

John Perrot, aka John Henry Perrott, Attorney, Family Law, CA State Bar Number 213080

John, good day. Review the four statements in bold that follow. If you have concerns related to these four statements, respond within 10 business days. Read the document as a whole and address specifics. Threats or legal actions which ignore the request for a response or fail to address specifics are inadvisable.

You should have received 4 pages. Respond in writing. Do not badger or threaten the process server. Do not attempt to get her to pass verbal threats back to me. You commented, in a video discussed on page 2, that *“it's getting pretty old”*. The part that's *“getting pretty old”* is your behavior.

**1. Documents may, in the future, be delivered to you at residential as well as business addresses.** For related points and/or details, see pages 1 to 2.

**2. For reasons connected to threats that you've made against process servers and against me, as well as defamation that you've engaged in, couriers, process servers, interviewers, and/or other agents may, to the extent that this is permitted legally, transcribe, record, and/or film their interactions with you.** For related points and/or details, see page 2.

**3. I most certainly will be engaging, in the years to come, in communications, for legitimate and reasonable purposes, with third parties formerly or presently associated with Loleta, CA, Eureka, CA, Humboldt County, Santa Clara County, and/or other Counties located in California and/or other States. Such parties may include individuals, organizations, institutions, agencies, and/or entities of other types. Entities may be informal, religious, professional, or governmental in nature.** For related points and/or details, see page 3.

**4. The primary purpose of my previous formal communication to you was to offer to allow you to review the contents of a pending State Bar complaint. The paperwork issue that you've commented on is presently low-priority. However, this document includes a response to a related question that you've asked.** For related points and/or details, see page 4.

#### Web sites:

This document consists of 4 pages. If you didn't receive all 4 pages, complete copies may be viewed online at the following web links:

Text version: <http://johnperrott.attorney/>

PDF version: <http://johnperrott.attorney/perrott170321.pdf>

There are two domain names. Both **johnperrott.attorney** and **johnperrott.org** will work. Note: The right to use both domain names under the Nominative Use provision of trademark law is asserted.

#### Regarding document delivery address:

John Perrott: To the best of my recollection, a grand total of 2, possibly 3, documents were delivered to you by process server at a residence address in the 5 years prior to March 2017. If there were more than 3 such deliveries in 5 years, list the additional deliveries and I'll correct the number in future documents.

(continued on page 2)

You've characterized the infrequent delivery of documents to you at a residence as tantamount to a crime because, you note, "*I have a regular business address*".

So what? You're usually not at your office. Additionally, if there are occasions where you're willing to schedule delivery at a particular date and time, some process servers charge extra for deliveries of this type. Are you offering to cover the costs involved? And, what, exactly, do you submit is remotely inappropriate about residential delivery?

In a video that is discussed in the next section, you suggest that, though you're unable to state a cause of action, you'll use the fact that "*I'm an attorney*" to look for "*some sort*" of means to harm me regardless of the fact that you don't have a leg to stand on.

If you expect abuse of process to go well, as the young people say, "Come get some".

The three questions in the second paragraph above, and your failure to respond to them, will be part of my response. If I elect to retain copies of videos, and they prove to be admissible, they'll be filed as well along with detailed analyses.

Deliveries will be made to the addresses that work for process servers and other agents. If you drop the bullsh\*t and agree to discuss mutually acceptable approaches, this will simplify things.

If you feel the need to continue badgering or threatening process servers, note that YouTube is a legitimate and reasonable venue for discussions of your behavior. That part is discussed below.

### **Regarding videos of deliveries:**

John Perrott: In early March 2017, I hired a process server to deliver to you an offer to allow you to review, and comment on, drafts of a pending State Bar complaint related to you.

It had been reported to me by previous process servers that you'd been pompous, belligerent, and threatening.

I discussed your behavior, and how to address it, with the new process server. Filming delivery was one obvious option. I left the decision up to the process server. He indicated that this step was legal and that he was comfortable with proceeding.

There was no third party filming your meeting with the process server. Which, as you may recall, took place in public and in a context in which there would be no expectation of privacy. It was filmed by the person to whom you were spouting defamation and threats.

Would you like to make an issue of this step, John? If so, state this and include your reasoning. Understand that your comments will not be treated as confidential.

