

MICHAEL PATRICK DONNELLY

Jalan Pengembak No 12, Sanur, Bali *dan* 3455 Rancho Rio Bonita Road, Covina, California, 91773, U.S.A.
mpdkayun@hotmail.com, 085738567440

To the honorable,
Chairman of the Board of Honor PERADI DKI Jakarta
Grand Slipi Tower Lt. 11
Jl. S. Parman Kav. 22-24
Jakarta Barat

Re : Reply to the Appeal of Ida Bagus Wikantara, S.H. regarding the PERADI Decision.

With respect,

The undersigned:

1. Michael Patrick Donnelly : Age 63 years, male, religion Hindu, private businessman, citizen United States of America, address Jalan Pengembak No. 12 Sanur Denpasar, Bali, Indonesia and 3455 Rancho Rio Bonita Road, Covina, California, U.S.A.
2. Sean Wayan Donnelly : Age 22 years, male, religion Hindu, student, citizen United States of America, address 3455 Rancho Rio Bonita Road, Covina, California, U.S.A.
3. Brenden Surya Donnelly : Age 20 years, male, religion Hindu, student, citizen United States of America, address 3455 Rancho Rio Bonita Road, Covina, California, U.S.A.

Each individually as Complainant I, Complainant II, and Complainant III, hereafter also known as the COMPLAINANTS referring to the complainants severally and together.

With this submit a Reply to the Request for Appeal to the Decision of the Board of Honor of PERADI regarding the violation of the Code of Ethics of Indonesian Lawyers and criminal

actions as declared against:

Ida Bagus Wikantara, : Age 47 years, religion Hindu, Lawyer, citizen of Indonesia,
S.H. address Jalan Sumandang III/ A5A, Batu Bulan, Gianyar, Bali

1. That that COMPLAINANTS reject in entirety the explanations of the DEFENDANT.
2. That the explanation of the DEFENDANT strengthens and proves the points already set forth by the COMPLAINANTS. The explanation of the DEFENDANT demonstrates that the **DEFENDANT misunderstands the concept of the ethics of his profession, the processes and procedures of law, and the common moral code which forms the basis of civil society.**

The essence of the Complaint by the COMPLAINANTS was that the DEFENDANT did not honor the ethics of his profession such that the COMPLAINANTS requested PERADI to withdraw the DEFENDANT's license to practice law **because of repeated violations the Code of Ethics, acts showing contempt for legal institutions, and acts suspected of being criminal.** The COMPLAINANTS have already submitted complete explanations to the Board of Honor which do not need to be repeated here.

3. That the DEFENDANT has again shown disrespect to his profession and to the structure of the organization of his profession because he failed to appear before the Board of Honor despite being summoned repeatedly. Now the Accused is attempting to reopen the trial process by belatedly submitting arguments, evidence, and witness testimonies that the DEFENDANT previously refused to submit to the Board of Honor at the time designated according to the trial process.

After the issuance of the Judgment of the Board of Honor, the DEFENDANT then reacted by privately requesting assistance of members of the PERADI organization with support from a **partisan member of IKADIN who has never met the COMPLAINANTS and has no knowledge of the relevant cases except as conveyed to him by the DEFENDANT himself.**

That the pattern of behavior of the DEFENDANT for over 10 years has been to avoid

trial before judges, avoid honoring existing agreements, avoid mediation, deposition, attempts at reconciliation through private discussion or discussion in front of witnesses, and all other attempts intended by law or by legal institutions or privately to give assistance to the settlement of issues between husband and wife, and rather than follow the procedures honored by society at large, the DEFENDANT consistently works behind the scenes in attempts to “lobby” legal officials.

That the behavior of the DEFENDANT demonstrates a disrespect for the process of law and for the ethics of his profession as a lawyer.

4. That the action of the DEFENDANT who now submits into evidence a letter from his client Ni Made Jati claiming that the client does not feel she has suffered a loss due to the actions of the Accused demonstrates that the DEFENDANT misunderstands the essence of the Complaint, and that the DEFENDANT misunderstands the legal basis for the Complaint by the COMPLAINANTS.

