

This agreed order completed the apparent disappearance of “federal Plaintiff Curtis” and completed her conversion into “probate court Defendant Curtis”, a “nominal” defendant of Carl individually and a “nominal” defendant of the Estate of Nelva Brunsting.

Plaintiff terminated Ostrom when data mining revealed the conversion agreement. Unfortunately, the damage had already been done. Plaintiff was left without a pending lawsuit and everything that followed was a game of attrition, obstruction, evasion, intimidation, and abuse, but nothing that could be legitimately called litigation. Ostrom did not surrender the file when terminated and an examination of the docket reveals that he never even bothered to file an appearance in the state court.

## VIII. CONCLUSION

Carl Brunsting is a cross plaintiff, not a co-plaintiff. Citation to involuntary Plaintiff Carl Brunsting was not issued, served or waived. An involuntary plaintiff was not added to the above styled action and diversity was not polluted. The record was never certified for transfer to the state court, was never transferred to the state court and was never received by the state court. Candace Louise Curtis vs. Anita and Amy Brunsting No. 4:12-cv-592 never left this court as a matter of law or as a matter of fact.

November 11, 2019 marked the eighth year since the passing of the last Settlor, when rights in property vested equally in each of the five beneficiaries, and the eighth consecutive year that not one dime has been distributed to any income beneficiary of the Brunsting trusts.

February 27, 2020 marked eight years since trust beneficiary Candace Curtis filed suit against Anita and Amy Brunsting in the Southern District of Texas seeking required accounting