



From: Carole Brunsting <cbrunsting@sbcglobal.net>  
Subject: Re: Demand Letter  
To: "Drina Brunsting" <drinabrunsting@sbcglobal.net>, "Candace Curtis" <occurtis@sbcglobal.net>  
Date: Sunday, December 18, 2011, 5:48 PM

Something occurred to me this afternoon now that we are looking at the time line of how this all happened. When Mother requested the change in August to the lawyer, Mother had never even seen Carl. The lawyer never corroborated what Mother was telling her and never even tried to contact Carl to make sure Mother was not making this change without his knowledge.

Anita was the one that contacted the lawyer originally and then told Mother what to tell the attorney. I know this because I caught her in so many lies. How could Mother's lawyer who is suppose to be looking out for her best interest not even check out what was fact? Also, Mother spoke with Betty Brunsting who had the same thing 40 years ago and knew that Betty recovered so why would Mother do this with Carl's money when in Mother's mind Carl was going to recover.

This was all Anita's doing and the fact that neither Carl or Drina was contacted to at least make sure Mother was correct in her facts about Carl being ill cannot be right. Carl was with Mother and Daddy at all meetings from the beginning in 1995 and she knew Carl. But the lawyer was taking everything as truth from what Anita told her. The lawyer was doing everything Anita told her to do and was bulling Mother in the process.  
--- On Sun, 12/18/11, Candace Curtis <occurtis@sbcglobal.net> wrote:

From: Candace Curtis <occurtis@sbcglobal.net>  
Subject: Demand Letter  
To: "Carole Brunsting" <cbrunsting@sbcglobal.net>, "Drina Brunsting" <drinabrunsting@sbcglobal.net>  
Date: Sunday, December 18, 2011, 5:08 PM

Greetings,

Drina, thank you for your earlier email. You will see where I used some of the language in my letter (attached).

I also attached the "valid living trust agreement". Keep the barf bucket handy, it will make you sick if you can manage to get through it. Otherwise, please look

at page 36 at the bottom, where it talks about another one of these dated June 15, 2010. I can only assume it was for Daddy's side. Carl, do you have a copy of this?

So, basically, when Anita gave herself control over Carl's and my trust property, she not only created a conflict of interest with herself as a beneficiary, she clearly showed her fraudulent intent when she created a paradox by virtue of the Prohibition Against Contest Section on pages 22 - 24.

It works like this. When she gave herself control over our property she essentially claimed ownership, and then added no contest clauses saying that if we object to her taking our property away from us, WE LOSE IT.

Nice try Anita 

Now is the time for us to start putting together our "litigation files". The last attachment I am sending sets forth how we should go about asserting our rights. This is GREAT stuff. If you don't want to read the whole thing right now you should just go to page 35 and start with F.

Call me if you want. I'm free now that I have my demand letter out of the way.

Love you guys,

C