

ESTATE OF	§	IN PROBATE COURT
	§	
NELVA E. BRUNSTING,	§	NUMBER FOUR (4) OF
	§	
DECEASED	§	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, et al	§
	§
v.	§
	§
ANITA KAY BRUNSTING, et al	§

**Anita Kay Brunsting 's Response to
Candace Louise Curtis'
First Written Interrogatories**

Anita Kay Brunsting serves her response to Candace Louise Curtis' first written interrogatories.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Brad Featherston

Stephen A. Mendel (13930650)
Bradley E. Featherston (24038892)
The Mendel Law Firm, L.P.
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 104
Houston, Texas 77079
Tel: 281-759-3213
Fax: 281-759-3214
stephen@mendellawfirm.com
brad@mendellawfirm.com

Counsel for Anita Kay Brunsting
In Capacities at Issue

Certificate of Service

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was served on the following:

Candace Louis Curtis
218 Landana Street
American Canyon, CA 94503
Tel: 925-759-9020

Pro Se

Bobbie G. Bayless
2931 Ferndale
Houston, Texas 77098
O: 713-522-2224; F: 713-522-2218

Attorney for Drina Brunsting,
Alleged Attorney in Fact for
Carl Brunsting

Darlene Payne Smith
1401 McKinney, 17TH Floor
Houston, Texas 77010
O: 713-752-8640; F: 713-425-7945

Attorney for Carole Ann Brunsting

Neal Spielman
Griffin & Matthews
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 300
Houston, TX 77079
O: 281-870-1124; F: 281-870-1647

Attorney for Amy Brunsting

via email on June 4, 2015.

/s/ Brad Featherston

Bradley E. Featherston

Response to Written Interrogatories¹

Anita Brunsting objects to Candace's interrogatories and request for production made pursuant to "fiduciary obligations." Interrogatories and request for production are exclusive to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and are not contemplated by the trust instruments nor any other applicable law. To the extent Candace's interrogatories and request for production are made pursuant to fiduciary obligations under the trust instruments then, pursuant to the trust, the Trustee requires that Candace pay the additional costs incurred to respond to such requests before the Trustee is required to comply with such request.

1. In your exercise of discretion, which of the Founders' ten intended purposes and what aspects of the HEMS standard were factored into your determination to oppose a distribution to beneficiary Candace from her personal asset trust, and upon what set of facts did your determination rely? If you did not use any of the ten expressed purposes or the HEMS standard, what standard did you use, if any?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, see Anita's response to Candace's request for distributions that was filed with the Court and which documents speak for themselves.

2. In 2011, which of the ten intended purposes, if any, and what aspects of the HEMS standard did you apply to your exercise of discretion in transferring Exxon Stock to Carole, and upon what set of facts did your exercise of discretion rely? If you did not use any of the ten expressed purposes or the HEMS standard, what standard did you use, if any?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, such transfer was made at Nelva Brunsting's instruction.

3. In 2011, which of the ten intended purposes, if any, and what aspects of the HEMS standard did you apply to your exercise of discretion in transferring Exxon Stock to Candace, and upon what set of facts did your exercise of discretion rely? If you did not use any of the ten expressed purposes or the HEMS standard, what standard did you use, if any?

¹ Candace's Interrogatories were renumbered for the convenience of the parties and the Court.

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, such transfer was made at Nelva Brunsting's instruction.

4. In 2011, which of the ten intended purposes, if any, and what aspects of the HEMS standard did you apply to your exercise of discretion in transferring Exxon Stock to Amy, and upon what set of facts did your exercise of discretion rely? If you did not use any of the ten expressed purposes or the HEMS standard, what standard did you use, if any?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, such transfer was made at Nelva Brunsting's instruction.

5. Which of the ten intended purposes, if any, and what aspects of the HEMS standard did you apply to your exercise of discretion in not transferring Exxon Stock to Carl, and upon what set of facts did your exercise of discretion rely? If you did not use any of the ten expressed purposes or the HEMS standard, what standard did you use, if any?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, presumably the inquiry relates to the time period Nelva Brunsting was alive and Nelva Brunsting did not instruct an Exxon Stock transfer to Carl.

6. What are, and how did the trustees interpret, the particular distribution standards contained in "the trust"?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the distribution standards are as set forth in the trust instruments, which were interpreted as written.

7. What is/was the trustee's process for making discretionary distribution decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the process is as set forth in the trust instruments.

