

Letter to John Perrott, November 28, 2014

This document is a copy of a letter to attorney John Perrott, further identified below. There should be 8 numbered pages.

The content is not of great significance but may be of interest to those with views on spousal abuse (battered women), child abuse, abuse of process, gag orders and Free Speech issues, “hacking” and felony DDOS, sexual misconduct, and other issues of social relevance.

For more information about the situation discussed herein, feel free to visit the Kiraly Gag Order Cases website at any of the following links:

<http://gracekiraly.com/>

<http://haggishell.com/>

<http://jameskiraly.org/>

<http://michaelbonetto.com/>

<http://thomaschasestutzman.com/>

<http://thomaskiraly.com/>

Date: November 28, 2014

To: [John H. Perrott](#)

STATE BAR #213080

THOMAS CHASE STUTZMAN

1625 The Alameda, Suite 626

San Jose, CA 95126

(408) 294-4600

Today, depending on how you measure things, is the third anniversary of the start of the Kiraly Gag Order Cases.

Around this day in 2011, I asked my Parents to help me with a book. It was supposed to be a positive work about relationships. But my Father, wealthy abuser Jim Kiraly of 32 La Gaviota, Pismo Beach, CA, went to the police circa the next business day.

As I understand it, the police dismissed Jim as a crank. But subsequently he hired a high-powered law firm, [Hoge Fenton](#), and spent, I'm told, possibly on the order of \$100,000 USD in a failed attempt to stop the book and take down these websites.

It would be laughable if I hadn't lost everything, including my life savings, most of the books that I'd treasured for 40 years, and my home of 25 years as part of this.

Letter to John Perrott, November 28, 2014

What's left to me now is to do what's possible to seek changes in the system. And, as part of this, to see to it that Jim Kiraly and his Son Tom Kiraly, who joined him in what amounted to gag order actions, can't hurt others in the future.

Here's a letter that I'm sending today to John Perrott, my attorney in the Kiraly Gag Order Cases. It's simply a discussion of documents, but it's included here for the sake of transparency.

As a note to attorneys in general, I consider nothing in this letter to be confidential. Additionally, I explicitly waive confidentiality for this letter.

In fact, I'm thinking about waiving attorney client privilege in its entirety. People have expressed surprise at my willingness to consider this step. However, I feel it's important that the right thing be done. The Kiralys took a procedure designed to protect battered women and used it to seek a gag order preventing discussion of an abuser's actions.

It seems sick to me. And by misusing the Law they've arguably helped to promote abuse.

If Michael Bonetto, Opposing Counsel in the cases, and John Perrott, my attorney, can be disciplined by the State Bar or at other levels, or if my abuser Jim Kiraly or his co-conspirator Tom Kiraly can be prosecuted, I'll do my part to ensure that this happens.

The Attorneys referred to in this letter include:

[Michael T. Bonetto](#)

STATE BAR #252742
HOGE, FENTON, JONES & APPEL, INC.
Sixty South Market Street, Suite 1400
San Jose, California 95113

[Thomas Chase Stutzman](#)

STATE BAR #69452
THOMAS CHASE STUTZMAN
1625 The Alameda, Suite 626
San Jose, CA 95126
(408) 294-4600

[John H. Perrott](#)

STATE BAR #213080

THOMAS CHASE STUTZMAN

1625 The Alameda, Suite 626

San Jose, CA 95126

(408) 294-4600

Dear John,

1. Good morning. I trust that your Thanksgiving holiday went well and that you enjoyed the break. I'm in receipt of a letter from you, dated November 20, 2014, which states the following:

(start of quote from attorney John Perrott)

“You left me a message stating that you wanted a copy of your file, by stating “I want my documents.” When will you stop by to pick up a copy of your file?”

(end of quote from attorney John Perrott)

This letter is a response to your letter of the 20th. If possible, read this one instead of ignoring it as you did my letter of August 1, 2014.

2. Assertions in this letter are believed to be true and correct, but they're not warranted or certified for accuracy.

3. It appears that you wrote to me, as a coincidence, on Michael Bonetto's 34th birthday.

Did you happen to send him birthday greetings? I'm not presently aware that the two of you are personal friends, but based on past letters from you, you've communicated with him intimately on prior occasions, so intimately that you're cognizant of his innermost thoughts.