Your behavior has been such that, from a legal perspective, process servers and other agents really ought to film you. If you disagree, understand that your present behavior is inadvisable.

### **Regarding communications with third parties:**

John Perrott: In the video discussed on page 2, you made statements concerning alleged communications between myself and a third party.

Your statements were defamatory, but, a few years ago, you tried to go farther than defamation. You filed a false police report. In doing so, you committed a prosecutable crime. In fact, in California, the crime that you committed could be prosecuted as a felony.

The relevant point today, though, is that you weren't paying attention 5 years ago. How much did you say that Jim Kiraly and Tom Kiraly spent trying to shut me up? Hoping that I'd sign something that I was never going to sign?

Of course, it would have worked out better for me if you'd troubled yourself to do your job as opposed to committing fraud. You told me, for example, that if I paid you to write a special document, the Court would order the other side to pay my legal fees in advance.

You lied, John. Nobody was going to order my fees paid in advance. You charged me thousands of dollars for a document that the Court reprimanded you for submitting. Then you tried to convince me that the reprimand was a major victory.

But that's a subject for the future.

Even under the best of conditions for you, the rights that you'd have in connection with barring legitimate and reasonable communications with third parties, especially on an "a priori" basis, would be limited.

And, the fact is, you've committed prosecutable crimes. This is asserted publicly as a fact. John, I'm not using any weasel words. Wish to try for a defamation action? I'd be more successful with that than you'd be.

The fact that you've committed prosecutable crimes means that the scope of the legitimate and reasonable purposes that apply is expanded. To refresh your recollection of the larger picture, visit the following web pages:

**<http://haggishell.com/infopurposes>**

I'll be updating the pages in question to address your role. And I'll be communicating with whoever it's appropriate to communicate with for legitimate and reasonable purposes.

**Regarding paperwork issue:**

John Perrott: In early March 2017, you told a process server a story suggesting I wouldn't pick up paperwork that you owed me because I was afraid to come to your office.

The story that you told was partly made-up. This would have surprised me before 2012. I was naive. But I've changed and I look forward to demonstrating this.

In mid-March 2017, you asked another process server to pass a message similar to the following on to me: "*if you wanted your stuff why don't you just ask for it*".

(continued on page 4)

At least you commented politely this time. Thank you for that. Or, more likely, she omitted your usual pompous positioning and threats.

I have a two-part response. First, why are you asking about the paperwork issue? The issue that's time-sensitive presently is the pending State Bar complaint.

I only mentioned the paperwork issue briefly at the end of my previous document. And the focus in that case was on the unresolved question of electronic materials.

Regardless of the outcome of an investigation at the State level, I'd like the State Bar complaint to be properly structured and as accurate as possible, as I plan to snail-mail it to a number of parties who may be in a position to comment.

I assume that you feel the same way as I do about the accuracy of the complaint. So, why are you talking about the paperwork issue as opposed to saying "Yes" or "No" to the invitation to review the document in question?

As far as the paperwork issue goes, I did ask. I raised some simple questions in 2014. You've chosen to ignore the letter in question. Or you never bothered to read it to begin with.

The parts that are still relevant include the involvement of a third party who would pick things up, payment for the party in question, and the fact that no receipt stating everything has been delivered will be signed until the issue of electronic materials is addressed.

#### **Addressing news media and other parties:**

This document is distributed under Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0. In short, sharing of unmodified copies on a non-profit basis is both permitted and encouraged.

This is an interesting story. John Perrott is pompous but also a genuine Fundamentalist who compartmentalizes crime. He feels no guilt or shame. In fact, he's developed specific techniques, which he refers to as "client management", that he consciously uses to defraud.

He's believed to have an indirect connection to the past Perrott kerfuffle in Humboldt County, CA and may be one of the heirs that some of the legal filings involved discuss.

John Perrott's former boss and close professional associate, Tom Stutzman, was disciplined for alleged sexual advances towards a female client as well as theft.

John Perrott himself is deceptive, classically "sleazy", an archetype of a bottom of the barrel attorney. He won't hesitate to mislead a client or lie outright to them.

For related posts, feel free to visit <http://johnperrott.attorney/> or <http://johnperrott.org/> but note that the sites are under construction. You can also just type **John Perrott Attorney** into Google as related links are often on the first page of results.

(end of document)