Exhibit 1

CAUSE NO. 2013-05455

CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, INDEPENDENT EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATES OF ELMER H. BRUNSTING AND NELVA E. BRUNSTING,	§	IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
Plaintiff,	§	
V.	§	HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS
CANDACE L. KUNZ-FREED AND VACEK & FREED, PLLC F/K/A THE VACEK LAW FIRM, PLLC,	§	
Defendants.	§	164TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

DEFENDANT CANDACE L. KUNZ' FIRST AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND ANSWERS TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES

TO: **CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, INDEPENDENT EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATE OF ELMER H. BRUNSTING AND NELVA E. BRUNSTING,** Plaintiff, by and through his attorney of record, Bobbie G. Bayless, Bayless & Stokes, 2931 Ferndale, Houston, Texas 77098.

Pursuant to Rule 197, TEXAS RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Defendants **CANDACE L. KUNZ** hereby submits her First Amended Objections and Answers to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMPSON, COE, COUSINS & IRONS, L.L.P.

By: _____

Zandra E. Foley
State Bar No. 24032085
Cory S. Reed
State Bar No. 24076640
One Riverway, Suite 1600
Houston, Texas 77056
Telephone: (713) 403-8200
Telecopy: (713) 403-8299
E-Mail: zfoley@thompsoncoe.com
E-Mail: creed@thompsoncoe.com

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS, CANDACE L. KUNZ-FREED AND VACEK & FREED, PLLC F/K/A THE VACEK LAW FIRM, PLLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that pursuant to the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, on this the 4th day of March, 2014, a true and correct copy of this document has been forwarded by certified mail, facsimile and/or e-filing to counsel:

Bobbie G. Bayless
Bayless & Stokes
2931 Ferndale
Houston, Texas 77098

_____
Cory S. Reed

INTERROGATORIES

INTERROGATORY NO. 1: Provide any cell phone numbers you have had since July 1, 2010 and identify the company providing cell phone service for each such number.

ANSWER: Defendant further objects to the request on the grounds of undue burden, harassment, irrelevancy, and violation of confidentiality and rights of privacy of Defendant and it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it constitutes an unfair prejudicial invasion of Defendant's proprietary interest, personal, constitutional, and property rights absent probative value to the issues of this case. The unfairness far outweighs any probative value.

Subject to the foregoing objection and without waiving the same, Defendant answers as follows: Since July 1, 2010 my cell phone number has been (281) 217-0013.

INTERROGATORY NO. 2: Identify the company providing your long distance service both at work and at home since July 1, 2010.

ANSWER: Defendant further objects to the request on the grounds of undue burden, harassment, irrelevancy, and violation of confidentiality and rights of privacy of Defendant and it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it constitutes an unfair prejudicial invasion of Defendant's proprietary interest, personal, constitutional, and property rights absent probative value to the issues of this case. The unfairness far outweighs any probative value.

Subject to the foregoing objection and without waiving the same, Defendant answers as follows: Since July 1, 2010 the provider of my long distance service at home has been AT&T and at the office has been Cbeyond, Inc.

INTERROGATORY NO. 3: Provide all email addresses you have had since July 1, 2010 and identify the internet service provider for all such addresses.

ANSWER: Defendant further objects to the request on the grounds of undue burden, harassment, irrelevancy, and violation of confidentiality and rights of privacy of Defendant and it is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, it constitutes an unfair prejudicial invasion of Defendant's proprietary interest, personal, constitutional, and property rights absent probative value to the issues of this case. The unfairness far outweighs any probative value.

Subject to the foregoing objection and without waiving the same, Defendant answers as follows: Since July 1, 2010 I have used Candace@vacek.com and freedcandace@sbcglobal.net.

INTERROGATORY NO. 4: If you contend Nelva Brunsting had capacity at each time after July 1, 2010 when she signed documents prepared by Vacek & Freed, state all actions you took to insure her capacity.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal its evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: As I do for all of my clients, I met with Ms. Nelva Brunsting in-person and discussed all of the documents prior to her signing them. Before she actually signed any of the documents I ensured they were properly drafted as she requested.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5: If you contend Nelva Brunsting lost capacity at some point after July 1, 2010, state when that occurred, how it was determined she lacked capacity, what documents it prevented her from signing, and all facts indicating her lack of capacity at that point.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: At no time before or after July 1, 2010 have I ever stated that Ms. Brunsting lost capacity.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6: Please indicate all steps taken to ensure that Nelva Brunsting was not unduly influenced by other parties in connection with documents prepared by Vacek & Freed after Elmer Brunsting's death.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: As I do for all of my clients, I met with Ms. Brunsting in-person and discussed all of the documents prior to her signing them. Before she actually signed any of the documents I ensured they were properly drafted as she requested. I do not think/believe Ms. Brunsting was influenced by other parties, because at no time were any material changes made in the disposition of her estate plan with respect to the beneficiaries.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7: Describe all steps taken after July 1, 2010 to ensure that the beneficiaries of the Brunsting Trusts were treated impartially.

