United States District Court

for the

Southern District of Texas

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS, Plaintiff,	§	
VS.	§	Civil Action No._____
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, and AMY RUTH BRUNSTING And Does 1-100 Defendants	§ § § §	Jury Trial Demanded

PLAINTIFF'S ORIGINAL PETITION, COMPLAINT AND APPLICATION FOR EX PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER, ASSET FREEZE, TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT INJUNCTION.

I.
Parties

1. Plaintiff, Candace Louise Curtis, is a citizen of the State of California. Defendant Anita Kay Brunsting, is a citizen of the State of Texas and Defendant Amy Ruth Brunsting a citizen of the State of Texas.

II.
Jurisdiction and Venue

2. This Court has federal subject matter and diversity jurisdiction of the state law claims alleged herein pursuant to 28 USC §1332 (a) (1) - 28 USC §1332 (b) and 28 USC §1332 (C) (2) in that this action is between parties who

are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds the sum or value of $75,000, exclusive of interests and costs.

3. The Res in this matter is the Brunsting Family Living Trust (the Trust). Known real property of the Trust is located in Texas and Iowa. No known actions have been previously filed with any court involving the Trust or the trust Res and neither the Will nor the Pour Over Will of either Settlor has been filed with any court for probate.

4. Defendant Anita Brunsting resides in the county of Victoria and Defendant Amy Brunsting resides in the county of Comal. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas is the proper venue under 28 USC §1391(a)(1).

III.

Nature of Action

5. This is a diversity action alleging breach of fiduciary duty, extrinsic and constructive fraud and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The nature of action in breach is focused upon failures to disclose and failures to give notice. Plaintiff reserves the right to amend this complaint to add additional causes at any time prior to judgment.

IV.

CAUSES OF ACTION COUNT ONE

Breach of Fiduciary Obligation

Breach of Trust

It is settled law that no more than affidavits are necessary to make a prima facie case, U.S. V. Kis, 658 F. 2d 536 (CA7, 1981 Cert den, 50 U.S.L.W. 2169 (1982)

6. Attached Declaration of Candace Louise Curtis is incorporated herein by reference as if fully restated.

7. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting have accepted the appointment and are acting jointly as co-trustees for the Brunsting Family Living Trust (the Trust) of which I am a beneficiary and named successor beneficiary.

8. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting acting as co-trustees for the Trust owe a fiduciary duty to plaintiff, under the common law and under the property statutes of Texas, to provide all beneficiaries and successor beneficiaries of the Trust with information concerning trust administration, copies of trust documents, and semi-annual accounting. As co-trustees for the Trust both defendants owe a fiduciary duty to provide notice to all beneficiaries prior to any changes to the trust that would affect their beneficial interest.

9. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting acting individually and severally as co-trustees for the Trust have exercised all of the powers of trustees while refusing or otherwise failing to meet their first obligation under that power, to provide full, accurate, complete and timely accounting to the beneficiaries, to provide copies of material documents or other information relating to administration of the Trust, and to provide notice to all beneficiaries and successor beneficiaries of proposed changes to the trust that may tend to affect their beneficial interests.

10. Defendant(s) individually and severally damaged Plaintiff through their breach of fiduciary obligations. Upon information and belief, Defendant(s)

individually and severally benefited through their breach of fiduciary obligations to Plaintiff.

11. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for all of the damages, both general and special, caused by the breach of fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff by Defendants.

12. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for punitive damages arising from wrongful acts constituting breach of fiduciary duties insofar as conduct in furtherance of wrongful acts as set forth above amounted to egregious and intentional and/or reckless conduct carried out by Defendant(s) as fiduciaries against Plaintiff, whom they intentionally kept in an inferior position of knowledge.

COUNT TWO
Extrinsic Fraud

13. Attached Declaration of Candace Louise Curtis and all previous allegations are incorporated herein by reference as if fully re-alleged and restated.

14. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting acting individually and severally as co-trustees for the Trust have refused or otherwise failed to meet their obligations to provide full, accurate, complete and timely accounting or to provide copies of material documents or notification of material facts relating to trust administration, the concealing of which constitutes extrinsic fraud.

15. Defendant(s) individually and severally damaged Plaintiff through their breach of fiduciary obligations. Upon information and belief, Defendant(s) individually and severally benefited through their breach of fiduciary obligations.

16. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for all of the damages caused by the breach of fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiffs through their fraudulent concealment.

17. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for punitive damages arising from wrongful acts constituting breach of fiduciary duties insofar as conduct in furtherance of wrongful acts as set forth above amounted to egregious and intentional and/or reckless conduct carried out by Defendant(s) as fiduciaries against Plaintiff, whom they intentionally kept in an inferior position of knowledge.

COUNT THREE

Constructive Fraud

18. Attached Declaration of Candace Louise Curtis and all previous allegations are incorporated herein by reference as if fully re-alleged and restated.

19. Plaintiff alleges the existence of conflicts of interest in that both Defendant(s), acting individually and severally as co-trustees for the Trust, were at all times complained of herein, beneficiaries or successor beneficiaries of the Trust.

20. Plaintiff further alleges the existence of conflicts of interest in that Anita Brunsting, while being a successor beneficiary to the Trust, held a general Power of Attorney for Settlor Nelva Brunsting, an original trustee who at some point resigned making Defendant Anita Brunsting her successor trustee.

21. Defendant Anita Brunsting acting as a successor trustee for the Trust has transgressed the limitation placed upon her authority by the Trust and by the rule of law and has refused or otherwise failed to meet her obligations to provide full, accurate, complete and timely accounting or to provide copies of material documents and facts relating to trust administration, the concealing of which, coupled with multiple conflicts of interest constitute manifest acts of constructive fraud.

22. Defendant(s) individually and severally damaged Plaintiff through their breach of fiduciary obligations. Upon information and belief, Defendant(s) individually and severally benefited through their breach of fiduciary obligations.

23. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for all of the damages caused by the breach of fiduciary duties owed to Plaintiff through their fraudulent concealment.

24. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable for punitive damages arising from wrongful acts constituting breach of fiduciary duties insofar as conduct in furtherance of wrongful acts as set forth above amounted to egregious and intentional and/or reckless conduct carried out by Defendant(s) as fiduciaries against Plaintiff, whom they intentionally kept in an inferior position of knowledge.

COUNT FOUR

Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

25. Attached Declaration of Candace Louise Curtis and all previous allegations are incorporated herein by reference as if fully re-alleged and restated.

26. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting acting individually and severally as co-trustees for the Trust have refused or otherwise failed to meet their obligations to provide full, accurate, complete and timely accounting or to provide copies of material documents and facts relating to trust administration.

27. Since the death of Nelva Brunsting, plaintiff has attempted verbally, via email, and by certified mail to obtain information from Defendant(s) regarding the Trust and the Trust's administration. Defendant co-trustee Amy Brunsting has remained totally silent and her part in the perceived fraud may be limited. Defendant co-trustee Anita Brunsting has been disingenuous and manipulative while avoiding answer and disseminating limited numbers of documents in piecemeal fashion. Defendant co-trustee Anita Brunsting is the principal defendant in this action.

28. As detailed in the attached Declaration of Candace Louise Curtis, Defendant(s) acted intentionally or recklessly and the conduct was both extreme and outrageous. The acts of Defendant(s) caused and continue to cause Plaintiff to suffer severe emotional distress.

29. Defendant(s) Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are liable to plaintiff for damages caused by their reprehensible and egregious acts of intentionally inflicting emotional distress and suffering upon Plaintiff.

V.
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

For present purposes little more is needed than Restatement of the Law of Trusts 2nd

DISCLOSURE BY A FIDUCIARY/TRUSTEE OUTSIDE FORMAL DISCOVERY: NON-TRADITIONAL RULES AND ALTERNATIVE METHODS

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper contains an analysis of a trustee's duty to disclose information to trust beneficiaries. While it is outside the scope of this paper, many of these duties apply to other fiduciaries such as executors and administrators. The duty of a trustee to disclose information is an **equitable duty**. Enforcement of this duty should therefore be through an **equitable remedy** rather than by the formal legal remedies that are set forth in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and apply to legal causes of action. Many Texas courts, however, have trouble recognizing this distinction.

2. AN OVERVIEW OF THE TRUSTEE'S DUTY TO DISCLOSE

The Commentators

American Law Institute, *Restatement Of The Law, Trusts 2d,* §173 states that:

"The trustee is under a duty to the beneficiary to give him upon his request at reasonable times complete and accurate information as to the nature and amount of the trust property, and to permit him, or a person duly authorized by him, to inspect the subject matter of the trust and the accounts and vouchers and other documents relating to the trust."

William E. Fratcher, *Scott On Trusts,* §173 (Fourth Edition) states that:

"The trustee is under a duty to the beneficiaries to give them on their request at reasonable times complete and accurate information as to the administration of the trust. The beneficiaries are entitled to know what the trust property is and how the trustee has dealt with it. They are entitled to examine the trust property and the accounts and vouchers and other documents relating to the trust and its administration. Where a trust is created for several beneficiaries, each of them is entitled to information as to the trust. Where the trust is created in favor of successive beneficiaries, a beneficiary who has a future interest under the trust, as well as a beneficiary who is presently entitled to receive income, is entitled to such information, whether his interest is vested or contingent."

George Gleason Bogert and George Taylor Bogert,

The Law of Trusts and Trustees, § 961(Revised Second Edition) explain this duty in the following manner:
"The beneficiary is the equitable owner of the trust property, in whole or in part. The trustee is the mere representative whose function is to attend to the safety of the trust property and to obtain its avails for the beneficiary in the manner provided by the trust instrument. That the settlor has created a trust and thus required that the beneficiary enjoy his property interest indirectly does not imply that the beneficiary is to be kept in ignorance of the trust, the nature of the trust property and the details of its administration. **If the beneficiary is to be able to hold the trustee to proper standards of care and honesty and to obtain the benefits to which the trust instrument and doctrines or equity entitle him, he must know what the trust property consists and how it is being managed.** (emphasis supplied)

From these considerations it follows that the trustee has the duty to inform the beneficiary of important matters concerning the trust and that the beneficiary is entitled to demand of the trustee all information about the trust and its execution for which he has any reasonable use. It further follows that the trustee is under a duty to notify the beneficiary of the existence of the trust so that he may exercise his rights to secure information about trust matters and to compel an accounting from the trustee. **For the reason that only the beneficiary has the right and power to enforce the trust and to require the trustee to carry out the trust for the sole benefit of the beneficiary, the trustee's denial of the beneficiary's right to information consists of a breach of trust.** (emphasis supplied)

If the beneficiary asks for relevant information about the terms of the trust, its present status, past acts of management, the intent of the trustee as to future administration, or other incidents of the administration of the trust, and these requests are made at a reasonable time and place and not merely vexatiously, it is the duty of the trustee to give the beneficiary the information which he is asked. Furthermore, the trustee must permit the beneficiary to examine the account books of the trust, trust documents and papers, and trust property, when a demand is made at a reasonable time and place and such inspection would be of benefit to the beneficiary."

2. The Cases
In examining Texas cases involving this duty it is important to distinguish between cases that relate to transactions where a trustee has some personal dealing with a beneficiary (which impose very harsh disclosure requirements) from those cases that relate to disclosure in general. The following cases relate to the general disclosure rules.

In *Shannon v. Frost National Bank,* 533 S.W.2d 389 (Tex. App. - San Antonio, 1975, writ ref'd n.r.e), the court stated that: "However, it is well settled that a trustee owes a duty to give to the beneficiary upon request complete and accurate information as to the administration of the trust. 2 Scott, Trusts §173 (3rd. ed. 1967)."

In *Montgomery v. Kennedy,* 669 S.W.2d 309 (Tex. 1984) the Texas Supreme Court held that: "As trustees of a trust and executors of an estate with Virginia Lou as a beneficiary, Jack Jr. and his mother owed Virginia Lou a fiduciary duty of full disclosure of all material facts known to them that might affect Virginia Lou's rights....The existence of strained relations between the parties did not lessen the fiduciary's duty of full and complete disclosure..... The concealment of a material fact by a fiduciary charged with the duty of full disclosure is extrinsic fraud."

30. FURTHER, the Texas legislature has codified the common law duty a trustee owes to a beneficiary in the Texas Property Code.

§ 113.060. INFORMING BENEFICIARIES. The trustee shall keep the beneficiaries of the trust reasonably informed concerning:

(1) the administration of the trust; and

(2) the material facts necessary for the beneficiaries

to protect the beneficiaries' interests.

Added by Acts 2005, 79th Leg., ch. 148, § 15, eff. Jan. 1, 2006.