4. I'd like to be transparent. Understand, therefore, that this letter and any responses may be posted publicly.

Additionally, such material may be distributed to third parties, including but not limited to past, present, or future professional associates, personal associates, organized groups, and government agencies, who may be able to provide information, to be used for [legitimate and reasonable purposes](#), related to your firm, to you personally, and to others involved in the Jim Kiraly and Tom Kiraly spousal abuse and child abuse gag-order cases.

Such material may also become part of a documentation set used to build administrative cases or criminal cases related to parties involved in the Kiraly Gag Order Cases, including but not limited to:

* Jim Kiraly of 32 La Gaviota, Pismo Beach, CA and 217 Gerry Court, Walnut Creek, CA; Vice President of [Transamerica](#) Corporation; representative of [Service Core](#) for Retired Executives; possibly around young people at [Saint John's](#) Lutheran Church, Arroyo Grande, CA and [New Life Community Church](#), Pismo Beach, CA

* Tom Kiraly of 3611 Glenview Ave, Glenview, KY; Vice President of Humana Corporation, Sheridan Healthcare, and possibly Hanger, Inc.

* Michael T. Bonetto of Hoge Fenton

* And, of course, you personally, John Perrott of [Thomas Chase Stutzman](#)

To proceed:

5. Actually, John, I've requested copies of my documents, including copies of documents that I believe you've withheld from the "file", for more than a year.

The wording of your November 20, 2014 letter suggests that the request is new. The request is not new. Your attempt to position the request as new might be considered part of a pattern of misrepresentation that you've referred to previously as "client management". But we'll come back to that subject in the future.

6. You sent me a terse letter previously, on August 22, 2014, that said essentially the same thing as your November 20, 2014 letter. Both messages disregarded, entirely, my response on August 1, 2014 to your original so-called "offer", received on August 1, 2014, to provide me with copies of my documents.

7. I refer you, as I've done before, to my response of August 1, 2014, which was posted publicly as well as sent directly to you. It's about time, by the way, that you acknowledged receipt of a copy.

If you'd like to claim that you have not received a copy of my August 1, 2014 response, you're invited to read the online copy. When today's letter, the one that you're reading, goes online, there will be a link below this paragraph that can be used to access the document in question.

To see the August 1, 2014 letter, [click here](#).

8. In the August 1, 2014 letter, I noted that you were making false statements regarding the documents issue.

There were also remarks related to *“a pattern of shifting stories, misrepresentations, falsehoods, and/or violations of Professional Standards on the part of you and/or your firm that [dates] stretches back two years.”*

The most relevant parts of the August 1, 2014 response, though, are the parts related to possibly illegal explicit or implied threats made separately by Tom Stutzman and yourself.

Tom Stutzman directed me, through you in a letter received by me on July 29, 2014, not to contact “this law office”. I responded the same day with a polite letter which suggested, though it did not state explicitly, that legal actions threatened by Tom Stutzman would most likely end up, as a simple and casual metaphor, stuffed up his sex-offender ass.

Mr. Stutzman seems to have backed off subsequently on his threat to commit abuse of process. However, he has never explicitly retracted the threat in question.

9. You, for your part, offered me a misrepresentation on July 17, 2014, that was significant.

You had expressed concerns related to Tom Stutzman's views regarding communications between you and I. I responded, on July 17, 2014, reasonably enough as follows:

(start of quote from OldCoder)

“It's my expectation that Mr. Stutzman is not an issue. Is Tom an issue, John? If so, speak directly and let us proceed sensibly to discuss the consequences of that fact. But as part of the picture note that we could use your residence address for the purpose in question as opposed to your business address.”

(end of quote from OldCoder)

You responded, on the same day, as follows:

(start of quote from attorney John Perrott)

“Your reference to my residence address as the possible address for service of process was a clear threat.”

(end of quote from attorney John Perrott)

This was a startling assertion on your part. So startling that, I feel, reasonable people might agree that this was an implied threat to build false and fraudulent charges against me.

It was the final piece that I needed to complete my assessment of your character. You're a criminal, John. Do not expect trust.

