

I. **NOTICE OF CASES RELATED BY OPERATIVE FACTS AND PARTICIPANTS**

- I. [SDTX No. 4:12-cv-592](#) Candace Louise Curtis vs Amy Brunsting, Anita Brunsting and Does 1-100, a breach of fiduciary action seeking accounting and disclosures filed 2/27/2012. Filed Pro se!
- II. [5th Circuit ROA.12-20164](#) – **Curtis v Brunsting 704 F.3d 406 (pro se appeal)**
- III. [Harris County District Court 164 Cause No. 2013-05455](#), a malpractice action against the estate planning attorneys filed by Carl Brunsting as “independent executor” of his Parents estate, filed January 29, 2013. Carl resigned the office of “independent executor” February 19, 2015 and there has been no plaintiff in this case since.
- IV. [Harris County Probate Court No. 4 Cause No. 412249-401](#), a civil tort action exclusively related to the Brunsting trust filed on April 9, 2013, the same day as the injunction hearing in SDTX No. 4:12-cv-592.
- V. [Harris County Probate Court No. 4 Cause No. 412249-402](#) – the federal case was remanded to Harris County Probate Court No. 4 May 14, 2014.
- VI. The “[remand order](#)” was accepted in Probate Court No. 4 as a “[transfer order](#)” on May 22, 2014; converted into “*Estate of Nelva Brunsting No. 412249-402*” and then Dissolved into *Estate of Nelva Brunsting No. 412249-401*, which is the case brought by Carl Brunsting both individually and as “independent” executor on March 9, 2015.
- VII. [Curtis et al., vs. Kunz-Freed et al., SDTX No. 4:16-cv-1969](#), an honest services fraud case brought under the racketeer influenced corrupt organization statutes filed July 5, 2016: dismissed for failure to state a claim.
- VIII. [5th Circuit ROA.17-20360](#) affirmed for lack of a sufficient statement of supporting facts June 28, 2018.
- IX. [Registration of Foreign Judgment, Submission ID: 43704956](#), filed with Harris District Clerk on June 12, 2020, domesticating the federal preliminary injunction. The Foreign Judgment was not challenged by the respondents within 30 days as required and thus, the Foreign Judgment became a final judgement on July 12, 2020.
- X. [412249-403](#) – This is case #3 supra, Harris County District Court 164 Cause No. 2013-05455 [ordered transferred to Harris County Probate Court No. 4](#) on April 4, 2019, without a pending probate administration to be ancillary to and, where it remains without a plaintiff. (See *Narvaez v Powell*)

*Haight v. Koley Jessen PC, No. 10-18-00057-CV, at *4-5 (Tex. App. June 12, 2019) (“In In re Hannah, the court held that a cause of action brought in the district court was not a “matter related to a*

probate proceeding" within the scope of [Section 31.002 of the Estates Code](#). In re Hannah, [431 S.W.3d at 809](#). The court focused on the nature of the damages sought, and held that because the suit sought damages which would, if awarded, be satisfied from the defendant's individual assets rather than from any property of the estate, the claims were not related to a probate proceeding. In re Hannah, [431 S.W.3d at 809-811](#). In Narvaez, the court agreed with the court in Hannah that the nature of the claims and the relief sought must be examined when determining whether the probate court has jurisdiction of a non-probate claim. Narvaez v. Powell, [564 S.W.3d 49, 56](#) (Tex. App.—El Paso 2018, no pet). In Narvaez, a group of heirs filed suit in district court against attorneys alleging breach of fiduciary duties and legal malpractice. Narvaez v. Powell, [564 S.W.3d at 52](#). The court in Narvaez found that a legal malpractice claim cannot be characterized as a probate proceeding within the meaning of [Section 31.001](#) or related to a probate proceeding as that term is defined by [Section 31.002 of the Estates Code](#). Narvaez v. Powell, [564 S.W.3d at 57](#).”)

- XI. [412249-404](#) – A statutory Bill of Review constituting a direct attack on the Probate Courts Order denying Candace Curtis Plea to the Jurisdiction BUT MADE INTO A SEPARATE CASE BY THE CLERK.
- XII. [412249-405](#) – This case was created March 11, 2022 by an order severing Carl Brunsting from the 412249-401 lawsuit Carl Brunsting filed in the probate court April 9, 2013, [No. 412249-401], leaving Candace Curtis as the sole defendant with alleged Co-Trustee Defendants Amy Brunsting and Anita Brunsting and their attorneys Stephen Mendel and Neal Spielman as the only remaining Plaintiff’s in the lawsuit Carl Brunsting filed the same day as the preliminary injunction hearing in the Southern District of Texas.
- XIII. [Texas First District Court of Appeal No. 01-22-00378-CV](#) (Appeal Withdrawn) The clerk will not compile a record from more than one case number. This would explain why the attorneys create a mess with multiple case file numbers when there is only one family and one family trust at issue.
- XIV. [Texas First District Court of Appeal No. 01-22-00513-cv](#) Petition for Writ of Mandamus ([denied with no explanation](#)) Apparently the dirt flows up steam in Texas which is a mirror of the [Chalupowski fleecing](#) in Massachusetts.

A December 5, 2021 Rule 11 Agreement; March 11, 2022 order severing the claims of diversity polluting “[involuntary](#) Plaintiff” Carl Brunsting from those of

“Co-Plaintiff” Candace Curtis, [Carl Brunstings’ March 18, 2022 Nonsuit of Candace Curtis](#) and a [February 25, 2022 Order for Summary Judgement](#), changing Candace Curtis standing, uncover the veil of fraudulent joinder and provide the basis for invoking removal jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a) and (b)(1).

There hasn’t even been an evidentiary hearing. Candace Curtis could never get an evidentiary hearing. Without a hearing there is no evidence and without evidence no judgment can be entered. Oh, but let us not let law get in the way when stealing money is the only issue.

XV. [SDTX No. 4:22-cv-1129](#) April 7, 2022 created by removal of the alleged Co-Trustees’ counterclaims to the Southern District of Texas.