1 REPORTER'S RECORD 2 VOLUME 3 OF 3 FILED IN TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. 4121st COURT OF APPEALS HOUSTON, TEXAS 3 APPELLATE COURT NO. 01-23-05/35/2023-4:07:40 PM 4 DEBORAH M. YOUNG INCIPRE PROBATE COURT 5 THE ESTATE OF: NELVA E. BRUNSTING, NUMBER 4 (FOUR) OF 6 DECEASED HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS 7 8 9 10 11 PRETRIAL CONFERENCE & MOTION FOR SANCTIONS 12 & MSJ & MOTION TO EXCLUDE 13 14 15 16 17 18 On the 25th day of February, 2022, the following 19 proceedings came to be heard in the above-entitled and 20 numbered cause before the Honorable Kathleen Stone, 21 Judge of Probate Court No. 4, held in Houston, Harris 22 County, Texas: 23 24 Proceedings reported by Machine Shorthand 25

```
1
                      A-P-P-E-A-R-A-N-C-E-S:
 2
    ATTORNEY FOR CARL BRUNSTING:
        Ms. Bobbie G. Bayless
3
        BAYLESS & STOKES
        Attorney at Law
        SBN 01940600
4
        2931 Ferndale
5
        Houston, Texas
                         77098
        713.522.2224
6
        bayless@baylessstokes.com
    ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT AMY BRUNSTING:
7
        Mr. Neal E. Spielman
 8
        GRIFFIN & MATTHEWS
        Attorney at Law
 9
        SBN 00794678
        1155 Dairy Ashford
        Suite 300
10
        Houston, Texas
                         77079
11
        281.870.1124
        nspielman@grifmatlaw.com
12
    ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT ANITA BRUNSTING:
13
        Mr. Stephen A. Mendel
        Attorney at Law
        THE MENDEL LAW FIRM, L.P.
14
        SBN 13930650
15
        1155 Dairy Ashford
        Suite 104
16
        Houston, Texas 77079
        281.759.3213
17
        steve@mendellawfirm.com
18
    ATTORNEY REPRESENTING VACEK & FREED ET AL:
        Mr. Cory S. Reed
19
        Attorney at Law
        THOMPSON, COE, COUSINS, & IRONS, LLP
20
        SBN 24076640
        One Riverway
21
        Suite 1400
        Houston, Texas
                         77056
22
        713.403.8213
23
24
25
```

```
1
    ATTORNEY FOR CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS:
        Ms. Candice L. Schwager
 2
        SCHWAGER LAW FIRM
        Attorney at Law
 3
        SBN 24005603
        P.O. Box 580008
        Houston, Texas
 4
                          77258
        832.315.8489
 5
        candiceschwager@icloud.com
 6
    ALSO PRESENT:
        Ms. Carole Ann Brunsting
 7
        5822 Jason
        Houston, Texas
        cbrunsting@sbcglobal.net
 8
        713.560.6381
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	(Pretrial Conference & Motion For Sanctions & MSJ & Motion to Exclude)
3	February 25, 2022 Page
4	PROCEEDINGS5
5	MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT RULING5
	MOTION TO EXCLUDE18
6	THE COURT'S RULING19
7	COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE21
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	February 25, 2022

1 February 25, 2022 2 (WHEREUPON the following proceedings 3 were conducted via Zoom and YouTube:) 4 PROCEEDINGS: 5 THE COURT: Okay. We're here on a 6 pretrial, correct? 7 MR. SPIELMAN: We're here on a couple of 8 things, Your Honor. We are here on a pretrial that is set for 3:00, but we're also here on a motion to exclude 9 testimony evidence and for sanctions and for third 10 contempt as to Ms. Curtis. I don't know that any of the 11 12 lawyers know in what order the Court wanted to address 13 those things. 14 MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT RULING: 15 THE COURT: Well, I think the very first 16 thing I need to address is the Co-Trustees' summary 17 judgment. I've been in contact with Judge Horwitz, and I've signed the motion for summary judgment. 18 19 MR. SPIELMAN: Thank you, Your Honor. 20 THE COURT: So, where are we now? 21 MR. SPIELMAN: Well, I guess I'll have to 22 ask the Court that question, too. 23 So, this pretrial, this pretrial order -pretrial conference, Your Honor, has to do with the 24 lawsuit between Candace -- from Candace Curtis to the 25

Co-Trustees and the Co-Trustees' counterclaims against
Candace Curtis; if both have just been resolved by
summary judgment, then I believe the only pretrial
matters that would be left would involve the remaining
parties which would be Carole Brunsting, who is pro se,
Carl Brunsting, who is represented by Ms. Bayless, and
Ms. Curtis and whatever remaining causes of action and
claims exist between the three of them. But if the
summary judgment's been granted in its totality, then
Mr. Mendel and I probably don't need to participate in
the pretrial because our clients are now summary
judgment -- have now summary judgment in their favor;
does that sound right, Steve?

