Exhibit 2

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

DEFENDANTS' FIRST AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFF'S FIRST REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

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 196, TEXAS RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE, Defendants **CANDACE L. KUNZ-FREED AND VACEK & FREED, PLLC F/K/A THE VACEK LAW FIRM, PLLC** hereby submits their First Amended Objections and Responses to Plaintiff's First Request for Production.

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@thomspsoncoe.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

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 1: All agreements with Elmer Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 2: All agreements with Nelva Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 3: All agreements with Anita Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 4: All agreements with Amy Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 5: All agreements with Carole Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants object to

this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 6: All joint defense agreements with any party concerning the Brunsting Trust dispute.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 7: All invoices for services provided or expenses incurred on behalf of Elmer and/or Nelva Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 8: All documents reflecting payments made on the invoices described in number 7 above.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 9: All invoices for services provided or expenses incurred on behalf of Anita and/or Amy Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 10: All documents reflecting payments made on the invoices described in number 9 above.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 11: All invoices for services provided or expenses incurred on behalf of any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 12: All documents reflecting payments made on the invoices described in number 11 above.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 13: All correspondence, including emails, with Elmer and/or Nelva Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 14: All correspondence, including emails, with Anita Brunsting prior to the establishment, if any, of an attorney client relationship with her.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 15: All correspondence, including emails, with Amy Brunsting prior to the establishment, if any, of an attorney client relationship with her.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 16: All correspondence, including emails, with Carole Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 17: All correspondence, including emails, with Carl and/or Drina Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 18: All correspondence, including emails, with Carl Brunsting's daughter, Marta.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 19: All correspondence, including emails, with any third parties, other than your attorney, about Nelva Brunsting, any other member of the Brunsting family, and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 20: All drafts of documents prepared by Vacek & Freed for Nelva Brunsting's signature.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 21: Originals of all documents signed by Nelva, Elmer, Anita, Amy, Candy, Carole, or Carl Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced. The originals will be made available at the offices of Defendants' counsel at a reasonable and mutually agreeable date and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 22: Originals of all documents notarized by Candace Freed involving Elmer, Nelva, Anita, Amy, Candy, Carole, or Carl Brunsting and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced. The originals will be made available at the offices of Defendants' counsel at a reasonable and mutually agreeable date and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 23: Originals of all documents notarized or witnessed by anyone at Vacek & Freed, PLLC other than Candace Freed which involve Elmer, Nelva, Anita, Amy, Candy, Carole, or Carl Brunsting and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced. The originals will be made available at the offices of Defendants' counsel at a reasonable and mutually agreeable date and time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 24: All opinion letters or reports provided concerning Elmer, Nelva, Amy, Anita, Candy, Carole, or Carl Brunsting or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 25: All opinion letters or reports sought or received from any third parties concerning Elmer, Nelva, Amy, Anita, Candy, Carole, or Carl Brunsting or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 26: All joint representation or conflict of interest disclosures provided to Elmer, Nelva, Anita and/or Amy Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause,

is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 27: All documents establishing your attorney/client relationship with Elmer and/or Nelva.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, and overbroad. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 28: All documents terminating your attorney/client relationship with Nelva.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 29: All documents establishing your attorney/client relationship with Anita, either individually or as trustee of any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 30: All documents terminating your attorney/client relationship with Anita, either individually or as trustee of any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause,