ANSWER: Defendant objects that this interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and fails to specify the information sought with reasonable particularity. Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: Ms. Brunsting had a general power of appointment over the Survivor's Trust assets and a Limited Power of Appointment over the Decedent's Trust assets among the joint descedents of Elmer and Nelva. These power of appointments allowed her to include or exclude descendants of both Nelva and Elmer Brunsting from the assets. No notice is required to be given if she had exercised these limited and general powers of appointment. Notwithstanding, at one point in time, Ms. Brunsting requested that I draft documents removing one of her grandchildren as a remainder beneficiary. After further discussion, Ms. Brunsting decided not to sign the power of appointment.

INTERROGATORY NO. 8: Describe all steps taken to ensure that the beneficiaries of the Brunsting Trusts were properly informed concerning the terms and activities of the Brunsting Trusts after Elmer Brunsting died.

ANSWER: Defendant objects that this interrogatory is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unduly burdensome, and fails to specify the information sought with reasonable particularity. Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: Ms. Brunsting had a general power of appointment over the Survivor's Trust assets and a Limited Power of Appointment over the Decedent's Trust assets. These powers of appointments allowed her to include or exclude descendants of both Nelva and Elmer Brunsting from the assets. No notice was required to be given if she had exercised these powers of appointment. Ms. Brunsting was the primary beneficiary of both the Decedent's Trust and the Survivor's Trust until her passing. Upon her death, I provided the Successor Trustees with a document titled "I'm a Trustee Now What." This document provided the Successor Trustees with information related to their fiduciary duties as an acting trustee and accounting requirements. It would be the Successor Trustee(s) responsibility to keep the beneficiaries informed of the terms and activities of the Trust according to the terms of the Trust.

INTERROGATORY NO. 9: Describe all steps taken to ensure that Nelva Brunsting's interests were protected both before and after she resigned as trustee.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: As I do for all of my clients, I met with Ms. Brunsting in-person and discussed all of the documents prior to her signing them. Before she actually signed any of the documents I ensured they were properly drafted as she requested. Specifically, I explained to Ms. Brunsting the effect of the resignation and that the resignation was revocable and could be reversed if she later desired. Also, as a matter of course, trustees are advised of their fiduciary duty to the beneficar(ies) and their duty to account for trust assets. Trustees are advised to be familiar with and defer to the trust documents.

INTERROGATORY NO. 10: Describe all steps taken to ensure that the assets of the Brunsting Trusts were preserved after July I, 2010.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: I did not take any steps to preserve the Trust assets. It is one of the duties of the Trusee(s) to preserve the assets of the trust.

INTERROGATORY NO. 11: Describe all steps taken to determine the nature and values of the assets owned by Elmer Brunsting, Nelva Brunsting, or by any of the Brunsting Trusts at the time of Elmer Brunsting's death and identify every person providing information concerning the value and existence of assets.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: After the death of a Grantor, the remaining trustee or successor trustee may engage my firm to assist in the identification of assets, titling, and if recommended or desired, implement tax planning and file federal estate tax return, if necessary. In this case, Ms. Brunsting did retain our firm to advise on the administration of the Trust and to implement the tax planning, including the funding of a credit shelter trust. In fact, I met with Ms. Brunsting a minimum of three times to discuss the value and existence of assets. Date of death values are/were obtained from brokers, appraisers, tax preparers, and banks, as well as the internet, evaluation programs and monthly account statements provided by Ms. Brunsting herself. These values are/were used to determine proper allocation among trusts and then are divided according to the terms of the trust agreement, State law and Trustee discretion. In this case, asset information was obtained from the following persons or companies:

Rich Rikkers
Bennie K. Jans, Broker at Jans Real Estate
Darlene at Edward Jones
Nelva Brunsting
Harris County Appraisal District
Anita Brunsting
Kelley Blue Book
John Hancock: Donna Vickers
Securian: Erin Nuccum
BNY Mellon
Computershare
Metlife: Clare Cook, Douglas Uhling
Ohio State Life Insurance Co
ChaseMellon Shareholder Services
Bank of America
BlueBonnett Credit Union

INTERROGATORY NO. 12: Describe all steps taken to determine the nature and values of the assets owned by the Brunsting Trusts at the time of Nelva Brunsting's resignation as trustee and identify every person providing information concerning the value and existence of assets.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: I did not take any steps to determine the nature and value of the assets owned by the Trusts at the time of Ms. Brunsting's resignation as trustee, and I was requested or engaged to do so. One of the duties of the Successor Trustee would have been to determine the Trusts assets.

