

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS,  
PLAINTIFF

VS.

ANITA KAY BRUNSTING,  
AMY RUTH BRUNSTING,  
AND DOES 1-100,  
DEFENDANTS

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:12-CV-00592  
JUDGE KENNETH M. HOYT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

MOTION TO REMAND

TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Comes Now, Plaintiff, Candice Louis Curtis and files this Motion to Remand pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a), and in support thereof would respectfully show as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Plaintiff filed her Original Petition bringing causes of action against Defendants Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting as Co-Trustees of the Brunsting Family Trust. Diversity jurisdiction existed between Plaintiff and Defendants.
2. Contemporaneously with this Motion, Plaintiff is filing her Motion for Leave to File First Amended Petition, which will add necessary parties to this case in order to have complete adjudication of all matters and to avoid inconsistent judgments. Necessary parties include Carl Brunsting, Executor of the Estate of Nelva Brunsting, Deceased and Carole Brunsting.
3. Plaintiff believes that the filing of the First Amended Petition and addition of necessary parties will destroy the diversity jurisdiction that is required by 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).
4. Carl Brunsting, Executor of the Estate of Nelva Brunsting, Deceased, is currently a party to

an action pending in Harris County Probate Court Number Four involving the same parties. Similar issues of fact and law are pending in that court.

## II. ARGUMENTS AND AUTHORITIES

5. Here, the interests of justice and comity with State courts counsel in favor of this Court abstaining from exercising further jurisdiction over this Action and remanding it to Harris County Probate Court Number Four.
6. The First Amended Petition seeks a declaration as to certain Trust documents, and complete relief as to this issue cannot be granted without the addition of necessary parties, which will destroy diversity jurisdiction.
7. If this Court retains this case despite the lack of diversity, it is possible that inconsistent judgments may be reached as between this Court and Harris County Probate Court Number Four where the Estate of Nelva Brunsting, Deceased is pending and where similar issues of fact and law are currently pending.
8. Because diversity jurisdiction will be destroyed via the First Amended Petition and because similar issues of fact and law are pending before Harris County Probate Court Number Four, equity mandates that this cause be remanded to Harris County Probate Court Number Four and consolidated with the cause pending under Cause Number 412,249.
9. Counsel for Defendants Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting has been consulted and is not opposed to the remand.

## IV. PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court (a) remand this cause of action to Harris County Probate Court Number Four to be consolidated into Cause Number 412,249 and (b) grant such other and further relief that the Court deems just and appropriate.

Respectfully Submitted,

OSTROM/*Sain*

A limited Liability Partnership

BY: /s/ Jason B. Ostrom

JASON B. OSTROM

(Fed. Id. #33680)

(TBA #24027710)

NICOLE K. SAIN THORNTON

(TBA #24043901)

5020 Montrose Blvd., Ste. 310

Houston, Texas 77006

713.863.8891

713.863.1051 (Facsimile)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

The undersigned hereby certifies that he has conferred with opposing counsel and they are unopposed to this motion to remand.

/s/ Jason B. Ostrom

Jason B. Ostrom

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that service on known Filing Users will be automatically accomplished through the Notice of Electronic Filing. Additionally, this document will be served by copy to any attorney-of-record for those parties in state court litigation.

/s/ Jason B. Ostrom

Jason B. Ostrom

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

CANDACE LOUISE CURTIS,  
PLAINTIFF

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

VS.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:12-CV-00592  
JUDGE KENNETH M. HOYT

ANITA KAY BRUNSTING,  
AMY RUTH BRUNSTING,  
AND DOES 1-100,  
DEFENDANTS

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO REMAND

The matter before the Court is the Plaintiff’s Motion to Remand. Plaintiff seeks remand of the case to state court on substantive and procedural grounds including a lack of complete diversity between the parties and the existence of similar questions of law and fact currently pending before Harris County Probate Court Number Four under Cause Number 412,249. The Court finds that the remand should be granted.

The Court finds that Plaintiff originally filed her Petition against Defendants Anita Brunsting and Amy Brunsting as Co-Trustees of the Brunsting Family Trust and that diversity jurisdiction existed between Plaintiff and Defendants. Plaintiff has sought and been granted leave to file her First Amended Petition, in which she has named additional necessary parties including Carl Brunsting, individually and as Executor of the Estate of Nelva Brunsting and Carole Ann Brunsting, which has destroyed diversity jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s First Amended Petition also alleges questions of law and fact similar to those currently pending in Harris County Probate Court Number Four under Cause Number 412,249, and that the possibility of inconsistent judgments exists if these questions of law and fact are not decided simultaneously. The Court further finds that no parties are

opposed to this remand and that no parties have filed any objection thereto. It is, therefore,

ORDERED that this case shall be and hereby is remanded to Harris County Probate Court Number Four, to be consolidated with the cause pending under Cause Number 412,429. It is further,

ORDERED that all Orders rendered by this Court shall carry the same force and effect through the remand that they would have had if a remand had not been ordered.

---

JUDGE PRESIDING