DM DATA ENTRY PICK UP THIS DATE

PROBATE COURT 4

NO. 412,249-401

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	§	

RESPONSE TO CANDACE'S MOTION FOR DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS & RESPONSE TO CARL'S MOTION FOR DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUNDS

Defendant Anita Kay Brunsting files this response to Candace Louise Curtis' Motion for Distribution of Trust Funds and this response to Carl Brunsting's Motion for Distribution of Trust Funds and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

I. Summary of the Argument

1. Distributions to pay legal-fee creditors are not authorized by the trust and, therefore, the motions must be denied.

2. Distributions to pay legal-fee creditors are prohibited by the trust and, therefore, the motions must be denied.

3. The Court lacks jurisdiction to decide the distributions for legal-fee creditor issue because there are no allegations of fraud, misconduct, or clear abuse of discretion with respect to Candace's and Carl's request that the trust pay their attorneys' fees.

4. If the Court finds the *in terrorem* clause is enforceable, then Candace and Carl have no right to any distribution from the trust.