MR. MENDEL: That's true. The one thing we would need clarification from the Court is the one outstanding issue with regard to our clients is the fee issue and any hearing regarding same. So, would the Court be keeping the trial date to take care of the fees or would we be looking at some potential earlier date?

THE COURT: The date is April -- I forgot.

MR. MENDEL: April 4th, Your Honor.

MS. SCHWAGER: Your Honor, I would just point out that the Defendants have no cognizable claim against my client; they simply ask for attorneys' fees based upon on a new cause of action asserted. So, I

don't think there's anything to talk about there regarding my client.

THE COURT: Well, Ms. Bayless?
MS. BAYLESS: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: What would be tried -- or as I understand it - your claim against the Co-Trustees has been, by Rule 11 Agreement, kind of set aside?

MS. BAYLESS: Right, they've been severed, yes.

THE COURT: And so, is this going to be -I mean, is there anything to be tried on April the 4th
for you?

MS. BAYLESS: Well, Your Honor, I've been trying to resolve the issues that -- the only issues that would be there relate to claims that we filed against Carole and claims that Carole raised in a counterclaim. I've been trying to resolve those.

Carole is pro se, and she's going through some health issues; and so, she wanted to delay, further, the discussions. I don't know where that stands. She wanted to have an attorney look at the proposed dismissal that I had sent to her which was a joint dismissal with prejudice, and then that timing was dependent upon her health issues. So, I don't really know where that stands, and I don't really know how to

```
1
    answer that question. I think those claims should be
    able to be resolved based on the discussions we've had,
 2
   but I don't have that resolution to give you today.
 3
 4
                  THE COURT: All right. Ms. Brunsting?
 5
    Carole?
 6
                  MR. MENDEL:
                               You're on mute, Carole.
 7
                  THE COURT:
                              You're on mute.
 8
                  MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING:
                                         Yes.
                                                I got the
 9
   proposal to -- from Ms. Bayless about a week before I
    was to have surgery; and because I'm pro se, it just
10
    wasn't a decision I wanted to make at that time.
11
    then also, too, I just didn't feel it was a good idea to
12
13
    sign anything without having an attorney look at it.
   Unfortunately, my [audio interruption] got delayed; and
14
15
    unfortunately, just because I've had to make so many
    trips back and forth to M.D. Anderson and between work
16
17
    and things like that, I just haven't had a chance --
    well, no, actually what they did was they told me that
18
19
    I'm supposed to minimize my exposure to anything at this
    point because they don't want to have to delay the
20
    surgery any longer. So, I can't go -- I've been unable
21
22
    to go to meet with an attorney just to have them look at
    this. So, that's what's causing the delay - is just
23
   poor timing and all of this happening. So, I'm just,
24
    like I said, I -- because I'm pro se, I'm just not
25
```

really comfortable just having something signed on -for me to sign something without the benefit of having
an attorney review it. And I'm not trying to drag that
out, it's just, unfortunately, my focus is somewhere
else at this time. So, my best guess would be maybe in
the next -- I talked to an attorney this morning, would
be possibly in the next two weeks.

THE COURT: All right. Well, you might -MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: Just depends on how
fast my recovery goes and all of that.

THE COURT: You might ask the attorney to contact - if you've decided to hire them - to contact

Ms. Bayless directly and then maybe if they had any questions, she would be able to answer them.

MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: Okay.

