

38. Defendant co-conspirators, Attorneys Vacek & Freed, are sequestered in the District Court, where there is no plaintiff, and the probate Court has refused to join the suits.

39. The Defendants' attorneys and Plaintiff Brunsting's attorney have scheduled summary judgment hearings and un-scheduled those hearings, but Curtis cannot get a hearing set on dispositive motions in that Court.

40. The probate Court has clearly colluded with the lawyers to validate the 8/25/2010 QBD without an evidentiary hearing, to create delay, to avoid evidentiary hearings, to exacerbate Plaintiff's costs and to apply Hobbs Act pressure. There is a clear "stream of benefits" at play here.

41. There is no current or proper accounting and no balance sheet has ever been produced.

42. Other than an Order modifying the federal injunction, in the two years this case has been in Harris County Probate Court No. 4 there have been no evidentiary hearings and no orders or judgements have been entered on the record.

43. Rather than set dispositive motions for hearing on Plaintiff Curtis' request, Plaintiff was ordered to a second mediation, with Defendants who have established an intractable record of having no intentions of honoring any legal or moral obligations.

44. Neither the lawyers nor the probate Court will make a distinction between the trust and the estate.

45. Resolution of the litigation and distributions from the trust are being held hostage to the payment of attorneys' fees in direct defiance of this Court's express orders and the purposes for the trust.

46. Defendants absolutely refuse to deposit income into an appropriate account for the beneficiary as ordered by this Court's injunction and continue to flaunt the law in their effort to game the judicial process as hereinafter more fully appears.

#### **VI. IN THE HARRIS COUNTY PROBATE COURT**

47. Upon remand to the Harris County Probate Court, Defendants' Counsel filed a motion to modify the injunction to allow Defendants to pay the quarterly and annual taxes without the expense of petitioning the Court each time and a limited modification was granted relating only to payment of taxes and associated professional fees.

48. Jason Ostrom agreed to provide Plaintiff Curtis with a review of documents before they were filed, but did not communicate before, or even copy her after pleadings were filed. Plaintiff was forced to data mine to try to discover what was happening in the probate Court and received much of her information via email from Carl Brunsting.

49. The five Brunsting siblings then attended a mediation that ended with no prospect for resolution. Immediately thereafter, Defendants' attorneys with Mills Shirley filed a petition to be relieved as counsel of record, citing to non-specific conflicts of interest.

50. Then, without conferring and having never submitted a single invoice to Plaintiff Curtis, Jason Ostrom filed application for a distribution of \$25,000 from the trust to pay his attorney fees and Carole Brunsting's attorney, Darlene Payne Smith, objected.

51. Ostrom then filed a second motion for a distribution of \$45,000, after discussion with Curtis, and both Anita and Carole objected.

52. Anita's new counsel, Brad Featherston, argued that the trust was not liable to pay the attorney creditors of the beneficiary. (Exhibit 20: E1254-E1409) Anita attached a "version" of the alleged 8/25/2010 QBD and a copy of the 2005 Restatement.