1 2 3	Thomas Chase Stutzman SBN 69452 John Henry Perrott SBN 213080 THOMAS CHASE STUTZMAN, A Professional Corporation 1625 The Alameda, Suite 626 San Jose, California 95126		
5	Telephone: (408) 294-4600 Fax: (408)-295-5811		
67	Attorney for Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY		
8 9 .0	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA		
.1 .2 .3	In re J. KIRALY vs. R. KIRALY Petitioner: JAMES KIRALY	Case No. 1-12-DV-015910 STIPULATION AND ORDER RE: LIMITING SCOPE OF LITIGATION	
. 4	and	CMC: January 24, 2013 @ 9:00 AM	
.5	Respondent: ROBERT KIRALY	Department 75 APJ: L. Michael Clark	
.7	IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, by and between Petitioner, JAMES KIRALY, by and		
.9	through his attorney of record, Michael T. Bonetto, with HOGE, FENTON, JONES & APPEL, INC., and		
20	Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY, by and through his attorney of record, John H. Perrott, associate counsel		
	with Thomas Chase Stutzman, A Professional Corporation, that:		
21	1. <u>RECITALS</u> : The parties recite pursuant to the provisions of Evidence Code §622 that the		
22	following facts are true:		
23	A. STIPULATION REVIEWED BEFORE SIGNING: At the time of the preparation and		
2.4	the signing of this instant Stipulation and Order Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY, was represented by John		
2.5	Henry Perrott, Associate Counsel with THOMAS CHASE STUTZMAN, A PROFESSIONAL		
26	CORPORATION, and Petitioner, JAMES KIRALY, was represented by Michael T. Bonetto, Associate		
2.7	Council with HOGE FENTON IONES & ADD	FI Inc. Roth parties and both counsel have had a fair and	

28

complete opportunity to thoroughly review the terms contained in this instant Stipulation and Order prior to signing it.

B. AGREEMENTS VOLUNTARILY MADE: Petitioner and Respondent have each carefully read this instant Stipulation and Order in its entirety. Petitioner and Respondent each recite and warrant that they understood all the terms of this Stipulation at the time they each signed it. Petitioner and Respondent both freely and voluntarily agree to all the terms contained in this instant Stipulation and Order. All the agreement(s) contained herein have been made voluntarily by each party, free from duress, fraud, undue influence, coercion, or misrepresentation of any kind.

ISSUE: Both Petitioner and Respondent understand that by agreeing to the terms of this instant Stipulation and Order they give up the right to have a hearing before the Court to have the Court make a determination of the single issue resolved by agreement and that the Court might have awarded either party either more or less relief on that issue than they will receive under the terms of this Stipulation and Order. Petitioner and Respondent also both understand that by resolving this single issue in their case by agreement instead of litigating it they may incur substantially less in legal fees and avoid the need to spend additional time in Court. They have each made a knowing and voluntary decision to settle the single issue resolved under the terms of this instant Stipulation and Order instead of litigating.

2. CLETS ORDERS LIMITED TO AVOID ANY PRIOR RESTRAINT: The parties agree that the purpose of the instant Domestic Violence Request does not include stopping either party from exercising any right to freedom of speech they either do or may possess, including but not limited to any right(s) found in the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States. To that end, any and all Orders issued in the instant case shall be modified by this instant Stipulation and Order to make clear that Writing any Book(s), posting on any Web Blog(s), setting up any Web Page(s), making any Twitter posting(s), posting on any YouTube Channel(s), posting on any Twitter Stream(s), posting on any Website(s), posting on any RSS Feed(s), posting on any Scribd Publication(s), posting on any Reddit IAMA(s), posting on any IRC Channel(s), and/or any other mean(s) of communication aimed at the general public (such as a traditional magazine article) and/or groups and/or institutions such as: News Media; Abuse Prevention Centers; Mental

Health Professionals; County Medical Officials; First Amendment Advocates; Legislators; Torts Specialists; SLAPP Specialists; the California State Bar; and/or Religious Groups shall not be a violation of any Order(s) in this case. Such communications, designed to be available to the general public and/or any party(ies) not listed as a Protected Party, shall not be a violation of any CLETS Order(s) in this case.