§ 113.151. DEMAND FOR ACCOUNTING. (a) A beneficiary by written demand may request the trustee to deliver to each beneficiary of the trust a written statement of accounts covering all transactions since the last accounting or since the creation of the trust, whichever is later. If the trustee fails or refuses to deliver the statement on or before the 90th day after the date the trustee receives the demand or after a longer period ordered by a court, any beneficiary of the trust may file suit to compel the trustee to deliver the statement to all beneficiaries of the trust.

The court may require the trustee to deliver a written statement of account to all beneficiaries on finding that the nature of the beneficiary's interest in the trust or the effect of the administration of the trust on the beneficiary's interest is sufficient to require an accounting by the trustee. However, the trustee is not obligated or required to account to the beneficiaries of a trust more frequently than once every 12 months unless a more frequent accounting is required by the court. If a beneficiary is successful in the suit to compel a statement under this section, the court may, in its discretion, award all or part of the costs of court and all of the suing beneficiary's reasonable and necessary attorney's fees and costs against the trustee in the trustee's individual capacity or in the trustee's capacity as trustee.

(b) An interested person may file suit to compel the trustee to account to the interested person. The court may require the trustee to deliver a written statement of account to the interested person on finding that the nature of the interest in the trust of, the claim against the trust by, or the effect of the administration of the trust on the interested person is sufficient to require an accounting by the trustee.

Added by Acts 1983, 68th Leg., p. 3332, ch. 567, art. 2, § 2, eff. Jan. 1, 1984. Amended by Acts 2003, 78th Leg., ch. 550, § 3, eff. Sept. 1, 2003.

(b) Notwithstanding Subsection (a)(9), a person other than a beneficiary who, without knowledge that a trustee is exceeding or improperly exercising the trustee's powers, in good faith assists a trustee or in good faith and for value deals with a trustee is protected from liability as if the trustee had or properly exercised the power exercised by the trustee.

Added by Acts 2005, 79th Leg., ch. 148, § 21, eff. Jan. 1, 2006.

VI
PRAYERS FOR RELIEF

32. **WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff prays for judgment and relief as follows, where applicable, including but not limited to the following:

33. Awarding compensatory damages in favor of Plaintiff against Defendant(s) for the damages sustained as a result of the wrongful conduct alleged as will be established through discovery or at trial, together with interest thereon, in an amount in excess of $75,000 from each Defendant for each offense found,

34. Awarding punitive damages to Plaintiff against the Defendant(s) for the egregiously wrongful conduct alleged herein,

35. Granting declaratory and/or injunctive relief as appropriate,

36. Awarding legal fees and costs to plaintiff and,

37 Such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and proper.

REQUEST FOR EX-PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

38. Further, Plaintiff seeks an emergency order for injunctive relief and herein alleges irreparable harm will occur unless the court prevents the trustees from wasting the estate, and compels the trustees to produce a full, true and complete accounting of all assets.

Financial Misconduct and Need for Accounting

39. A cursory review of the preliminary accounting spreadsheet of the Trust assets provided the Plaintiff reveals possibly significant discrepancies in the value of some trust assets, while other previously known trust assets are unaccounted for.

As trustees for the survivor's trust, created under the Brunsting Family Living Trust after the death of the first Settlor, Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting are responsible for maintaining accurate books and records for the survivor's trust created under the Brunsting Family Living Trust. Under the terms of the Trust trustees are to provide an accounting to the beneficiaries every 6 months. Even under Texas law an accounting to the beneficiaries is required annually. No proper accounting has ever been received.

40. Further, Anita Brunsting, holding Power of Attorney for Nelva Brunsting, and serving as successor trustee for the Nelva E. Brunsting Survivor's Trust, had an ongoing duty to account and, as a successor beneficiary of the Trust and its sub trusts, had an even greater level of loyalty and fidelity owed to the other four successor beneficiaries. Anita Brunsting had an ongoing obligation to report and account to the other successor beneficiaries, and to seek their approval before accepting gifts from Nelva Brunsting or the Trust.

41. By the acts alleged herein, Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting have breached fiduciary duties of loyalty, care and good faith owed directly to Plaintiff as co-trustees for the BFLT by acting in bad faith and for the purpose of benefiting themselves and harming Plaintiff; by misappropriating trust

property; and by failing to keep and maintain accurate and reliable books and accounting records; and by failing to report on the administration of the Trust; and by failing to notice Plaintiff of actions adversely affecting Plaintiff's rights and beneficial interest in the Trust Res.

42. Due to the lack of proper inventory, accounting and disclosure it is imperative that this court act quickly to protect the Trust property and assets, and to ascertain the reasons for the trustees' refusal to answer and to account.

Tuesday, February 21, 2012

Candace Louise Curtis
1215 Ulfinian Way
Martinez, CA 94553
925-759-9020
occurtis@sbcglobal.net

AFFIDAVIT OF CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS

I, Candace Louise Curtis (Affiant), am a competent witness over the age of 18 years of age, have personal knowledge of the information stated herein, and do solemnly declare and state to be true as follows:

I am an heir to the estate of the late Elmer H. Brunsting and Nelva E. Brunsting of Houston, Texas, and I am a beneficiary of the BRUNSTING FAMILY LIVING TRUST initially dated October 10, 1996 and amended January 12, 2005 ("BFLT").

My Father, Elmer Brunsting, died on April 1, 2009 and my Mother, Nelva Brunsting died on November 11, 2011. Both of them ultimately required round-the-clock, in home, care. When Dad could no longer manage the affairs of their finances and estate, Mother took over and carried on, until it became too much for her in late 2010. At that point she turned some of these duties over to my sister Anita. Exactly what occurred before or after that is unclear, as my efforts to obtain even the most basic information about the trust, or the trust assets, have been frustrated. The documents I have received over the years are inadequate, incomplete, and contain redactions and strikeouts, but would indicate that changes have been made to the BFLT that affect my beneficial interest. These changes were made without any notice to me. Additionally, there appear to be some discrepancies in a recent preliminary asset list, and some of the previously known assets are unaccounted for. This list is the only accounting I have ever received.

My husband, our two sons and I, moved to California in September of 1995, after having lived in Houston for 30 years. In Houston we lived only a couple of miles from my parents and the boys had a very close relationship with their grandparents while they were growing up. After we moved to California my parents came to visit us several times and we enjoyed the occasions immensely.

Although I lived 1,700 miles away, as his eldest daughter Dad talked to me throughout the process, about his intentions and goals in forming the Brunsting Family Living Trust. He told me the primary reason was to make sure they could die at home, if they so chose, and have the financial means to do so. Secondly, anything left over would be divided 5 ways among us (Carole, Carl, Amy, Anita and myself) and he wanted no misunderstandings when it came time to divvy up the assets or family heirlooms. He explained how the trust was set up, and that my brother Carl was executor of the estate. Dad handed me the first trust documents personally at a family gathering. I knew what the documents said, so I stuck them in my suitcase. They ended up in a drawer after I got home.