THE COURT: And then you might not even have to go into their office for any reason.

MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: Okay.

THE COURT: They should be able to look at the document, talk to Ms. Bayless who's been in this lawsuit - from what I understand from the beginning - and answer any questions that your attorney might have.

MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: Unfortunately, since I'm talking to somebody that's brand new to all of this, they're having a lot of questions, and they just

want a lot of background and all of this, so it's not something that they're like - oh, sure, just send it over, and I'll give you my opinion. So, it's just gotten to be a lot more complicated than just making a simple phone call to an attorney.

1.7

THE COURT: Okay. Well, that's just a suggestion.

MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: Okay. Yes, that's a really good suggestion. So, maybe I can find someone that's willing to do that.

THE COURT: All right. So, the attorneys' fees that are for trial by the Co-Trustees, right? Is that what I'm hearing?

MR. MENDEL: Yes, Your Honor. Yes, Your Honor, we'd like to keep that April 4th trial date for the issue of fees.

THE COURT: All right. I don't see any reason why not. I'll expect it's probably not going to take four days, five days.

MR. MENDEL: Well, we told the Court when we did the severance - this case would be reduced
down to a week. You're right - it's probably not going
to take a week, but at this moment it's still a jury
case, and maybe it gets turned into a bench case. But I
don't think we're at a position at this moment to say if

it's going to be less than the full week.

THE COURT: All right. Well, we'll just keep it on the trial docket. I mean, Judge Horwitz was expecting a trial, and we'll just leave it on the trial docket for the 4th. So, a lot of the things that we would do today as far as the docket con --

MS. SCHWAGER: Your Honor, if I may interject? I'm rather sure that we're going to appeal the granting of the summary judgment, and I would suspect that's going to throw this April 4th trial date off so --

THE COURT: Actually, it's the 14th not the 4th.

MS. SCHWAGER: Oh, I see.

THE COURT: But go ahead.

MS. SCHWAGER: I don't know how long that it would take the court of appeals to respond, but it is an issue that affects the trial. So, I just wanted to bring that to your attention.

THE COURT: Well, it probably will take the court of appeals, I think, about between a year-and-a-half to two years.

MR. MENDEL: Well, Your Honor, she can just take up the MSJ along with the fees, so it's all up before the court of appeals. She's not entitled to some

interlocutory appeal.

THE COURT: Well, for one thing, we need to kind of get what's -- there's too much in the 401.

So, we're trying to - we, I mean the Court - is trying to make sure that what is left is just the -- Ms.

Schwager's client's case so that that can go up to the court of appeals. And then, if you want to include the attorneys' fees, I think we are -- we talked about trying to clear up or clean up - 'cause there's a 401, a 403, a 404, a 405 - and to go get the case in the two -- the 151st, bring it in and make it the 406.

JUDGE COMSTOCK: Judge, let me just chime
in.

When I spoke to counsel, you know, when we first got started, I think we all reached an agreement that the pleadings in the 151st could be brought down and put into the 401.

THE COURT: Okay.

JUDGE COMSTOCK: And then I was, you know, just thinking. I know that there's going to be a lot to process here. We could -- I do have an opening the Thursday before their April 4th trial setting, and we can put in another pretrial conference to let people kind of digest what's going on and decide what to do, actually, at trial, but there are a lot of loose ends.

```
1
                  THE COURT: Okay. So, that would be
    the -- what day would that be, April 1st?
 2
 3
                  JUDGE COMSTOCK: I'm sorry, March 31st.
                  THE COURT: March 31st, okay.
 5
                  JUDGE COMSTOCK: And we could have a
    pretrial that afternoon, maybe about 1:30 if that works
 6
 7
   with the people's schedules.
 8
                  THE COURT: Counsel?
 9
                  MS. SCHWAGER: I'm available.
10
                  THE COURT: Does it work with everybody's
    schedule?
11
12
                  MR. SPIELMAN: For right now, it does.
13
                  THE COURT: Okay.
                  MR. MENDEL: I'm available on the 31st.
14
15
                  THE COURT: Okay.
16
                  MS. BAYLESS: Fine with me, Judge.
