1. An estate planning attorney bait and switch guaranteeing the controversy necessary to the 3rd party interception of family generational asset transfers. (Facilitator for the probate mafia)
2. The bait and switch estate planning grifters are sued by an independent executor (a trust beneficiary) in the District Court and then the independent executor/trust beneficiary sued all of his trust co-beneficiary siblings in the state probate court, in an (1) independent administration of an estate, (2) with no tangible assets, (3) after the inventory, appraisement and list of claims had been approved and (4) the probate of the pour-over estate was removed from the active docket (closed)
3. This sequestered the estate planning bait and switch grifters in one court and trapping the entire family of victims in the probate court. This all occurred after an integrally related lawsuit for breach of fiduciary was pending in the SDTX, and after dismissal of the federal case under the **probate exception** had been reversed and remanded by the 5th Circuit.

SUMMARY

1. **A pour-over will**, with devise to a living trust, Will admitted without challenge, verified inventory approved without challenge **that somehow failed to pour**?
2. A probate case in which the estate has no tangible interest in the outcome
3. A unanimous Fifth Circuit Opinion (effectively ignored)
4. **A federal preliminary injunction** and rulings entered in open court (**effectively ignored**) on the same day the competing action was filed in probate A remand that was not the return of a removed case
5. A transfer from federal to state court for which there is no authority
6. A (complete) consolidation of the federal case with an estate that has no representative and no interest in the outcome
7. Counter claims filed more than six years after a Defendants original answer
8. Summary Judgment motion based on the false thesis that the beneficiary suing the trustee to compel specific performance triggers the forfeiture provisions in instruments that are not in evidence. Either the obligations of the trustee are affirmative and active or the trust is passive. The alleged co-trustee conspirators are either in breach of the affirmative duties prescribed by an active trust or they are in wrongful possession of the assets of a dry trust but in either instance they have misapplied fiduciary property held in trust for the benefit of elderly and disabled beneficiaries and that is a felony under both Tex. Penal Code §§ 32.45 & 32.53. There are no accessories in Texas. Everyone that participated in perpetrating this fraud is a principal.
9. Summary Judgment entered without a hearing, not rendered and in a probate case where there is no estate, no executor, and no declaratory judgment defining what instruments we are talking about when we say “the trust”. (A fact issue in dispute)
10. A Severance of the cases never actually consolidated but given the appearance of a complete consolidation when a complete consolidation, as opposed to a consolidation for trial, cannot be severed on the basis of alleged conflicts of interest that were never delineated and what has changed since the consolidation?
11. Carl’s (Drina’s) Non-suit of the severed plaintiff terminated any controversy or conflict between Carl and Candace, if there ever actually was any.