At approximately the same time that the BFLT was formed, a separate trust, The Brunsting Family Irrevocable Trust, was created for a last-to-die life insurance policy, of which the five of us were beneficiaries, naming Anita as original and sole trustee. My Father said that this was done so that if their estate was exhausted during their lifetimes, we would at least have something after they both passed away. He said that the trustee job would be easy, because all one had to do was send out a notice to the beneficiaries

each year and keep the signed copies in the trust file. He asked me if I would serve as trustee, and I agreed to, but ultimately he chose Anita, because she was the youngest.

I do not recall exactly when, but I think I first became aware that our Father was exhibiting signs of dementia sometime in 2006. I was visiting my parents at the time and some of my sisters were there. To see my Father's behavior and subsequent treatment by his own daughters was heartbreaking. I was dumbfounded to witness this ignorant cruelty and impatience in my sisters. One afternoon it was just he and I. In a fleeting moment of lucidity my Father asked me if his net worth was still such and such. Since he had kept me well informed over the years, I knew that it was and confirmed it. He smiled. He was always so proud of what he had created for his family. I gave him a hug and a kiss. He nodded off. That was the last time I saw him. He died in his OWN HOME, because Mother honored his wishes. Years later, when I started to realize something was "**going on**" with the trust, and began to question things, my sister Carole told me something like – Candy, if it makes you feel any better, Daddy asked for you by name the Sunday before he died.

In July of 2007, Mother asked me if I would be willing to replace Amy as successor co-trustee of the BFLT with Carl (attached as Plaintiff Exhibit P-1). She wrote that she did not think Amy was stable enough and that she thought I had a better relationship with my siblings than she. I said sure, and that is the last I heard of it until March of 2008, when I received an email from Mother asking if I minded if she made Anita successor co-trustee with Carl (P-2). She said she realized now that

> "Anita has a handle on everything from the insurance policy and the trust better than anybody."

At the time I had no reason to care one way or the other and I never gave it another thought.

Our Father passed away April 1, 2009. The cause of death was "dementia, likely vascular type". My sons were pallbearers for their grandpa. They loved their grandpa very much and were heartbroken and distraught when he passed away. They were very worried about their grandma being alone and volunteered to stay with her and take care of her if she wanted them to. After the funeral we returned home and it never crossed my mind that I might expect paperwork in connection with the settlement of the estate. I had no idea what, if anything, should happen. I knew that when Dad died, the terms of the trust became irrevocable. I also knew that I would not receive any inheritance until Mother was gone.

It began to occur to me in March of 2010 that something was amiss, but I could not quite put my finger on it. Anita emailed Amy and I (P-3) requesting that we print out and sign five undated "Notification of Demand Right" letters (P-4) (for the life insurance trust) and get them to her in the next couple of weeks. I asked her to send me a copy of the trust document and a current statement of account, because I do not like signing these

undated forms. I also thought that, as a beneficiary, I might actually be entitled to a copy of the trust. Her reply,

> "For now could you please send me a signed waiver dated 3/19/09, for last year's files?" (P-3)

It appeared that Anita was falling down on the easy trustee job.

On about July 2, 2010 Carl, our only brother, was stricken with encephalitis. When Carole called to tell me, she was crying and said that our brother might die. I could barely understand her she was sobbing so hard. They did not have a diagnosis at the time. I was so scared for him and his family. The next day I wanted to find out how he was doing, but could not reach Carole, so I called Anita. I started to ask about Carl, but before I could say anything she began to criticize Drina, Carl's wife of 36 years. I was somewhat dismayed at what I was being told, but Drina and I are the same age, have many of the same interests, and have always gotten along very well, so I figured I would react the same way in her situation. My main concern at the time was Carl, as was Drina's. I was unaware until just recently, that a few days later Amy drove in from New Braunfels and found it necessary to harangue Drina about their finances, at Carl's bedside. Carl is a self-employed architect. I was sure Drina was very worried about how she would be able to care for him financially with no income, but I doubt that was the most important thing on her mind at the time. Within days Amy and Anita started conjuring up totally unfounded scenarios of such things as Drina running off with Carl's money, divorcing him, killing him, and all kinds of other machinations having to do with Carl's future inheritance.

Mother was at the hospital visiting one day and offered to help Carl and Drina financially if they needed it. When they subsequently took her up on the offer, all of a sudden the entire situation blew up into a massive, unfounded character assassination of Drina, which I now know Anita started several years prior. Anita began to badger Mother and kept stopping her from acting on her promise to help. According to Carole, Anita was bullying and badgering Mother to the point that she was afraid to spend her own money to help her own son. In reviewing email communications, it was discovered that Anita had criticized our Father for his investments, expressed how Mother is finally "listening to reason", and regularly degraded one thing or another about each of us. Apparently Anita has sat in judgment of everyone except herself.

I continued to argue for help for Carl and Drina, even going so far as offering up any of my inheritance if they needed it to survive this and become whole again. Money means little to me in the face of family crisis and Carl is my only brother. I almost lost him once. I was not going to lose him for lack of money and care.

The character assassination continued in earnest. Amy and Anita were very aggressive in their attempts to prevent what they were convinced was happening. They kept coming up with ideas to keep Drina from touching Carl's money, even if it went directly for his care and well being. They were all consumed with this and never spoke about how his

recovery was progressing. I did not know that he almost died again, or that he lapsed into a coma and had to be put on a ventilator in ICU, before he started to mend ever so slowly.

Carl had a setback and Mother got pneumonia and was hospitalized. I attribute this to the stress my sisters were causing in both of them. At the same time I became concerned as to what this was doing to Drina's health and state of mind.

In October 2010 there was a flurry of activity regarding changes to the trust and Mother's competency, starting with an email (P-5) from Carole asking if I was okay with Anita taking over as Power of Attorney for Mother? She wrote "The paperwork is being drawn up today." She later said she was concerned that the trustee had more authority than we realize. I told her I needed a copy of the trust documents to figure out just what can and cannot be done.