   Hopefully by that time, we'll have the issue sorted out
17
   with Carole.
18
19
                  THE COURT: All right.
20
                  MR. SPIELMAN: I'll figure it out, Your
21
   Honor.
22
                  THE COURT:
                              All right. And, obviously,
23
    Ms. Brunsting - you don't have to be there?
24
                  JUDGE COMSTOCK: You're muted.
25
                  MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: So, I don't have to
```

be there because I'm not part of it at all?

THE COURT: I think that all we're talking about in the trial is the attorneys' fees, correct?

MS. CAROLE BRUNSTING: I mean, so I have

no participation in that? That's what I'm asking. I'm kind of a little bit lost in all of the severance and how this is all panning out. So, I'm just asking - is that something that I should be there for or I'm not required to be there for or I'm not sure.

THE COURT: Well, let me ask the attorneys if they think you're required to be there. Counsel?

Mr. Mendel?

MR. MENDEL: Well, she might want to be there. I mean, it's possible, depending on how the Court rules on our fees - off the top with regard to the trust, are they off the top and apportioned as to Ms. Curtis. So, Ms. Carole Brunsting might want to be present because she may have an interest in how that develops.

The other thing that's not clear to me,

Your Honor, is - and Ms. Bayless, maybe you can clarify

it - is right now, it appears to be fees and the bale -
Carl Brunsting, Carole Brunsting claims that are all

that's left that would be scheduled for trial. And if

Carl Brunsting and Carole Brunsting resolve their

```
issues, then we're just down to attorneys' fees.
 1
 2
                  MS. BAYLESS: I think that's right.
 3
    far as I --
                  MR. MENDEL: Carole, long story short -
 4
 5
    you have the right to be there; whether you want to be
 6
    there, is up to you.
 7
                  MR. SPIELMAN: I think we'll all know a
    little bit more when we see the actual order that got
 8
 9
    signed on the summary judgment, too.
10
                  THE COURT: Okay. Well, it should be --
11
    should pop up in the -- on the file online sometime
12
    shortly.
13
                  MR. MENDEL: I'm online now; it hasn't
14
    popped up yet.
15
                  THE COURT:
                              Okay. Well --
16
                  JUDGE COMSTOCK: It's being processed
    right now, so it should be up soon.
17
18
                  MR. SPIELMAN: And I suppose I have a
19
    question for the Court which I don't know if the Court
    will be able to answer.
20
21
                  Judge Comstock, when we spoke before we
    went on the record, when the attorneys spoke before we
22
    went on the record, and we discussed bringing the
23
    district court cases into the 401 - is that still the
24
```

right decision in light of the summary judgment being

25

granted and what we're talking about today? Is it the Court's intention that the summary judgment encompasses the injunction proceeding?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The injunction was just to pay fees, wasn't it?

MR. SPIELMAN: Well, the injunction that we're talking about has a lot of different terms - one of which is that, essentially paraphrased, nobody is to spend any money out of the Trust without the permission of the Court, and there are other things about it, of And in the district court, the injunction was filed as a final judgment, and it was argued that it should be enforced as such almost like out of -- almost like you would do collection of -- collecting of a And so, I guess either I may have misunderstand [sic] what that district court proceeding was or I'm confused as to what happens now that it's being brought over by -- now that it's a claim by Ms. Schwager on behalf of Ms. Curtis being brought into the 401 in which the Co-Trustees have just been granted summary judgment as to Ms. Curtis' claims.

MS. SCHWAGER: The injunction applied to the entire Trust not just Ms. Curtis' claims.

MR. SPIELMAN: Well, right - that's my point. So, I suppose that the injunction survives the

summary judgment to the extent that there are other parties still in the case.

JUDGE COMSTOCK: If I can chime in.

It seems to me that because that was all brought into the 401, that it would still be proper to bring that piece of it into the 401 and deal with it all as one animal, so to speak. So, I think I and Judge Stone and Judge Horwitz would all be willing to consider whatever counsel thinks is the best for y'all's case.

THE COURT: Well, if it's going to go up on appeal, it should go up with the fees also. The fees should go with it so there's not two different appeals going on.

