

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

CANDICE LOUISE CURTIS, *ET AL.* §  
§  
VS. §  
§ Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-01969  
CANDACE KUNZ-FREED, *ET AL.* §  
§  
§

**DEFENDANTS JUDGE CHRISTINE RIDDLE BUTTS, JUDGE CLARINDA COMSTOCK & TONY BAIAMONTE’S REPLY TO PLAINTIFFS’ RESPONSE TO DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(1) and (6)**

TO THE HONORABLE JUDGE ALFRED H. BENNETT:

Defendants, the Honorable Judges Christine Riddle Butts and Clarinda Comstock and substitute Court Reporter Tony Baiamonte (collectively, “Harris County Defendants”) file this Reply to Plaintiffs’ Response to their Motion to Dismiss and would respectfully show the Court as follows:

**Plaintiffs fail to controvert the facts that belie jurisdiction**

Plaintiffs contend the “only facts under consideration” in the subject Motion to Dismiss are *judicial acts* -- those taken by Judge Comstock in deciding “what gets set for hearing and when, and what does not find it way to the calendar.” [Doc. 57, ¶¶ 33-34]. Instead of addressing the complete lack of subject matter jurisdiction by this Court, Plaintiffs instead contend the probate court had no subject matter jurisdiction over the underlying probate proceeding. [Doc. 57, ¶¶ 37-38; 41-42]. *Plaintiff Curtis* sought remand of her prior federal suit *to the state probate court*. Plaintiffs then attempt to bootstrap this nonsensical argument to render immunity void in the

present case.

Plaintiff Munson's response to his lack of standing is he was "compelled to combat this public corruption at great personal expense in time and resources." [Doc. 57, ¶ 51]. This does not confer standing.

Lacking any evidence of any conspiracy or any injury, Plaintiffs contend the "mere fact of the attempt to extort is sufficient." [Doc. 57, ¶ 52]. This argument, unsupported by any legal authority likewise fails.

**Failure to be "satisfied" with a response is not actionable**

In response to the argument that Plaintiffs have failed to state a claim against substitute Court Reporter Tony Baiamonte, Plaintiffs contend that "Munson spoke with Mr. Baiamonte and *was not satisfied with the answer* to inquiries regarding unavailability of a transcript for September 10, 2015." [Doc. 57, ¶ 66] (emphasis added). Apparently, Mr. Baiamonte was sued for the singular reason that he "promised to reply with an email" and when that was not received, he was "added to this complaint." [Doc. 57, ¶ 67]. Not only are the claims against Mr. Baiamonte frivolous, they are certainly sanctionable.

**Conclusion & Prayer**

Plaintiffs wrongly believe that following a "form" is all they need to do to meet the stringent requirements of a RICO claim. [Doc. 57, ¶ 83]. Plaintiffs have not met the legal standard to bring a claim under RICO or any other state law. Harris County Defendants are entitled to dismissal as a matter of law, because the claims against the Honorable Judges are barred by judicial, official and governmental immunity. Likewise, the claims against Tony Baiamonte are barred by governmental, qualified and official immunity.

Harris County Defendants are entitled to dismissal on these additional grounds: (1) the Complaint fails to state a claim sufficient to meet the requirements of Rules 8 and 9(b), (2) the Complaint fails to state a RICO claim or RICO conspiracy claim against the Harris County Defendants, (3) the Complaint fails to allege standing under RICO, (4) the Complaint fails to allege a conspiracy, (5) the Complaint is not plausible, (6) the Complaint fails to plausibly allege the existence of an "enterprise" or "association-in-fact," and (7) the Complaint is frivolous.

Plaintiffs have failed to present any facts, argument or legal authority to refute these grounds for dismissal and the Harris County Defendants pray the Court grant their Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiffs' Verified Complaint for Damages [Doc. 1] with prejudice, sanction the Plaintiffs for filing a frivolous and groundless lawsuit, and award the Harris County Defendants such other and further relief, at law or in equity, to which they may show themselves to be justly entitled.

**Dated: October 17, 2016.**

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Laura Beckman Hedge

**Laura Beckman Hedge**

Assistant County Attorney

**ATTORNEY-IN-CHARGE**

Texas State Bar No. 00790288

Federal Bar No. 23243

[laura.hedge@cao.hctx.net](mailto:laura.hedge@cao.hctx.net)

1019 Congress, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor

Houston, Texas 77002

Telephone: (713) 274-5137

Facsimile: (713) 755-8924

**ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANTS, JUDGE  
CHRISTINE RIDDLE BUTTS, JUDGE  
CLARINDA COMSTOCK & TONY  
BAIAMONTE**

**OF COUNSEL:**

VINCE RYAN,  
HARRIS COUNTY ATTORNEY

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument has been served on all counsel of record in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on this the 17<sup>th</sup> day of October, 2016, via ECF.

Candace Louise Curtis  
218 Landana Street  
American Canyon, CA 94503

Jason Ostrom  
Ostrom Sain LLP  
5020 Montrose Blvd., Suite 310  
Houston, Texas 77006

Rik Wayne Munson  
218 Landana Street  
American Canyon, CA 94503

Cory S. Reed  
Thompson Coe Cousins Irons  
One Riverway, Suite 1600  
Houston, Texas 77056

Martin Samuel Schexnayder  
Winget, Spadafora & Schwartzberg LLP  
Two Riverway, Suite 725  
Houston, Texas 77056

Stephen A. Mendel  
The Mendel Law Firm, L.P.  
1155 Dairy Ashford, Suite 104  
Houston, Texas 77079

Rafe A. Schaefer  
Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP  
1301 McKinney  
Houston, Texas 77010

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

Anita Brunsting  
203 Bloomingdale Circle  
Victoria, Texas 77904

Amy Brunsting  
2582 Country Ledge Drive  
New Braunfels, Texas 78132

/s/ Laura Beckman Hedge  
Laura Beckman Hedge