8. What does the trustee require when asked to consider other resources and establish the beneficiary’s standard of living?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. The trustee requires what the trust instruments provide.

9. Does the trust require a beneficiary to waive their right of privacy as a condition of receiving a beneficial interest? If so, under which provision of what instrument(s)?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the trust instruments speak for themselves.

10. Does the trustee work with distribution advisors? If so, who and when? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: The trustee has not worked with distribution advisors. No distributions have been made since the Nelva’s death due to the litigation filed by Candace and Carl.

11. When and how did the acting trustees inform the beneficiaries of their beneficial interests?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, prior to defendant’s appointment as trustee, on or about October 23, 2010, Candace was informed of her beneficial interest via email. Shortly after Nelva’s death in November 2011, the trustees and their counsel were in the process handling the trust affairs incident to Nelva’s death. The trustees and

their counsel provided trust documents and assets lists via email and/or mail in December 2011 and thereafter to beneficiaries.

12. What types of distributions would the trustees like a beneficiary to receive?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as unintelligible. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, defendant would like a beneficiary to receive distributions in accordance with the trust instruments.

13. For what purposes can the beneficiary request a distribution from the trust?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, the beneficiary can request a distribution for the purposes contained in the trust instruments.

14. When would the trustees like distributions to be made and in what priority?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as unintelligible. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Subject to, and without waiving the foregoing objections, defendant would like a beneficiary to receive distributions in accordance with the trust instruments.

15. What circumstances should or should not exist prior to a distribution from "the trust"?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory as unintelligible. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which "trust" the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva's death or after Nelva's death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, currently, with respect to Candace, the Court must resolve Candace's claims and allegations in the pending lawsuit and, in particular, Candace's allegation that the no contest provisions in the trust instruments are unenforceable, prior to a distribution.

16. Who should be involved in the decision making process?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, currently, the Court and the parties to the litigation should be involved in the decision making process.

17. What factors does the decision-maker measure in determining the beneficiary’s need for a distribution?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, currently, the Court would consider the factors set forth in the trusts.

18. Describe the steps you have taken to honor the provisions of Article X, Section B (1)(a)(i) of the Brunsting Family Trust?

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and misconstrues the provisions and effects of the trust instruments. Defendant further objects because it is unclear which “trust” the question is seeking information about because the question is not limited to a time period (*i.e.*, before Nelva’s death or after Nelva’s death) and is, therefore, vague. The referenced section was superseded by Nelva and therefore, is inapplicable.

19. Describe the steps you have taken to honor the provisions at Page 6 Item C of the August 25, 2010 QBD regarding PERSONAL ASSET TRUST PROVISIONS, as those provisions relate to the personal asset trusts for each of the five Brunsting beneficiaries?

RESPONSE: After Nelva’s death, defendant began the process of collecting assets, informing trust beneficiaries, and working the attorneys specifically referenced in such section to implement the terms of the trust instruments. The trustees and their counsel provided trust documents and assets lists via email and/or mail in December 2011 and thereafter to beneficiaries. Candace then brought litigation.

20. A copy of the 8/25/2010 QBD was included in the October 23, 2010 email attachments. How did you come to be in possession of the 8/25/2010 QBD on October 23, 2010 when Nelva was the only then serving trustee?

RESPONSE: Nelva provided defendant such instrument.

21. What was your forthright explanation to Nelva regarding the changes that you planned for her to make to the trust and what were the exact changes that you intended to be made?²

RESPONSE: Defendant objects to this interrogatory, as it is misleading, capable of causing jury confusion, and is a compound question. Defendant never planned to make any changes to the trust for Carl. It was defendant's understanding that Nelva planned to make changes to the trust. There was a concern by Nelva, defendant, and defendant's siblings that Carl's future well-being may not be met by Drina, and that Drina may take steps to reach Carl's share of trust assets. Nelva never signed the changes into effect.

22. Where are the documents you referred to that you intended for Nelva to sign?³

RESPONSE: To defendant's knowledge they were never signed. Defendant does not know what happened to such documents.

23. What was the date of your prior inquiry and why was the inquiry made more than one year after you were noticed of the existence of those EE Bonds?

RESPONSE: Candace and Carl consistently and repeatedly accused Carol of stealing bonds that were alleged to be in the name of Nelva or Elmer. Defendant did not see a record of the bonds being in the name of the trusts. In late 2014, Carol informed defendant that she could request a record of the outstanding bonds, which was done in mid to late 2014.

