldn't let them do another thing until my brother arrived. That's the only reason I'm still alive. After the coma they had me strapped in ICU with a C-pap and an embedded send/receive unit. They gassed me with so much shit that I couldn't even think. They threatened me and my loved ones and they kept asking questions that didn't make any sense.

They released me with a bucket of pills and i went to a local ER. they admitted me that Monday night and I had surgery to replace my aortic trunk and valve on Thursday. I went home the following Wednesday after spending less time than I had spent being terrorized. Is there a connection? I don't know. I just know they are all tied in. I left here in an ambulance. They all got the news. I ended up at John Muir Med Ctr in Concord when I live between Napa and Vallejo and there are four closer hospitals. The interrogations didn't make sense until i saw the warrant.

You can think what you want but here is one of the replies to my communications regarding filing the return. The warrant is attached to the email. It's not really an issue but I was effected by the news paper article about Sandra. The guy that wrote it was an ignorant ass and I was offended. This is the kind of thing I should be focused on and not some petty inter-familial thievery. I do admit that things happen for a reason whether you know the reason at the time or not and I have learned a great deal from this experience. The message is that I feel the need to return to my previous area of endeavor.

On 7/22/2015 8:42 PM, Bobbie Bayless wrote:

That's a pretty ambitious project. I totally get the part about it being about funding, and corruption definitely seems to be everywhere, but what I don't understand is how it jumps from that to this level of police officers killing so many people who haven't really done anything. I am not sure that can be blamed of the focus having moved to funding or even on the corruption itself. It is like there is no screening of these people before they are allowed into law enforcement. Or maybe it is even worse than that and they are screening **for** people with violent tendencies.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Rik Munson](#)
To: [Bobbie G Bayless](#)
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 9:20 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

The project I was working on to expose the institutionalized corruption that is the source of these events. they are not lone, isolated events. They are constant and unbelievable. So many tragedies because most police officers in today's society are not involved in law enforcement at all. Its all about funding. That's why Sandra was stopped at the onset. I've spent almost 20 years figuring out this racketeering scheme. That's what I should have been working on instead of this childish fraud theft menagerie. I'm on mailing lists. I get these stories every day. I'm not saying I could have saved anyone in particular but people need to know what its really about. read Fant and then Read Hein v North Carolina. What a crock of shit. That Lawyer Fischer said "probable cause" a thousand times but never once said "crime". It's called ask the wrong question get the wrong answer. intentionally generating lousy case law. This is what got me to study law to begin with and my work here is not done. That's all. This is domestic terrorism by definition. What a sickness.

On 7/22/2015 4:18 PM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

What the hell is he talking about??? I know about the Sandra Bland tragedy, but what is all this crap about how he could have saved her, etc???

— Original Message —

From: Rik Munson
To: Bobbie G Bayless
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2015 6:13 PM
Subject: Re: Tino

On 7/22/2015 10:49 AM, Bobbie G Bayless wrote:

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

We are there again on the 3rd and other than that we would simply want 14-17 days advance notice so we can get the better airfare. She also prefers any days other than Mondays or Tuesdays as those are big demand days for her job. I thought the hearing went the way it was going to go anyway and had Candy set to accept it. Neal didn't look cocky and Brad almost looked as bad as Carole.

Something really bothered me when leaving Houston though. It's not about Candy's case. I picked up a few news papers in the lobby and read the tragic story of Sandra Bland. If I had continued what I stopped doing to help Candy that beautiful young woman might still be alive today. I can't help but feel guilty about that even though I'm one man and can only do so much. It doesn't give me much comfort. This is a subject I know more about than any other area of the law. Sandra was murdered as a by product of institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering and domestic terrorism. You will find the definition at 18 USC §2331 (5). I don't need notes. I can quote the relevant portions of the applicable California Vehicle Code Statutes without looking at a single written note. I'm sure I can write the same brief for Texas.

Sandra was murdered. No if's, no and's and no but's!

let's use a California incident as I have as of yet not written a Texas brief

On Mother's Day 2014, just a couple of weeks before Memorial Day, 32 year old Iraq and Afghanistan Veteran Tommy Yancy Jr., was pulled over for not having a front license plate. Before that police contact was over five California Highway Patrol officers had beat Tommy Yancy to death in the street while stunned onlookers filmed the horrific event on a cell phone commenting, "too much excessive force" and "not resisting.

