

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
 HOUSTON DIVISION

Curtis, et al	§	
Plaintiffs	§	
	§	Civil Action No. 4:16-CV-01969
v	§	
	§	The Honorable Alfred Bennett
Kunz-Freed, et al	§	
Defendants	§	

**PLAINTIFFS’ ANSWER TO DEFENDANT NEAL SPIELMAN’S MOTIONS TO DISMISS PURSUANT TO FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE 12(b)(1), 12(b)(6) AND 9(b)**  
**Table of Contents**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 2

II. CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY ..... 2

III. ISSUES RAISED ..... 3

IV. PLAINTIFF’S REPLY ..... 4

    The Probate Matter ..... 4

    The Trust Matter..... 5

    Defendant’s Challenges D, E and F ..... 6

    Failure to State a Claim ..... 7

    Plaintiffs Lack Privity with Defendant Spielman..... 7

V. STANDING..... 8

    Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis ..... 8

    Plaintiff Rik Wayne Munson..... 9

VI. TANGIBLE PROPERTY IS NOT THE THING ITSELF..... 9

VII. IMMUNITY ..... 11

VIII. CONCLUSION ..... 11

**Cases**

Curtis v Brunsting 710 F.3d 406..... 3, 4

Meza v. General Battery Corp., 908 F.2d 1262 (5th Cir. 1990)..... 8

**Other Authorities**

Blackstone’s Commentaries on the Laws of England ..... 8

**I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Before the Court are motions to dismiss filed by Defendant Neal Spielman. Docket entry 39 is a Rule 12(b)(6) Motion and docket entry 40 is a Rule 12(b)(1) Motion.

2. Plaintiffs incorporate and adopt by this reference the Complaint (Dkt 1 and 26), the previously filed Rule 12 Motions, Dkts 19, 20, 23, 25, 30, 35, 36, 38 and 53 and Plaintiffs’ replies thereto, Dkt 33, 34, 41, 45, 62, 57 and 65, as if fully restated herein.

3. Plaintiffs further request this Honorable Court take judicial notice of the following related public records:

- a. Curtis v Brunsting C.A. 4:12-cv-592 TXSD 2/27/2012
- b. Carl Henry Brunsting Executor for the Estates of Elmer and Nelva Brunsting v. Candace Freed & Vacek & Freed, Harris Co. District Court CA No. 2013-05455;
- c. Carl Henry Brunsting Executor for the Estates of Elmer and Nelva Brunsting CA No, 2012-14538 164TH Judicial District Court of Harris County, Texas;
- d. Carl Henry Brunsting Individually and as Executor for the Estates of Elmer and Nelva Brunsting, Harris Co. Probate No. 4 CA No 412248, 412249, 412249-401, 412249-402

**II. CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY**

4. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the “Standards of Review”, “Contextual Summary”, “History of the Controversy”, and “History of the Litigation” (Dkt 33 sections I, II, III and IV) from Plaintiffs’ response to Motions to Dismiss by Defendants Vacek & Freed, (Dkt 19 & 20) as if fully restated herein. In short:

5. Curtis v Brunsting 4:12-cv-0592 was filed in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas on February 27, 2012 under diversity jurisdiction, was dismissed under the “Probate Exception” to federal diversity jurisdiction March 8, 2012 and went to the Fifth Circuit for review.

6. The Fifth Circuit held that Curtis v Brunsting 4:12-cv-0592 is a lawsuit related only to the Brunsting inter vivos trusts, not property of any estate but the heir in fact, and does not come within the purview of the probate exception to federal diversity jurisdiction, *Curtis v Brunsting* 710 F.3d 406 (Jan 2013).

7. A remand to Harris County Probate Court No. 4 was facilitated by Defendant Jason Ostrom and Plaintiff Curtis now returns the matter to the federal Court with a separate complaint.

### **III. ISSUES RAISED**

Defendant argues:

- A. Plaintiffs are involved in a bitterly contested “Probate Matter” involving a dispute between the Brunsting siblings over the administration of their late parents' estate. (Dkt 39 & 40 Pages 1 unnumbered paragraphs 2);
- B. Plaintiffs’ claims are incomprehensible conspiracy theories;
- C. Plaintiff is avoiding a court ordered mediation;
- D. Plaintiffs’ claims are barred by Attorney Immunity;
- E. Plaintiffs fail to plead particular acts of fraud;
- F. Plaintiffs fail to plead particular conduct of the Defendant;
- G. Plaintiffs lack Privity with Defendant;
- H. Plaintiffs lack proper standing;