24. What claim(s), if any, were you asking to be processed?

RESPONSE: None.

25. Did you subsequently submit the properly completed forms? If no, why not? If yes, what were the results and where are the transaction records?

² This is a question about a March 8, 2011 email from Anita.

³ This is a question about a March 8, 2011 email from Anita.

RESPONSE: No, because Candace would not agree to the disposition of the bonds and the legal fees to seek court approval to cash the bonds in light of Candace's failure to agree made the transaction cost prohibitive.

Defendant objects to the balance of the interrogatories as exceeding the limits of permissible discovery under the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant further objects to the balance of the interrogatories because Candace has not paid Candace pay the additional costs incurred to respond to such requests before the Trustee is required to comply with such request.

Intention 2. To eliminate and reduce income taxes, generation skipping transfer taxes and estate and death taxes on trust assets and on assets in the estate of the beneficiary,

(a) The decedent's trust has received farm income every year, which has not been distributed since 2012. Consequently the decedent's trust owed hefty income taxes each year. Why have those taxes not been reduced by distributions of farm income to personal asset trusts for the five beneficiaries? What advice have you been given regarding income taxes paid by the trusts, if any?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) When considering funding for Mother's day-to-day needs prior to the establishment of the Rights of Survivorship account in the name of Carole Brunsting and Nelva Brunsting, what criteria did you use when you liquidated assets in the Edward Jones account? Was avoidance of capital gains tax a factor? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

5. Trustee Manual: The Bates stamped documents included in Plaintiff's document production P6-P155, "MyTrustee Manual". Chapter 2, P19-P22 is titled "BEFORE GETTING STARTED: A FEW IMPORTANT "DO'S AND DON'TS".

(a) Please review pages 2-1 through 2-4 of My Trustee Handbook and answer the following questions with specificity:

i. Which of the eight "Do's" have you done?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

ii. Which of the eight "Do's" have you not done?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

iii. Which of the nine “Do Not’s” have you done?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

iv. Which of the nine “Do Not’s” have you not done?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

6. Instruments are alleged to have been signed by Nelva Brunsting on August 25, 2010.

(a) Were you involved in the preparatory discussions? If yes, please explain the circumstances leading up to the creation of the instruments.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) Were you personally present when those documents were signed? If yes, please identify the location where they were signed and provide the names and contact information for everyone who was personally present when those instruments were signed.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

7. Instruments are alleged to have been signed by Nelva Brunsting on December 21, 2010.

(a) Were you involved in the preparatory discussions? If yes, please explain the circumstances leading up to the creation of the instruments.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) Were you personally present when those documents were signed? If yes, please identify the location where they were signed and provide the names and contact information for everyone who was personally present when those instruments were signed.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

8. Please refer to the RESPONSE OF DEFENDANTS TO REPORT OF MASTER, filed

August 27, 2013, and answer the following:

Regarding trustee compensation,

(a) At the point in time when you paid your personal credit card debts from trust assets, were you aware that paying personal debt obligations directly out of trust accounts can be considered self-dealing or co-mingling, whether you were entitled to trustee compensation or not? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) Appendix A, Section 1. states that Vacek & Freed determined the percentage amount of your fee to be 2% of the trust value of \$2,291,300, or \$45,826.00. What date was the fee calculation determined? What trust was the value based upon? What trust assets and their corresponding values were used in the calculation? Why was this calculated on an annual basis, rather than monthly or quarterly, since the value of the trust diminished every single month? What provision(s) in the trust set forth the standard for calculating this rate of compensation?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

9. Please refer to George Vie's July 15, 2013 letter to the Master and Attachment 1 to these interrogatories when considering the following questions. Note that Attachment 1 is a summary of your Schedule F, plus distributions to beneficiaries from the Edward Jones account during the 10-year period covered by the schedule, and the distribution you received in 2005 to pay off your house.

Your letter states that:

"Numerous gifts were given to the older Brunsting children (Carl, Candace and Carole); Candace's sons, Kevan Curtis and Andy Curtis (currently in their mid-30s); and Carl's daughter, Marta Brunsting Huntsman (prior to Mr. Brunsting's death) to assist with their college, business and/or wedding expenses." Attachment 1 demonstrates that during the 10-year period of the schedule, approximately 46% of the distributions went to Candy, Carole, Carl, Kevan and Andy, with the balance of approximately 54% going to you, Amy and your respective children. Nothing was noted to have been received by Marta during the 10-year period.