On October 13, 2010 Anita, Carole, Amy, and I received an email (P-6, 4 pgs.) from Summer Peoples on behalf of attorney Candace Freed saying that Candace would like to have a conference call with "you and your Mother", reserving some times for "next week". Carl did not receive this email. Carole wrote back and asked Summer what the meeting was in reference to. Carole did not know if she could make the meeting and wanted to know if that would be a problem. Summer replied:

> "Ms. Brunsting: To answer your questions – This teleconference meeting is to discuss changes to your Mother's trust. If you are unable to attend, it simply means that you will have no say in what changes will be made. It will not be a problem if you cannot attend. However, Ms. Freed wants to extend the invitation to all Mrs. Brunsting's children."

I did not understand why Carl was not included, since he was executor of our parents' wills and a successor co-trustee of the Brunsting Family Living Trust, as well as one of "Mrs. Brunsting's children".

I wrote Anita that same day and reminded her that she had mentioned that she had a copy of the trust document. I asked if she would scan it and send it to me in the next day or two. I wanted to read it before the conference call. I still had not received anything by October 20, 2010 and was not planning on participating in the conference call without seeing the trust we would be discussing changes to. On October 23, 2010 Anita sent twelve documents in four separate emails (P-7, 5 pgs.). I could not believe my eyes when I started to read what she sent. Apparently the changes to which this conference call was in reference to, which by the way no one would clarify, had to do with changes THAT HAD ALREADY BEEN MADE - WITHOUT NOTICE.

The conference call was held on or about October 25, 2010. Neither Mother nor Carl participated. Anita began by asking how much power she had by virtue of the power of attorney. I wanted to know why someone thought it necessary to convert Carl's and my personal asset trusts, giving Anita and Amy control. Attorney Candace jumped in and said I was not entitled to those document copies, as Mother was the only beneficiary, and

that Anita should not have sent them in the first place. Amy jumped in and kept screeching that Drina needed to get a job, Carole kept asking her who is going to take care of Carl with Drina working. Finally Amy said I don't care and Carole hung up. The discussion then segued into having Mother declared incompetent. I wanted to know why, and no one would answer. At that point I hung up because the changes had already been made and it appeared there was nothing I could do about it. I am still not sure what the purpose of the call was, other than an attempt to lend some form of legitimacy to the changes that had apparently already occurred.

As I look at the email (P-7, supra) I received regarding this call, neither Carl nor Mother was copied on that communication.

The day after the call I spoke with Mother. She affirmed that she DID NOT know the full implications of what she signed. She said she should have been included on the call. She said that she would not have given Anita the authority to manage Carl's and my money. I told her it seems as though Amy and Anita were conspiring with Attorney Candace to have her declared incompetent so they can take control. She said Anita was driving her crazy. After talking to her for over 30 minutes I realized that she was NOT incompetent, simply left in the dark. I passed this information on to Carole in an email, (P-8, 4 pgs.) to which she replied,

> "Anita is going to be the one responsible for keeping Mother sick because she is such a control freak and will not LET IT GO!! Let Mother decide what she wants to do. It is Mother's money, not ANITA'S and not AMY's."

On or about 11/21/2010, after Anita had taken control of Mother's finances under the power of attorney, Amy apparently received a "gift", allegedly from Mother, of $13,000, and Anita's son Luke apparently received an unknown sum of money for a truck, also allegedly from Mother.

Much later, in March of 2011, I received a phone call from Carole regarding a meeting with Candace at Vacek and Freed. Carole had been asked by Anita to take Mother to sign some papers. During the meeting apparently Candace asked Mother if she REALLY understood what she was being asked to sign. She asked her if she REALLY wanted to disinherit her granddaughter Marta (Carl's daughter) and Mother said emphatically – NO.

On March 8, 2011, Anita emailed (P-9) Amy, Carol and I and wrote

> "I spoke w/mom about the whole situation; she listens to reason and can understand our concerns for Carl, and will sign the changes to the trust next week. I have been very forthright in explaining the changes in the trust to her, and that they would be done in order to minimize any pathway that Drina might have to Carl's money. The changes are not to penalize Carl, but to ensure the money goes for his care. I told her to 'just say No' to Carl or Drina if they brought up the trust or money and to refer them to me. I reminded her that she isn't trustee anymore and doesn't have access to the trust accounts – she seems fine w/everything, and expressed no desire to put Carl

back on as a trustee. I told her that in the event she did that, that it would not be fair to the rest of us, as we would end up having to deal w/Drina, not Carl. Mom begrudgingly admits to knowledge of the unpleasantness of this whole situation and Drina's past behavior since Carl has been ill, but I think she is really naïve regarding the lengths to which Drina may go through to get Carl's inheritance."

It is difficult from this remote location and from listening to all of the "rumors" to really place validity on any particular claim. But this communication is **very** telling and gives great weight to Carole's concerns about Anita bullying Mother.

On January 8, 2011 I received an email (P-10) from Amy asking for my husband's phone number. She wanted to ask him a question about private investigators. I supplied the number.

In March of 2011 the character assassination of Drina and the rest of us resumed with a vengeance. I am so ashamed that I was a party to any of it, if only to listen to their lies and misplaced judgment. They were so aggressive with their assertions that at times I was convinced that what they were saying was true. They alleged having taped, in-person, conversations between Mother and others, taped telephone conversations between Mother and others, and video of the behavior and actions of others in Mother's house. I was told a private investigator had been hired to follow Drina around. Apparently, a GPS unit was affixed to her vehicle. They would not share this alleged "evidence" in its physical form, they only told me what was said and done. After telling me that my own character was assassinated by Carl in one of the videos, I almost lost my faith and hope that Carl would get his life back and that our brother/sister relationship could someday be renewed. What they were telling me was totally unbelievable and left me feeling devastated and in shock.

At this point Mother's health began to decline rather rapidly. I spoke to her at least once a week on the telephone. Several times neither she nor her caregiver answered the phone when I called. I would then call Carole, Amy, Anita, and the caregivers until I reached someone, only to find out that Mother was in the hospital, AGAIN. I had to drag the phone number to Mother's room out of someone each time, usually getting it from Tino or Robert (my Mother's caregivers), rather than one of my sisters. This happened for the last time on November 8, 2011,(P-11) just three days before Mother passed away. I had been urging them to get her home before it was too late. It now appears that both Carl and I were being purposely prevented from seeing or talking to our Mother in the last days of her life. WHY? On November 11, 2011 Carole called Carl, apparently much to the dismay of Anita, and told him to get to the hospital right away. He arrived just in time to say goodbye to Mother, who he loved very much. I was on my way to Houston, having not been told of the seriousness of her condition until that day, and not having had any opportunity to know where she was or to even have contact with her until it was too late. She died when I was on my way to the airport. Had they been forthcoming and honest with me I would have been there.