#### IV. PLAINTIFF'S REPLY

##### The Probate Matter

8. Defendant Spielman begins both motions with an identical summary in which he states:

*“This case stems from “conspiracy” claims and other allegations against lawyers, judges, and court personnel involved in a bitterly contested probate matter in Harris County Probate Court No. 4. The Plaintiffs “claims,” which are nearly incomprehensible...”*

9. In his BACKGROUND section he states:

*“Plaintiffs’ suit arises from a case pending in Harris County Probate Court Number 4, Cause No. 412.249-401, Carl Henry Brunsting et al. v. Anita Kay Brunsting, et al., (“the Probate Matter”). The Probate Matter involves a dispute between the Brunsting siblings over the administration over their late parents’ estate”.*

10. Given that both motions are built entirely upon this erroneous factual ground it is unnecessary to address the supporting authorities.

11. The record will show the case before the Court involves claims against Defendants in their individual capacities, arises out of a probate court, and does not arise from a controversy over the administration of any “estate”.

12. These matters were res judicata before any state court actions were even filed.<sup>1</sup>

13. Claims were first filed in Harris County Probate No. 4 April 9, 2013, the same day a federal judge issued an injunction against Anita and Amy Brunsting to preserve and prevent wasting of assets of the Brunsting trusts then in the custody of a federal court. (Dkt 26-2, 26-7, 33-5, 34-6)

14. The claims filed in Harris County courts by Defendant Bayless were filed on January 29, 2013 and April 9, 2013. The Harris County District Court suit No. 2013-05455 is styled:

---

<sup>1</sup> Curtis v Brunsting 704 F.3d 406

*“CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, INDEPENDENT EXECUTOR OF THE ESTATES OF ELMER H. BRUNSTING AND NELVA E. BRUNSTING”*

15. Like Defendant Bayless, (Dkt 23) Defendant Spielman states in the opening sentence of his Rule 12(b)(1) motion that the “Probate Matter” is styled “*Carl Henry Brunsting et al. v. Anita Kay Brunsting, et al.,*” (“*the Probate Matter*”). The Harris County Probate suit (412249-401) is actually styled as Docket entry 34 Exhibits 5 and 7 show:

*CARL HENRY BRUNSTING, individually and as independent executor of the estates of Elmer H. Brunsting and Nelva E. Brunsting”*

16. It is important to note that federal Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis is named a “Nominal Defendant” in Bayless, exclusively trust related Probate Court suit, filed on the same day Plaintiff Curtis obtained a protective Order in the federal Court regarding the same Trust.

17. Both state court petitions raise only issues related to the Brunsting trusts and both state court actions were filed while the Brunsting trust res was in the custody of a federal court.

18. The Fifth Circuit noted that the wills of both decedents (Dkt 41-3 and 41-4), bequeathed everything to one heir and that the only heir in fact to either estate was “the trust”.

## **The Trust Matter**

*Curtis v. Brunsting*

*United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit*

*January 9, 2013, Filed No. 12-20164*

*Reporter*

*704 F.3d 406; 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 524; 2013 WL 104918*

*Procedural Posture*

*Plaintiff, the beneficiary of a trust, sued defendant co-trustees of the trust, for breach of fiduciary duty, extrinsic fraud, constructive fraud, and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, concluding that the case fell within the probate exception to federal diversity jurisdiction. The beneficiary appealed.*

*Overview*

*The court found that the case was outside the scope of the probate exception under the first step of the inquiry because the trust was not property within the custody of the probate court. Because the assets in a living or inter vivos trust were not property of the estate at the time of decedent's death, having been transferred to the trust years before, the trust was not in the custody of the probate court and as such the probate exception was inapplicable to disputes concerning administration of the trust. The record also indicated that there would be no probate of the trust's assets upon the death of the surviving spouse. Finding no evidence that the trust was subject to the ongoing probate proceedings, the case fell outside the scope of the probate exception.*

*Outcome*

*The district court below erred in dismissing the case for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction.*

**Defendant's Challenges D, E and F**

D. Plaintiffs' Claims Are Barred by "Attorney Immunity" Doctrine;

E. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead Particular Acts of Fraud;

F. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead Particular Conduct of the Defendant;

19. The United States Attorney's Resource Manual at CRM 2403 defines Extortion by Force, Violence, or Fear as follows:

*In order to prove a violation of Hobbs Act extortion by the wrongful use of actual or threatened force, violence, or fear, the following questions must be answered affirmatively:*

- 1. Did the defendant induce or attempt to induce the victim to give up property or property rights?*
- 2. Did the defendant use or attempt to use the victim's reasonable fear of physical injury or economic harm in order to induce the victim's consent to give up property?*

20. Defendant Spielman's performance on March 9, 2016 (Dkt 26 and exhibit 26-16) inarguably answers these inquiries in the affirmative. Plaintiffs' allegations regarding Mr. Spielman are articulated in the Complaint with the specificity required by rule 9(b).