INTERROGATORY NO. 13: Describe all steps taken to determine the nature and values of the assets owned by Elmer Brunsting's estate, Nelva Brunsting, or by any of the Brunsting Trusts at the time of Nelva Brunsting's death, and identify every person providing information concerning the value and existence of assets.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks to limit future deposition and/or trial testimony by requesting Defendant to answer this question without any limitation when the information would be better elicited through deposition and/or trial testimony. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: After the death of a Grantor, the remaining trustee or successor trustee may engage my firm to assist in the identification of assets, titling, and if recommended or desired, implement tax planning and file federal estate tax return, if necessary. Date of death values are obtained from brokers, appraisers, tax preparers, and banks, as well as the internet, evaluation programs and monthly account statements. These values are used to determine proper allocation among trusts and then are to be divided according to the terms of the trust agreement. In this case, asset information was obtained from the following persons or companies:

Anita Brunsting
Amy Brunsting
Carol Brunsting
Candace Curtis
Bank of America Statements
Houston Association of Realtors
Harris County Appraisal District
BNY Mellon
Bluebonnett Credit union
Internal Revenue Services
Lincoln Financial Group
Edward Jones
Doug Williams
Kally Mouw, Certified Appraiser

INTERROGATORY NO. 14: Specify the dates and locations of all meetings any representative of Vacek & Freed had with Nelva Brunsting after July 1, 2010 and identify all parties attending such meetings.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: I met with Ms. Brunsting in her residence on December 21, 2010. At this time I cannot recall everyone present, but believe remember Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting, and Carole Brunsting, along with a caregiver to have been present.

INTERROGATORY NO. 15: Specify the date of every telephone conference any representative of Vacek & Freed had with Nelva Brunsting after July 1, 2010 and identify any other parties participating in each telephone conference.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: The following conference calls were conducted between Ms. Brunsting and a representative of Vacek & Freed after July 1, 2010:

October 7, 2010 (am) – Candace Kunz-Freed and Nelva Brunsting. Carol Brunsting was on the telephone for part of the conversation.
October 7, 2010 (pm) – Candace Kunz-Freed and Nelva Brunsting.
October 11, 2010 – Summer Peoples and Nelva Brunsting.
October 11, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed, Susan Vacek, and Nelva Brunsting.
October 14, 2010 – Summer Peoples and Nelva Brunsting.
October 25, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed, Carol Brunsting, Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting, and Candace Curtis.

It is possible there more telephone calls, but these are all of the conference calls that I can recall based on my notes up to the time Nelva resigned.

INTERROGATORY NO. 16: Specify the date of every telephone conference any representative of Vacek & Freed had with Anita Brunsting after July 1, 2010 and identify any other parties participating in each telephone conference.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: The following conference calls were conducted between Anita Brunsting and a representative of Vacek & Freed after July 1, 2010 and up to the time Nelva resigned:

July 20, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed and Anita Brunsting.
October 6, 2010 – Candace Kuntz-Freed and Anita Brunsting.
October 11, 2010 – Summer Peoples and Anita Brunsting.

October 25, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed, Carol Brunsting, Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting, and Candace Curtis.

It is possible there more telephone calls, but these are all of the conference calls that I can recall based on my notes up to the time Nelva resigned.

INTERROGATORY NO. 17: Specify the date of every telephone conference any representative of Vacek & Freed had with Amy Brunsting after July 1, 2010 and identify any other party participating in the call.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence. Defendant further objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: The following conference calls were conducted between Amy Brunsting and a representative of Vacek & Freed after July 1, 2010 and up to the time Nelva resigned:

October 25, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed, Carol Brunsting, Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting, and Candace Curtis.

It is possible there more telephone calls, but these are all of the conference calls that I can recall based on my notes up to the time Nelva resigned..

INTERROGATORY NO. 18: Specify the date of every telephone conference any representative of Vacek & Freed had with Carole Brunsting after July 1, 2010 until the present and identify any other party participating in the call.

ANSWER: Defendant objects to this interrogatory because it assumes facts not in evidence. Moreover, Defendant objects to this interrogatory for the reason it requires Defendant to marshal her evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendant answers as follows: The following conference calls were conducted between Amy Brunsting and a representative of Vacek & Freed after July 1, 2010:

October 7, 2010 (am) – Candace Kunz-Freed and Nelva Brunsting. Carol Brunsting was on the telephone for part of the conversation.
October 13, 2010 – Candace Kuntz-Freed and Carol Brunsting.
October 25, 2010 – Candace Kunz-Freed, Carol Brunsting, Anita Brunsting, Amy Brunsting, and Candace Curtis.

It is possible there more telephone calls, but these are all of the conference calls that I can recall based on my notes up to the time Nelva resigned.