10. As my August 1, 2014 letter indicates, the positions taken by Tom Stutzman and you yourself warrant caution. I stated:

(start of quote from OldCoder)

“Your proposal might necessitate a physical meeting with you, with associates of yours, or with representatives of yours. I feel that, for a physical meeting to be appropriate, the aggressive threat that Mr. Stutzman has made, together with the false and fraudulent accusation that you've made, should be retracted.”

“Additionally, it might be better to settle on neutral territory instead of the location that you've suggested. Upon retraction of the aggressive threat and the false and fraudulent accusation, perhaps a meeting at an agreed-upon location such as the Pho restaurant that was used previously could be arranged.”

“In the scenario where there is no retraction, I could hire somebody to pick up the so-called “box of documents” for me. Perhaps this is a sensible way to proceed, whether or not there is a retraction. If a third party is hired, taking the history of the situation into account, I feel that you and/or your firm should be responsible for the costs involved.”

“I'm prepared to offer you a concession to simplify things. I won't demand that the electronic materials discussed previously be included in the current delivery. However, at the same time, I do expect you to state whether you yourself feel that I am, or contend that I am not, entitled to such materials.”

“You do not need to state your position prior to the current delivery. But understand that the statement is expected promptly and that the issue is going to be discussed. It's been months since I first asked you about this part of the picture. I've been more patient than I should have been.”

“If you wish me to sign a receipt as part of the proposed delivery, the wording of the receipt will need to be discussed in advance. I will not, of course, sign anything that acknowledges the delivery of anything but that which is actually delivered.”

“Additionally, if the delivery is accomplished with the assistance of a third party, I'm not going to sign anything until I see for myself what's in the box.”

(end of quote from OldCoder)

11. I've never received a response to the preceding legitimate and reasonable points. You should address them, John.

12. Tom Stutzman seems, as mentioned previously, to have dropped his demand for an end to communication with “this law office”.

However, as a sensible step, based on his actions and on your own, it is my intention to shift some, though not all, communications from “this law office” to other venues.

Do you acknowledge that my suggestion related to your residence address was no such thing as a “threat” and, accordingly, do you retract your false and fraudulent allegation?

If so, is the following address correct for the purposes of legitimate and reasonable communications?
If not, is the following address, regardless, one of the addresses that may be used for the purposes of legal service?

John Henry Perrott
4516 Bucknall Road
San Jose, CA 95130

Would one of the Santa Clara, CA or Loleta, CA addresses be more appropriate for legitimate and reasonable communications or legal service, or are those addresses obsolete?

13. I remain interested in the apparent attempt in July 2014 by Tom Stutzman to take down my websites through a back-door approach as opposed to employing direct threats and possible felony DDOS as seems to have been done by Michael Bonetto's clients, Jim Kiraly and Tom Kiraly.

What's the true story? Was Tom Stutzman enough of a fool, as Metacognician speculated, that he thought a magic link he found in Google would delete articles which mentioned his alleged sexual offense?

I suppose that it's possible. Sheridan Healthcare has apparently tried the same thing. I'm not sure why. As far as I'm aware, Sheridan Healthcare didn't know that their former Vice President, Tom Kiraly, now possibly Vice President or Treasurer of Hanger, Inc., was involved in perjury, felony conspiracy, felony DDOS, and a case related to child abuse and spousal abuse. I've made no allegations as of yet to this effect regarding the firm.

14. Don't be tiresome. I'd prefer that you cease sending me terse remarks that ignore the points raised in my August 1, 2014 letter.

I want my documents, John. And this includes, independently of the paper documents that we're presently discussing, copies of electronic files related to the Kiraly Cases.

Not just the folder that you showed me on your LAN. I want the rest of it or your assertion, in writing, that I'm not entitled to it.

15. As noted in my August 1, 2014 letter:

(start of quote from OldCoder)

"The proposed delivery would settle one issue. Other issues, including but not limited to the question of the electronic materials, would remain open."

(end of quote from OldCoder)

To be clear, other issues that would remain open include, but are not limited to:

- * malpractice committed by you
- * the nature of the "client management" system that you practice
- * one particular discussion that you had with Michael Bonetto during the Kiraly Cases that may have contradicted professional standards or possibly involved prosecutable crimes on your part
- * promises you've made that you haven't kept
- * your views on God and your responsibilities to Him and to people in the temporal world

Regards, Robert (the Old Coder)

End of document