is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 31: All documents terminating your attorney/client relationship with Amy, either individually or as trustee of any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 32: All documents establishing your attorney/client relationship with Amy, either individually or as trustee of any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 33: All documents relating to any referrals of Anita and/or Amy, either individually or as trustees of any of the Brunsting Trusts, to other attorneys.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 34: All cell phone and/or long distance records and logs reflecting telephone calls with Anita, Amy, and/or Candy from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 35: All long distance records and logs reflecting faxes to Anita, Amy, and/or Candy from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 36: All logs reflecting faxes from Anita, Amy and/or Candy from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 37: All cell phone records reflecting calls with Nelva from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 38: All records reflecting 'faxes to or from Nelva from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 39: All cell phone records reflecting calls with Carl and/or Drina Brunsting from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 40: All records reflecting faxes to or from Carl and/or Drina Brunsting from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 41: All cell phone records reflecting calls with Carole Brunsting from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 42: All records reflecting faxes to or from Carole Brunsting from July 1, 2010 to the present.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 43: All investigators' reports relating to the Brunsting family and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it seeks information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it is overbroad, exceeds the scope of permissible discovery, and requires Defendants to marshal their evidence. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(c)(2). Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 44: All tape recordings and/or video recordings involving any Brunsting family member and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it seeks information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it is overbroad, exceeds the scope of permissible discovery, and requires Defendants to marshal their evidence. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(c)(2). Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 45: All photographs involving any Brunsting family member and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing. Defendants object to this request because it seeks information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of relevant evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it is overbroad, exceeds the scope of permissible discovery, and requires Defendants to marshal their evidence. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(c)(2). Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 46: All materials provided to Elmer and/or Nelva Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, and fails to specify those documents sought with reasonable particularity. Defendants object to the request as it is overly broad, calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, and is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it documents that are equally available to Plaintiff.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants could not possibly recall every material ever provided to Elmer and/or Nelva

Brunsting. Please see the responsive documents previously produced which Defendants specifically recall providing to them.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 47: All communications to beneficiaries of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 48: All calendars reflecting legal work and/or meetings or telephone conferences with any member of the Brunsting family or with any third parties concerning Brunsting family issues and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 49: All source documents used to prepare any accountings relating to assets owned by Elmer Brunsting, Nelva Brunsting and/or any of the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Please see the responsive documents previously produced.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 50: All speeches, outlines and/or materials distributed at presentations made by Vacek & Freed attorneys or employees which were attended by Elmer or Nelva Brunsting.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, harassing, and fails to specify those documents sought with reasonable particularity. Defendants object to the request as it is overly broad, calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, and is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this request because it is not limited in time.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants do not recall which presentations were attended by Elmer and/or Nelva Brunsting.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 51: All speeches, outlines and/or materials distributed at presentations made by Vacek & Freed attorneys or employees since January 1, 2008.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to the request as it is overly broad, calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, does not state with reasonable particularity what is being called for, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants will supplement related speeches, outlines and/or materials distributed at presentations in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 52: All pleadings from any cases in which you have been named as a party since January 1, 2008, other than those relating to the Brunsting Trusts.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request because it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, and harassing. Defendants also object to this request because it seeks information that is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks public information that is equally available to Plaintiff.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 53: All expert designations identifying attorneys at Vacek & Freed as experts in any cases since January 1, 2008.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 54: All opinions or expert reports concerning fiduciary or trust issues prepared by any attorney with Vacek & Freed since January 1, 2008.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 55: All designations of experts, reports prepared by experts, and depositions of experts in cases in which you have been named as a party since January 1, 2008.

RESPONSE: Defendants object that this request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, and harassing. Defendants object to the request as it calls for material wholly irrelevant to this cause, is a mere fishing expedition and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Defendants object to this request because it assumes facts not in evidence. Defendants further object to this request to the extent it seeks information protected by the attorney-client privilege. Defendants object to this request to the extent it seeks confidential and private information of person(s) who are not parties to this lawsuit. Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories, and thereby invades the work product privilege.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objects, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants have no documents responsive to this request at this time.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION NO. 56: All exhibits you plan to offer in the trial of this case.

RESPONSE: Defendants object to this request on the grounds that it is overbroad, exceeds the scope of permissible discovery, and requires Defendants to marshal their evidence. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(c)(2). Defendants further object to this request because it seeks, on its face, the mental impressions, opinions, and legal theories of Defendants' counsel, and thereby invades the work product privilege.

Subject to the foregoing objection and without waiving the same, Defendants respond as follows: Defendants will timely supplement such documents in accordance with the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure, if necessary.