<http://www.opposingviews.com/i/society/crime/veteran-tommy-yancy-beaten-death-cops-during-traffic-stop-video>

The reality:

When that armed paramilitary predator activated his emergency lights he violated the penal code prohibition on false arrest. What Tommy was accused of doing was not conduct rising to the level of crime. There was no statutory authorization for that seizure. No front license plate an administrative infraction of a civil regulatory code. Under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 15 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to counsel and under Cal. Const. Art 1 sec 16 one accused of crime is constitutionally entitled to a jury trial. Penal code 19.6 says that one accused of infraction does not get assistance of counsel and Penal Code 1042.5 says one accused of infraction does not get a jury trial. The court of appeals in people v Sava looked at this and ruled "infractions are not crimes"

Probable Cause to arrest without warrant invariably requires presence of the element known as crime. This is not about public safety. It's about revenue. It's an institutionalized color of law extortion racketeering industry that is falsely arresting and killing people under a pretext of law enforcement. I'm very afraid to exercise my rights in America. I will be murdered like Tommy and my killers will do the investigation, file the reports and that will be that. Or maybe I'll be dragged to jail and hang myself like Sandra?

I've already been subjected to medically assisted interrogation in effort to remove me as a threat but that didn't produce fruit and I survived the coma that resulted from the propofol overdose that stopped my breathing because they thought I was a tough customer. The warrant served on my home while I was recovering in ICU also failed to produce fruit.

I have their written admission they found no evidence of crime. It took 8 months for me to get the return filed and there was never probable cause for an arrest. Under California vehicle code statutes the authority to arrest is limited to crime. I have a mountain of evidence. There is no due process or even the semblance of it. The felony murder rule applies to all of the traffic court judges, commissioners and referee's in this country.

Do you know about the Fant et al., v Fergusson and Fant et al v Jennings lawsuits?

That's reality! I'd rather read this than watch TV

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Recordings Received today from Anita's Counsel**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 1 Jul 2015 20:28:43 -0500

These recordings I got today and that have also been mailed to Candy I assume contain phone conversations between Carl and Drina while Carl was staying at Nelva's when Drina threw her back out trying to lift him. I don't see how there could have been any consent for these recordings, but I thought I should see what Candy knows about them. I assume it was part of the plan to get a guardianship over Carl and exclude Drina as a guardian. I don't think these do that. They don't show anything but the frustration of a caregiver trying to get here very sick husband to fight for his recovery, but I don't know how they are going to deal with the lack of consent for the recordings, so if Candy knows anything about them, it would be helpful to know it.

And never mind that I asked for recordings back when I did the presuit discovery long ago and didn't get anything.

From "Bobbie Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Service addresses for Carole?**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Sat, 6 Apr 2013 12:02:33 -0500

I am assuming I may have to try to serve Carole at her work since she tends to ignore these things and will presumably just not come to the door at home. I know she works at Cameron, but they have more than one location. Do you have any idea where she actually is during her work day?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **This is rich!!**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Mon, 20 Jul 2015 17:59:15 -0500

Well—it looks like I have hit a nerve.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Tino**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Wed, 22 Jul 2015 12:49:35 -0500

I have found some contact info for Tino that includes a home address. I am thinking of taking his deposition. The recordings are one reason, but there are plenty of other things I suspect he knows, and I expect him to be more truthful about things than Carole would be. It would probably be a challenge to get him served, especially since I would need to get a date coordinated with everyone before I go to the trouble to serve him with a subpoena, and I expect Carole would tell him to hide from us. I thought I would get your input before I sent an email around about potential dates.

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Tino contact info**
To "Rik Munson" <blowintough@att.net>
Date Tue, 14 Jul 2015 16:08:04 -0500

Rik—I have spoken with Brad so as to satisfy my conferencing requirements before filing my discovery motion and supplemental pleadings about this wiretap stuff. He seemed pretty surprised by my attitude about this, and didn't seem to be aware of the penal code provisions or the Texas Civil Wiretap Act. He claims the recordings were just found on an answering machine at Nelva's house. Of course, there are so many holes with that story that I don't know where to begin.

I have tried to call Tino to discuss this with him before calling the Special Crimes Bureau at the DA's office, but I got a recording that said the person I called wasn't taking messages right now. The number I called was 713-503-4795. Do you have any other contact info for Tino?

From "Bobbie G Bayless" <bayless@baylessstokes.com>
Subject **Trial Date was removed from the docket**
To "Candace Curtis" <occurtis@sbcglobal.net>
Date Mon, 3 Aug 2015 18:01:38 -0500

Also, the judge has just taken the trial date off the docket. No real point in keeping it there when nothing can proceed until the temporary administrator does his report. I called him today and he hasn't done anything. He talked about how he is just being buried in paper on this case. I don't think he is going to be any faster than the Judge about grasping this, much less evaluating it.