The Complaint was submitted to PERADI by the COMPLAINANTS **as three family members acting as family and on behalf of the forth victim Ni Made Jati**. The statement of the DEFENDANT that “the COMPLAINANT I submitted the Complaint on his own because he lost in the relevant cases” is not correct, and the fact is that the COMPLAINANT I **won** almost every case and that the client Ni Made Jati **lost** in every case. The Complaint by the COMPLAINANTS has no connection whatsoever with complaints about legal processes which proceeded according to law, and the COMPLAINANTS **firmly reject attempts by the DEFENDANT to confuse issues of law and process of law with the DEFENDANT’s actions violating the Code of Ethics.**

The Complaint by the COMPLAINANTS is based on the damages caused by the DEFENDANT **outside the channels of normal legal process**, including through 1) **actions within the process of law** which are Contrary to Law or suspected of being criminal such as submitting false testimony, documents, and witnesses to the courts, as well as 2) **actions outside the process of law** such as mixing personally into private and intimate affairs involving family relations between husband and wife and between parents and children using the excuse of attorney / client privilege.

That the new submission by the DEFENDANT of a letter from Ni Made Jati stating that she does not feel that she has suffered damages due to the actions of the DEFENDANT only strengthens the essence of the Complaint that Ni Made Jati continues to be controlled

and manipulated by the DEFENDANT, that any person of normal intelligence can see that Ni Made Jati has indeed suffered damages, that the DEFENDANT did not dare to advance Ni Made Jati or any other witness in trial to be cross-examined by the Board of Honor or by the COMPLAINANTS, and that the DEFENDANT and Ni Made Jati and most other witnesses brought forward in the past in previous cases connected to this matter have repeatedly lied to the courts and that therefore their new testimonies are not appropriate to be accepted by any court without cross-examination regarding the low credibility already established by their previous lies to the courts.

5. That the DEFENDANT has submitted further excuses based on formal arguments questioning jurisdiction of the Board of Honor.

That the DEFENDANT has a long history of advancing literally hundreds of formal excuses based upon the concept of “jurisdiction” to deny the existence of a marriage, reject the registration of a marriage in Indonesia by a foreign citizen, reject the right of a foreign citizen to use the laws of Indonesia, request the National Court of Denpasar to overturn a decision of the Supreme Court of Indonesia, reject the rights of a father and children to recognize parental rights, reject the rights of a husband to share in assets in common of a marriage, give advice to his client to violate the laws of another country at the moment his client was under jurisdiction of that country, order his client to abandon her children, reject communication between husband and wife and children because “there is no longer a legal relationship” between them, mix into the most personal and intimate affairs of a family with the excuse of his privilege as a lawyer, and many other actions and arguments all based on the concept of “jurisdiction.”

The DEFENDANT is a world-champion of “jurisdiction.”

But **NOT ONCE has any excuse put forth by the DEFENDANT based upon his concept of jurisdiction been accepted by any court in Indonesia or in California.** Clearly, **the DEFENDANT misunderstands “jurisdiction” and has built himself a fantasy palace based upon his personal misunderstanding of the meaning of jurisdiction.**

As a result of the DEFENDANT’s self-acknowledged expertise in “jurisdiction” which has been swallowed whole by his victim Ni Made Jati, the client Ni Made Jati has been damaged, has lost her children, and has had her assets ravaged for 10 long years by the DEFENDANT.

Supposing that the DEFENDANT's request to overturn the previous decision of the Board of Honor should be granted based upon "jurisdiction" and the DEFENDANT is then free to continue the destruction of his client and her family, all PERADI's aspirations for growth of civil society as embodied in the Code of Ethics as a basis for behavior by qualified professional lawyers aiding a public will be rendered pointless.

That after considering so many other arguments by the DEFENDANT based on "jurisdiction" but which are in gross error and have been repeatedly and consistently rejected by all courts in two countries, there is no reason that the Board of Honor of PERADI need be overly concerned that this latest attempt by the DEFENDANT to fling up an erroneous concept of "jurisdiction" is based upon serious jurisprudence.

For all the reasons explained above, the COMPLAINANTS request the Board of Honor to reject the explanations of the DEFENDANT.

Thus is the Reply of the COMPLAINANTS, given truthfully, and for all the kind attention of the Board of Honor of PERADI we wish to express our extreme appreciation and gratitude.

Jakarta, 1 November 2015



Michael Patrick Donnelly



Sean Wayan Donnelly



Brenden Surya Donnelly