Also around March of 2011, Anita called and said she had "found" some Exxon Mobil stock that was not in the trust. She said Attorney Candace was going to figure out what had to be done to get one half in Dad's side and the other half in Mother's side. Anita said she planned to give us each "gifts" from Mother's share. I did not know the total value of the stock, but I did receive 160 shares on June 15, 2011 (p-12). Apparently Carole also received a "gift", but I do not know how much it was, or what happened to the remainder of the stock. I do know that Carl did not receive any stock, and knew nothing about the "finding" of it until I told him last month.

I recently received copies of two asset schedules from Carl, one dated 2005 (P-13) and one dated 1/27/10. (P-14, 7 pgs.) In 2005 there were 3,522.42 shares of Exxon-Mobil listed. In 2010 there was no Exxon-Mobil listed.

Later, Anita supplied us all, via email, (P-15, 2 pgs.) with a "preliminary tally" of assets as of 1/20/12, with 1,259 shares of Exxon-Mobil listed. I wonder what happened to 2,264 shares between then and now?

I saw Carl and Drina for the first time since our Father's death, at our Mother's funeral. I did not know what to expect. Carl was talking to someone when Drina and I saw each other. In the blink of an eye we were hugging each other and crying. The deep wounds created by what had transpired over the last 16 months immediately began to heal. The bond between Carl, Drina and I was rekindled over the next few days. The difficulty for all of us was coming to grips with the notion that, apparently, behind our backs, Anita had made a concentrated effort to take control of the entire trust, and our individual inheritances, in such a manner that if Carl and I complain about it, she gets to keep it, all the while asserting to others that our Mother made this decision ON HER OWN. I know she did not, because she said so to me on the phone. She took my concern to heart and subsequently sent me a handwritten note saying, again, that it was not true.(P-16, 2 pgs.)

I returned home to California a few days after the funeral. The unexpected time off had disrupted my workflow and I spent the following weeks catching up on things, putting my concerns about the trust and my inheritance aside. I was so happy that Carl was quickly returning to good health and that we were in touch again. All of a sudden the holidays were upon us. I started to miss Mother, a lot. I wondered what was happening with the trust, the house, the life insurance, the farm, the settlement process and so on. I had heard nothing whatsoever for over a month.

I could not sit by and wonder, so I wrote a "Formal Demand for Full and Complete Disclosure and Accounting" letter, dated December 19, 2011, (P-17, 2 pgs) and sent it certified mail to both Amy and Anita, with copies to Carole, Carl, and Candace Freed. Anita signed for hers on December 31, 2011, and Amy signed for hers on January 5, 2012.

The first "trust update" I received was an email from Anita (P-18) on December 20, 2011, prior to her receipt of my demand letter. She advised that the life insurance

paperwork was being processed. She also said the beneficiaries are entitled to a copy of the trust which we would receive shortly.

On or about December 21, 2011 I received an envelope from Anita containing a copy of the Restatement of The Brunsting Family Living Trust, dated January 12, 2005, and a copy of the Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Exercise of Testamentary Powers of Appointment Under Living Trust Agreement, dated August 25, 2010.
December 28, 2011, Anita emailed me, (P-19) with a cc to Amy, re mom's house, wherein she stated that a realtor had been contacted and they hoped to

> "…get it on the market next week"… "After we get the house sold, we'll figure out the farm and the remaining liquid assets. Just double-checking, you still want to hold onto your portion of the farm right? If so, are you interested in "trading" some of the liquid assets (like your portion of the remaining stock/mutual funds or cash from the sale of the house) for more farmland? I'm just trying to get an idea of what everyone wants."… "We're still working w/ the lawyer to get a final tally of the worth of all the assets, when that's complete, you will get a spreadsheet that lists them."

I am not really sure how I was expected to make a major decision like this without knowing exactly what my assets are.

Being virtually in the dark about everything, I began to have a renewed sense of grave concern about the safety of the trust assets and was compelled to send a "Statutory Demand for Full and Complete Disclosure and Accounting" letter, dated January 3, 2012, (P-20, 4 pgs.) sent certified mail to Anita, with copies going to Amy, Carole, Carl and Mom's trust attorney Candace Freed. Anita's letter was signed for on January 9, 2012. Within that letter I asked her to

> "Please confirm to me in writing, within ten (10) days of your receipt of this demand, that you intend to furnish all of the information requested in this demand on or before the dates specified." "…inform me of the identities and contact information for the Trust Protector and the Special Co-Trustee, in writing, immediately, upon receipt of this demand."

The deadline for confirmation was January 19, 2012. To date I have not received a confirmation.

January 22, 2012, Anita emailed me, with cc's to Attorney Candace and Amy, writing "Attached please find the appointment of successor trustees dated 12/21/10 and Mother's will."

It seems to me I should have received some type of notice, as well as a copy of the appointment document more than a year previous. I was already angered by her blatant disregard of her legal obligations to the beneficiaries thus far and was compelled once

again to write and demand that she carry out the legal obligations of her position as trustee. On January 23, 2012, via email, (P-21, 2 pgs.) I explained that,

> "You received a written demand for disclosure of the identity of the trust protector or the special co-trustee(s) if any. Your lack of disclosure of this basic information, or any expression of good faith, leaves me with concerns that there is something you fear or want to conceal…"

On January 25, 2012 Anita replied, via email, (P-21, supra) with cc's to Attorney Candace and Amy, stating

> "Provisions for the Trust Protector and Special Co-Trustee can be found in the Qualified Beneficiary Designation on pages 15 and 28 respectively."

Directly following this email was a second email from Anita to Carl, Amy, Carole and myself, cc to Attorney Candace, regarding the life insurance money having been received on 1/17/12, eight days prior.

On or about January 23, 2012 I received a certified mail envelope with a cover letter that stated, "Per your request, enclosed please find the trust document regarding the life insurance policy mom and Dad had, as well as their death certificates."

It should be noted that I had requested a copy of this particular document back in March of 2010, almost two years earlier, when I was asked by Anita, the trustee, to sign blank, undated Notification of Demand Right forms.

On January 24, 2012 Anita sent an email (P-22) to Carl, Carol and myself, cc to Attorney Candace, writing

> "Attached please find a preliminary tally of trust assets and expenses (with a list of future liabilities). We are still working with Candace to complete the formal list."