21. Mr. Spielman's specific threats of injury to property rights if Curtis did not mediate a settlement agreement, using a knowingly false instrument, is conduct entirely foreign to the

duties of an attorney and the mere attempt constitutes the tort and crime of extortion whether successful or not.

### **Failure to State a Claim**

22. Defendant Spielman claims to have been involved in the very actions described above and claims to have been representing Defendant Amy Brunsting in a “Probate Matter”.

23. Plaintiff points only to the record of those proceedings in answer to each motion to dismiss and Defendant Spielman cannot claim to have been both counsel and ignorant of the facts contained in those records.

24. If it is the interpretation of those fact records that Defendant Spielman wishes to argue, a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim is neither the proper vehicle nor the proper stage of the proceedings for arguing his contrary facts.

### **Plaintiffs Lack Privity with Defendant Spielman**

25. The impregnable citadel of Privity. Privity is a legal expression defining a close, mutual, or successive relationship to the same right of property or the power to enforce a promise or warranty.

26. While the Doctrine of Privity is an important concept in contract law, a deliberate intent to defraud is not a good faith error in judgement and like the Attorney Immunity Doctrine, the Privity Doctrine is intended to preserve the integrity of the client professional relationship and in the case of an attorney, to provide confidence in one’s ability to be a zealous advocate for his client's position. The protection of the Doctrine of Privity does not apply as an impunity shield for conduct that is both tortious and criminal resulting in injuries to third parties.

27. Because Privity is actually a term to summarize a conclusion that one party was precluded, it may exist for the purpose of determining one legal question but not another

depending on the circumstances and legal doctrines at issue." *Meza v. General Battery Corp.*, 908 F.2d 1262 (5th Cir. 1990).

## V. STANDING

### **Plaintiff Candace Louise Curtis**

28. Defendant's challenge to Plaintiff Curtis' standing relies entirely upon erroneous juristic concepts, wayward fact assertions and misplaced logic.

29. Rights are of two divisions. First are those annexed to the persons of men called *Jura personarum* or the rights of men and second is the right to control external objects over which man may obtain a dominion and this is called *Jura rerum* or the right of things<sup>2</sup>. Property is not the thing itself but the interest one acquires in dominion and control over the thing.

30. Plaintiff Curtis is a *cestui que trust*, also known as a beneficiary. Her property interest is a one-fifth part of the undiminished *res* of *inter vivos* trusts as a matter of equity.

31. A beneficial interest in the assets of an *inter vivos* trust is property and not inheritance expectancy. The concerted effort to deprive Plaintiff Curtis of the enjoyment of her very tangible trust property, continuing for a period of five years, is an injury in fact.

32. Plaintiff Curtis began this journey with no legal education of any kind but knew full well by the time that her mother passed that her sisters, Defendants Anita and Amy Brunsting, had been plotting and were actively engaged in trying to deprive her and her disabled brother Carl Brunsting of beneficial interests in the Brunsting trust *res*. It now appears Carole Brunsting was also intended to be deprived of her interest in the trust *res* as well.

---

<sup>2</sup> See Blackstone's Commentaries on the Laws of England, Book the First, Chapter I, Part III, Pg 134.



**Plaintiff Rik Wayne Munson**

33. Defendant Spielman stood before the Probate Court on March 9, 2016 talking about his fees (Dkt 26-16 pg 14 ln 20) and how “*Ms. Curtis Pro se status and her, her need to be a lawyer and her failure to appreciate what it costs, what the costs of this lawsuit are, is...*” (Dkt 26-16 page 15). Later (p. 17) Spielman talks about how it would be an insult to respond to the Motions Plaintiff Curtis filed ... “*and all of the money that that's going to cost...*” and now claims to have been an attorney participating in those proceedings, immune from consequences for his mens rea motivated acts.

34. It is interesting that Mr. Spielman spoke about the cost of this litigation, as if somehow Plaintiff Curtis does not understand the war of attrition he and his co-defendants thought they would play to deprive her of her property rights.

35. Plaintiff Curtis and Plaintiff Munson have been co-habitant partners for ten years.

36. Munson’s tireless labor and effort to defend his household is the only thing that has protected Plaintiff Curtis’ property interests from the intended hijacking.

