

In Curtis²², this Court also clarified application of the doctrine of comity, holding that no court could assume in rem jurisdiction over a res in the custody of another court and yet, the composite action filed in the probate court raises only trust related issues, and it was filed while the trust was in the custody of the federal court.

The record will show [ROA.17-20360.1103] there are five beneficiaries to an inter vivos trust, Candace Curtis and Carole, Carl, Amy, and Anita Brunsting. The family “Trust” is the only heir to the deceased founders “Estates”. [ROA.17-20360-2372, 2384] Carl Brunsting is the named executor but has no “individual standing” in the administration of the Estate. Assets in the trusts are not assets belonging to an estate²³ and thus, Carl the “Executor” has no standing in the administration of the Trust. An honest temporary administrator’s report [ROA.17-20360.611] would have pointed these things out instead of attempting to validate the forgery called 8/25/2010 QBD.²⁴ Defendants cling to this instrument in their assertions of fact, but refuse to produce it and qualify it as evidence. They will not because they cannot.

The administration of an inter vivos trust is a business matter, not the sibling soap opera the attorneys scripted for themselves. Carl resigned as executor on February 2, 2015, due to a lack of competence, leaving the office of executor vacant.

²² Id at HN3

²³ Id at HN6

²⁴ See No-evidence motion [ROA.17-20360.243] and the answer [ROA.17-20360.623]