As stated earlier in this affidavit, there appears to be a discrepancy in the amount of some ExxonMobil stock that was "found" not to be in the trust. It had been accounted for in 2005, was not included in an accounting from 2010, and was listed on the "tally" attached (P-15, supra). In 2005 there were 3,522.42 shares listed. The "tally" listed 1,258.91. It seems the beneficiaries have a right to know what happened to the difference. It will be difficult to determine without any accounting records.

I have received no other response to my recent demands for information, no notice, no other copies of trust documents and no expression of good faith.

The law is clear. Trustees have obligations and beneficiaries have rights. I can think of no legitimate purpose for the trustees' breach of their duty to disclose. To date I am in possession of the following documents, some of which were obtained from another

beneficiary and not from the trustees, who still refuse to fully answer, and the bulk of which were obtained from Anita in October 2010.

Ordered by Document Date

AKB denotes documents received via email from Anita on 10/23/10
CHB denotes documents received from Carl in January 2012
All other documents were received from Anita pursuant to my demand letters, and received on the date noted

AKB Quit Claim Deed, State of Iowa, signed by EHB and NEB 10/29/96 and recorded in Sioux County Iowa 11/18/96 (P-23, 7 pgs.), which contained 3 asset schedules, A, B, C, all blank

The Brunsting Family Irrevocable Trust dated February 12, 1997 (life insurance trust) received from Anita on or about 1/26/2011, Anita Kay Riley trustee. (P-24, 53 pgs.)

AKB Affidavit of Trust made 1/12/2005 (only first page) (P-25)

AKB Certificate of Trust dated 1/12/05, Carl Henry Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees. (P-26, 2 pgs.)

AKB Certificate of Trust dated 1/12/05, Carl Henry Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees UNSIGNED WITH AMY RUTH TSCHIRHART CROSSED OUT (P-27, 2 pgs.)

AKB Affidavit of Trust made 1/12/05, with selected provisions attached, Article IV Our Trustees, Carl Henry Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees with Amy Ruth Tschirhart crossed out. (I do not know when it was crossed out – before or after it was signed) (P-28, 32 pgs.)

AKB The Restatement of The Brunsting Family Living Trust, dated 1/12/05, Carl Henry Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees with Amy Ruth Tschirhart crossed out. (I do not know when it was crossed out – before or after it was signed) (P-29 102 pgs.)

The Restatement of The Brunsting Family Living Trust, dated 1/12/05, Carl Henry Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees with Amy Ruth Tschirhart crossed out. (I do not know when it was crossed out – before or after it was signed), received from Anita Kay Brunsting on or about 12/21/11 (duplication of P-29, printed front and back – copy omitted)

AKB Transfer To Grantor Trust Subject To Withdrawal Contribution Agreement, UNSIGNED, dated 01/12/05 (P-30, 2 pgs.)

AKB Last Will of Elmer H. Brunsting (Pour-Over Will), UNSIGNED, WITH ARTICLE III (Appointment of Personal Representative) redacted, dated 01/12/2005 (P-31, 14 pgs.)

AKB Last Will of Nelva E. Brunsting (Pour-Over Will), UNSIGNED, Elmer H. Brunsting personal representative, Carl Henry Brunsting first alternate, Amy Ruth Brunsting second alternate, Candace Louise Curtis third alternate, dated 01/12/05 (P-32, 11 pgs.)

AKB Living Will also known as the "Physician's Directive" signed by NEB, dated 01/12/05 (P-33, 5 pgs.)

Last Will of Nelva E. Brunsting, signed 01/12/05, EHB personal representative, Carl Henry Brunsting first successor, Amy Ruth Tschirhart second successor, Candace Louise Curtis third successor, received 1/22/12 via email from Anita (P-34, 11 pgs.)

CHB First Amendment to the Restatement to the Brunsting Family Living Trust dated October 10, 1996 as restated on January 12, 2005, Article IV, Section B amended and attached as Exhibit "A", dated 09/06/07, Carl Henry Brunsting and Candace Louise Curtis successor co-trustees. ***CHB and CLC "shall each have the authority to appoint his or her own successor Trustee by appointment in writing."***, THE FROST NATIONAL BANK alternate (P-35, 2 pgs.)

AKB General Durable Power of Attorney of Nelva E. Brunsting, marked copy, unsigned, and only dated 2010, Anita Kay Brunsting initial agent, Carol Ann Brunsting first successor, Amy Ruth Tschirhart second successor (P-36, 27 pgs.)

CHB Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Exercise of Testamentary Powers of Appointment Under Living Trust Agreement, executed 6/15/10, in connection with advances against our inheritances AFTER JUNE 1, 2010 (P-37, 3 pgs.)

AKB Information Concerning The Medical Power of Attorney signed by NEB, dated 08/25/10 (P-38, 5 pgs.)

AKB Medical Power of Attorney Designation of Health Care Agent signed by NEB, dated 08/25/10, Carol A. Brunsting appointed, Anita Kay Brunsting first alternate, Amy Ruth Tschirhart second alternate (P-39, 5 pgs.)

AKB Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Exercise of Testamentary Powers of Appointment Under Living Trust Agreement, signed by Nelva E. Brunsting as Trustee, and Founder and Beneficiary on August 25, 2010. (P-40, 37 pgs.)

Qualified Beneficiary Designation and Exercise of Testamentary Powers of Appointment Under Living Trust Agreement, signed by Nelva E. Brunsting as Trustee, and Founder and Beneficiary on August 25, 2010, received from Anita Kay Brunsting on or about 12/21/11 (duplication of P-40, printed front and back – copy omitted)

AKB Appointment of Successor Trustees, signed by Nelva E. Brunsting as Founder and Original Trustee, dated 08/25/10, Anita Kay Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees, FROST NATIONAL BANK alternate. (P-41, 5 pgs.)

Hand written note from Nelva Brunsting to Candy Brunsting, dated Sunday, referencing trick or treaters' that evening, postmark illegible except for 2010. (P-16, supra)

Appointment of Successor Trustees, marked law firm copy, signed 12/21/10, if NEB resigns as Trustee, Anita Kay Brunsting first successor, Amy Ruth Brunsting second successor, THE FROST NATIONAL BANK third successor; if NEB fails or ceases to serve, Anita Kay Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees, THE FROST NATIONAL BANK successor trustee, emailed to me by Anita on 01/22/12 (P-42, 6 pgs.)