Petitioner reserves the right to present any such communication(s) as evidence in this case, and may make any comment(s) upon the contents of the communication(s) that he may choose to make. This term does not absolve either party from any related civil claim(s), including but not limited the tort of Defamation.

3. RESEARCH FOR A BOOK AND CONTACTING THIRD PARTIES: The parties agree that contact(s) by the Respondent of third parties, whether live persons or legal entities like the Amazon Corporation, who are not named as Protected Parties in this case shall not be prohibited. Respondent may contact unspecified third parties to do research for any book(s) he has planned, and/or for any other legal and/or lawful purpose(s), including but not limited to joining the congregation of a church and/or other group(s) and/or institution(s). Respondent may contact third parties by any reasonable means, including but not limited to telephone, mail, email, and/or facsimile.

In the event Respondent seeks to meet personally and/or face to face with any such unspecified third party who is not named or specified as a Protected Party, but that third party is physically located within 300 yards or less of any named Protected Party, then the Order shall be modified to allow the Respondent to meet with that third party. At any such meeting Respondent shall make reasonable and good faith efforts to maintain a respectful distance of no less than 50 feet from any Protected Party and/or the home, vehicle, or workplace of any Protected Party. For this exception to apply, the Respondent's contact with said third party within the 300 yards shall be consensual, peaceful, respectful, polite, and civil at all times. Possession by Respondent of written confirmation of the consent of the third party, which written consent may be by email, shall be conclusive proof that this exception shall apply; however, the burden of proof on any alleged violation(s) of any CLETs Order(s) shall remain with the party alleging the violation(s).

4. <u>NO ADMISSIONS</u>: This Stipulation and Order constitutes a settlement of one issue and nothing contained herein shall constitute or be treated as an admission of any liability for or any wrongdoing by Petitioner, JAMES KIRALY, Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY, and/or their agents, independent contractors,

1	consultants, attorneys, insurers, sureties, divisions, parents, subsidiaries, successors, predecessors, or assigns.	
2	In particular, Petitioner does not admit that he has ever sought to use the CLETS system to effect a prior	
3	restraint on free speech. Respondent does not admit that he has ever engaged in any inappropriate or	
4	unlawful act(s) which would justify any Court in making any CLETS Order(s).	
5	5. <u>CASE TO CONTINUE</u> : The parties agree that they continue to disagree regarding whether a	
6	CLETS Restraining Order should be issued permanently. They agree that they may ultimately need a Trial	
7	to resolve this point. In the event a permanent CLETS Order is granted, these instant provisions shall be	
8	included therein. In the event that a permanent CLETS Order is not granted then this instant Stipulation,	
9	which effects a modification of the CLETS Order(s), shall be of no further force or effect.	
10	6. <u>FAXED SIGNATURES ACCEPTABLE</u> : For purposes of this Stipulation and Order, facsimile	
11	signatures, scanned signatures, and signatures in counterpart are acceptable.	
12	Datade	
13	Dated: Petitioner, JAMES KIRALY	
14	Dated:	
15	Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY	
16	Dated: Thomas Chase Stutzman,	
17	A Professional Corporation Attorney for Respondent, ROBERT KIRALY	
18	Attorney for Respondent, ROBERT KIRALT	
19	By:	
20	John H. Perrott, Associate	
21	Dated: Michael T. Bonetto, Associate with HOGE, FENTON, JONES & APPEL, Inc.,	
22	Attorney for Petitioner, JAMES KIRALY	
23		
24	By: Michael T. Bonetto, Associate	
25	IT IS SO ORDERED:	
26	Datada	
27	Dated: JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT	
28		