(a) Please state with specificity the dates and amounts of all gifts given to the older beneficiaries and the source of the information in support of these alleged transactions, as claimed by you in your July 15, 2013 letter of influence addressed to the Special Master.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in

the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) Our Dad died April 1, 2009. The only noted transactions labeled as gifts to Kevan and Andy Curtis are dated October 2, 2009. Please state with specificity the dates and amounts of all other alleged gifts given to Kevan, Andy, or Marta between 2001 and April 1, 2009, the source of the information in support of these transactions, and the reason why these transactions were not listed on any schedules.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(d) In general the July 15, 2013 letter to the Master attempts to provide excuses for the sudden acceleration of dissipation of mass quantities of trust assets while our Mother was still alive. These take-my-word-for it assertions have not been supported by Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (GAAP) in any disclosures. The recap of distributions, or gifts if you want to call them that, reflected on Attachment 1, clearly shows an inequity. What was the distribution standard applied to those transactions? What effect did these transactions have on the value of the trust assets, trust tax liabilities, and the personal tax liabilities of the recipients? What were the facts upon which discretion was exercised in each of these transactions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(e) In your July 15, 2013 letter to the Master you claim “Defendants are individuals, not financial professionals.” It is presumed you knew of this fiscal incompetence before accepting the appointment to a fiduciary office. Did you hire financial professionals to assist you in meeting the obligations commensurate with your fiduciary duties? If yes, who, when, and what did they do? If not, why not?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(f) In a letter dated May 22, 2012, Edward Jones states “We’re contacting you because either your financial advisor recently updated your account information or it has been three years since we last verified your information.” It goes on to ask you to “Please review the enclosed pages, which list your account information. If the information is correct, you do not need to return this letter.” This information contains the following:

Net Worth (must exclude value of primary residence): \$1,700,000

Annual Income: \$64,000

Prior Investment Experience: (4) Extensive Experience

Risk Profile: (3) Moderate

Current Occupation: Homemaker

Did you return the letter? If not, why not? When did you provide this information to Edward Jones originally?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

10. The following questions refer to information contained in the 2011 Form 1040 for Nelva E Brunsting, prepared by Kroese & Kroese P.C., signed by you as fiduciary "Under penalties of perjury".

(a) Line 15a IRA distributions = \$58,792 / 15b Taxable amount = \$58,792. On February 24, 2010, Mother executed a Change of Beneficiary Designations for IRA Account at Edward Jones, designating the five of us as "beneficiaries in equal shares". A previous List of Beneficiaries under Edward Jones letterhead, dated July 23, 2009, stated the same designation. On May 23, 2011, an electronic transfer was made from the IRA account number 609-91956-1-9, to the B of A account ending in 1143, in the amount of \$54,000.

i. Were you aware of Mother's beneficiary designation for her IRA? If yes, why did you fail to follow it? If no, how could you not be?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

ii. Did you know this transaction would cause a tax liability for Mother?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) Schedule A Medical and Dental expenses are listed as \$118,893.

i. Many of the caregiver payments contained reimbursements for meals and incidental expenses purchased on behalf of our Mother. Were these reimbursements included in the caregiver costs? If so, what is the total for these reimbursements? Did the preparer know these reimbursements were included? If so, please provide support of the preparer's knowledge.

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

ii. IRS Publication 926 Household Employer's Tax Guide sets forth the rules for employment taxes. You were required to withhold and pay social security and Medicare taxes on the wages. As the employer you can choose to pay this yourself and not withhold it. Did you

withhold social security and Medicare from the caregivers paychecks? If no, why not? Did you pay 13.3% of gross wages on behalf of the caregivers to the IRS? If no, why not? Did you issue a W-2 to each caregiver? If no, why not?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(c) Did you seek the advice of a professional in connection with employing caregivers and related employment taxes? Did you seek the advice of a professional regarding what medical and dental expenses are deductible? If so, who did you consult with and what did they tell you?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

11. Numerous distributions have been made and some requests for distribution have been declined or opposed by you based upon your exercise of discretion.

(a) To what extent, if any, did Amy participate in your discretionary decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(b) To what extent, if any, did Carole participate in your discretionary decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(c) To what extent, if any, did Candace participate in your discretionary decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(d) To what extent, if any, did Carl participate in your discretionary decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

(e) To what extent, if any, did Candace Freed participate in your discretionary decisions?

RESPONSE: Defendants objects to this interrogatory as it exceeds the interrogatory limitations in the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

* * * * *