CHB Appointment of Successor Trustees, marked law firm copy, signed 12/21/10, if NEB resigns as Trustee, Anita Kay Brunsting first successor, Amy Ruth Brunsting second successor, THE FROST NATIONAL BANK third successor; if NEB fails or ceases to serve, Anita Kay Brunsting and Amy Ruth Tschirhart successor co-trustees, THE FROST NATIONAL BANK successor trustee (duplicate of P-42, copy omitted)

CHB Resignation of Original Trustee, Nelva E. Brunsting, signed 12/21/10, appointing Anita Kay Brunsting as trustee of BFLT dated October 10, 1996, as amended, as well as the subtrusts known as the NEB Survivor's Trust and the EHB Decedent's Trust. (P-43)

CHB Acceptance by Successor Trustee, Anita Kay Brunsting, signed 12/21/10 (P-44)

Certified Death Certificate EHB issued 3/10/2011 received from Anita on or about 1/26/2011, State file number 142-09-043-770

Certified Death Certificate NEB issued 11/18/2011 received from Anita on or about 1/26/2011, State file number 142-11-142-463

I, Candace Louise Curtis, declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the United States, that the above declaration of facts is true and correct and based upon personal knowledge, except for those things averred upon information and belief, and as to those things, I believe them to be true as well.

2/20/2012

Candace Louise Curtis, Plaintiff

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA §
§
COUNTY OF §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this _____ day of February 2012, by Candace Louise Curtis.

Kenny C. Lim, Notary Public

_____
Notary Public – State of California

See Attached California Jurat

CALIFORNIA JURAT WITH AFFIANT STATEMENT

☒ See Attached Document (Notary to cross out lines 1–6 below)
☐ See Statement Below (Lines 1–5 to be completed only by document signer[s], *not* Notary)

Signature of Document Signer No. 1

Signature of Document Signer No. 2 (if any)

State of California

County of NAPA

Subscribed and sworn to (or affirmed) before me on this 20th day of FEB, 2012, by

(1) CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS,
Name of Signer

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me (.) (,)

(and

(2) _____,
Name of Signer

proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person who appeared before me.)

Signature _____
Signature of Notary Public

KENNY C. LIM
Commission # 1926091
Notary Public - California
Napa County
My Comm. Expires Feb 19, 2015

Place Notary Seal Above

OPTIONAL

Though the information below is not required by law, it may prove valuable to persons relying on the document and could prevent fraudulent removal and reattachment of this form to another document.

Further Description of Any Attached Document

Title or Type of Document: AFFIDAVIT OF CANDACE L. CURTIS

Document Date: 2/20/12 Number of Pages: (13)

Signer(s) Other Than Named Above: NONE

RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #1
Top of thumb here

RIGHT THUMBPRINT OF SIGNER #2
Top of thumb here

JS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Candace Louise Curtis

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Contra Costa
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Pro se

DEFENDANTS

Anita Brunsting & Amy Brunsting

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Victoria
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☒ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

(For Diversity Cases Only)

	PTF	DEF		PTF	DEF
Citizen of This State	☐ 1	☒ 1	Incorporated *or* Principal Place of Business In This State	☐ 4	☐ 4
Citizen of Another State	☒ 2	☐ 2	Incorporated *and* Principal Place of Business In Another State	☐ 5	☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3	☐ 3	Foreign Nation	☐ 6	☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT
- ☐ 110 Insurance
- ☐ 120 Marine
- ☐ 130 Miller Act
- ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument
- ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment
- ☐ 151 Medicare Act
- ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)
- ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits
- ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits
- ☐ 190 Other Contract
- ☐ 195 Contract Product Liability
- ☐ 196 Franchise

REAL PROPERTY
- ☐ 210 Land Condemnation
- ☐ 220 Foreclosure
- ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment
- ☐ 240 Torts to Land
- ☐ 245 Tort Product Liability
- ☐ 290 All Other Real Property

TORTS

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 310 Airplane
- ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability
- ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander
- ☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability
- ☐ 340 Marine
- ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability
- ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle
- ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability
- ☐ 360 Other Personal Injury

PERSONAL INJURY
- ☐ 362 Personal Injury - Med. Malpractice
- ☐ 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability
- ☐ 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability

PERSONAL PROPERTY
- ☒ 370 Other Fraud
- ☐ 371 Truth in Lending
- ☐ 380 Other Personal Property Damage
- ☐ 385 Property Damage Product Liability

CIVIL RIGHTS
- ☐ 441 Voting
- ☐ 442 Employment
- ☐ 443 Housing/ Accommodations
- ☐ 444 Welfare
- ☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment
- ☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other
- ☐ 440 Other Civil Rights

PRISONER PETITIONS
- ☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence

Habeas Corpus:
- ☐ 530 General
- ☐ 535 Death Penalty
- ☐ 540 Mandamus & Other
- ☐ 550 Civil Rights
- ☐ 555 Prison Condition

FORFEITURE/PENALTY
- ☐ 610 Agriculture
- ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug
- ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881
- ☐ 630 Liquor Laws
- ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck
- ☐ 650 Airline Regs.
- ☐ 660 Occupational Safety/Health
- ☐ 690 Other

LABOR
- ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act
- ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations
- ☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act
- ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act
- ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation
- ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act

IMMIGRATION
- ☐ 462 Naturalization Application
- ☐ 463 Habeas Corpus - Alien Detainee
- ☐ 465 Other Immigration Actions

BANKRUPTCY
- ☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158
- ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157

PROPERTY RIGHTS
- ☐ 820 Copyrights
- ☐ 830 Patent
- ☐ 840 Trademark

SOCIAL SECURITY
- ☐ 861 HIA (1395ff)
- ☐ 862 Black Lung (923)
- ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))
- ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI
- ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))

FEDERAL TAX SUITS
- ☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)
- ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609

OTHER STATUTES
- ☐ 400 State Reapportionment
- ☐ 410 Antitrust
- ☐ 430 Banks and Banking
- ☐ 450 Commerce
- ☐ 460 Deportation
- ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
- ☐ 480 Consumer Credit
- ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
- ☐ 810 Selective Service
- ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
- ☐ 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
- ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions
- ☐ 891 Agricultural Acts
- ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
- ☐ 893 Environmental Matters
- ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act
- ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act
- ☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice
- ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):
28 USC 1332 (a) (1) - 28 USC 1332 (b) - 28 USC 1332 (c) (2)

Brief description of cause:
Breach of fiduciary, extrinsic fraud, failure to disclose, failure to notice

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23

DEMAND $ 600,000.00

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: ☑ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE _____ DOCKET NUMBER _____

DATE 02/21/2012

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

Plaintiff Pro Se

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____