JUDGE COMSTOCK: So maybe bring it in and then decide how you want it dealt with before pretrial on the 31st, and then maybe it can all be addressed in the same cause as part of the same process.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that sounds about right of how it should proceed 'cause you don't want two different courts of appeal - Fourteenth and the First - handling bits and pieces of this case.

MR. MENDEL: That's fine, Your Honor.

Like Judge Comstock just said, you know, the parties can figure out what they want to do, and it can be either raised by motion before the 31st or at the time of the

31st pretrial hearing. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. MS. SCHWAGER: Your Honor, I would also 3 point out - the 404 is a Bill of Review, and it's never 4 5 been ruled upon; it's a challenge to the jurisdiction. 6 And even though I might have some idea as to how this judge would rule, it's not been considered at this time. 7 8 And so, I believe --THE COURT: Well, Judge Horwitz and I've 9 discussed that also; we'll get that ruled on. 10 11 MS. SCHWAGER: Okay. THE COURT: I'll look at it, and he 12 obviously knows a lot more about it than I do. 13 MS. SCHWAGER: Sure. 14 THE COURT: Okay. Is there anything else? 15 16 MOTION TO EXCLUDE: 17 MR. SPIELMAN: Your Honor, just because we are on the docket today on the motion to exclude, I 18 think that the Co-Trustees will pass that, pass that 19 hearing for today; and if it needs to be considered by 20 2.1 the Court again, we will ask if we can have it 22 considered at the next pretrial on March the 31st --THE COURT: 23 Okay. MR. SPIELMAN: -- notice for that if we 24 decide to go forward. 25

```
1
                  THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?
2
                  MR. MENDEL: No, Your Honor.
                       THE COURT'S RULING:
3
                  THE COURT: Okay. We'll pass the motion.
 4
   We'll go get the case from the 151st, we'll put it into
 5
   the 401; we'll have a hearing on the potential trial on
 6
 7
   the fees and do the -- is it the 404, Ms. Schwager?
                  MS. SCHWAGER: The 404.
 8
                  THE COURT: 404. We'll look at the 404.
 9
   And I'll discuss it with Judge Horwitz.
10
                  Okay. So, does anybody need anything from
11
12
    me?
                  MR. SPIELMAN: No, Your Honor.
13
14
                  THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you.
                  Oh, Bobbie, do you still have the
15
    Christmas ornament place?
16
17
                  MS. BAYLESS: I'm sorry?
18
                  THE COURT: Do you still have the
    Christmas ornament place?
19
20
                  MS. BAYLESS: Yes. Yes.
21
                  THE COURT: There was always cute things
    in there.
22
23
                  MS. BAYLESS: Yeah, it's hard to do
    everything. I'm trying, but..
24
25
                  THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, counsel,
```

```
1
    y'all are excused.
 2
                    MS. BAYLESS: Thank you, Judge.
                    MR. MENDEL: Thank you, Judge.
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

HIPOLITA G. LOPEZ OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER, PROBATE COURT 4

```
The State of Texas
1
2
   County of Harris
3
           I, Hipolita Lopez, Official Court Reporter in and
4
5
   for the Probate Court Number Four of Harris County,
   State of Texas, do hereby certify that the above and
6
   foregoing contains a true and correct transcription of
7
   all portions of evidence and other proceedings requested
8
    in writing by counsel for the parties to be included in
9
    this volume of the Reporter's Record, in the
10
11
    above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred
12
    in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.
           I further certify that this Reporter's Record
13
    truly and correctly reflects the exhibits, if any,
14
    admitted by the respective parties.
15
           I further certify that the total cost for the
16
    preparation of this Reporter's Record is $147.00.
17
    and was paid by MS. CANDACE CURTIS.
18
19
           WITNESS MY OFFICIAL HAND this the 3rd day of
20
           March, 2022.
21
                     /s/ Hipolita G. Lopez
22
                     HIPOLITA G. LOPEZ, Texas CSR #6298
                      Expiration Date:
                                        10-31-23
23
                      Official Court Reporter
                      Probate Court Number Four
24
                     Harris County, Texas
                      201 Caroline, 7th Fl.
25
                      Houston, Texas 77002
```