**VI. TANGIBLE PROPERTY IS NOT THE THING ITSELF**

37. Mankind is born into the world possessing only those rights inherited from nature and it is through the institution and the natural order of family that man develops into an independent and autonomous person with knowledge and ability to defend those rights.

38. The knowledge, experience, skill and labor of a man are the only property man owns in nature by which they can obtain a dominion over other things, including those required by the necessities of life and which directly affect the quality of living in a society.

39. Munson has assisted Plaintiff Curtis in obtaining a favorable appellate opinion (Dkt 34-4) and an injunction (Dkt 26-2) and continues to help protect Plaintiff Curtis’ property rights while

also advancing matters of public interest. It is an insult that Defendants consider their worth so high and Plaintiff Munson's so low as to discount that knowledge, experience and the labor devoted to defending against their unholy assault as other than a property interest, rendering such activities and use of resources meaningless.

40. Munson, like Plaintiff Curtis has suffered personal injury as direct and proximate result of the intentional manipulation of the judicial process, multiplication of litigation and superficial pomposity of these Defendants' pretense of legitimacy.

41. The interference began when Defendant Bobbie Bayless filed her exclusively trust related claims in state courts in the name of the Estates of Elmer and Nelva Brunsting, knowing full well the Brunsting trusts were under the exclusive jurisdiction of a federal Court.

42. Munson's time is valuable and the application of his knowledge, experience and labor to these five years of litigation is and has been invaluable to Plaintiff Curtis' protection of her property rights. That effort has cost Munson invaluable and irreplaceable life property interests by diverting valuable time, energy and attention away from other life pursuits.

43. Our families and the communities in which we live have a property interest in the honest services of our public officials and licensed practitioners. There is no valid legal theory that shows public policy interests are not in any way implicated, or that public policy is not wounded by the conduct complained of before this Court.

44. Each Defendant has participated in the jurisdictional sham and the attempted extortion/mediation diversion scheme, using the Bayless vehicle to insinuate their personal interests into the private Brunsting controversy.

## VII. IMMUNITY

45. Refusal to provide government services to the public without a transfer of wealth from the private to the public sector are neither judicial nor litigious, but the very definition of public corruption.

46. Defendants appear before this Honorable Court attempting to sell their illicit “Probate Matter” wares, claiming the protection of the judicial and litigation immunity privileges when, as a matter of law, they have been engaged in neither activity.

47. Where there is no subject matter jurisdiction, there is no court and where there is no court there is no judge and no litigation. Claims of attorney and other immunities in this case rely upon facts not in evidence and Plaintiffs demand what they could never get in Harris County Probate Court, an evidentiary hearing with findings of fact and conclusions of law after hearing.

48. For these reasons the conduct of Defendant Spielman, as exemplified by the public record, is not conduct protected by any doctrines of immunity, and reference to a “*Probate Matter*” is a fraud upon this Court.

49. Defendant’s different view of the significance of facts contained in the public records in point is not plausible. Defendant does not support contrary claims with any form of competent evidence and such claims are thus not properly raised under Rules 12(b)(1) or 12(b)(6).

## VIII. CONCLUSION

50. As the case in point shows, citizens who resort to the courts to enforce rights vindicate wrongs and settle their differences, are all too often confronted by judges and attorneys with an attitude that demonstrates no regard for individual rights or the rules of law.

51. These same individuals now come before this Court claiming entitlement and asking this Court to grant them the very thing they themselves refuse others, the due process and protection of law.

52. One is loath to contemplate the dangers and likely costs of continuing to deny remedy in the face of the present pandemic of public corruption, for the only remedy left to ordinary people would be governed not by reason, but by necessity.

Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request this honorable court deny the Motions to Dismiss, Docket entries 39 and 40, filed by Defendant Neal Spielman on October 3, 2016, and hold Defendant to answer.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Candace L. Curtis

Candace L. Curtis

/s/ Rik W. Munson

Rik W. Munson

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was filed into Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-01969 and served on this 24th day of October, 2016, through the Court's CM/ECF system, which constitutes service on all parties.

/s/ Candace L. Curtis  
Candace L. Curtis

/s/ Rik W. Munson  
Rik W. Munson

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
HOUSTON DIVISION

Curtis, et al

Plaintiffs

v

Kunz-Freed, et al

Defendants

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-01969

---

**ORDER**

Upon due consideration, Defendants Rule 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) Motions to Dismiss filed on October 3, 2016, by Defendant Neal Spielman in the above styled cause (Dkt 39 and 40), should be Denied.

It is SO ORDERED

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable Alfred H Bennet  
United Stated District Judge