

EXCLUSIVE: Former firefighters file legal complaint against Seattle over wrongful discrimination from Covid-19 vax mandate

Ari Hoffman July 23, 2023

According to the complaint, "This announcement came just four days after the CDC announced that the vaccine did not prevent transmission."

A complaint was filed Thursday in US District Court on behalf of 38 Seattle firefighters alleging they were "wrongfully denied accommodations and terminated, forced to resign or retire for non-compliance with a new State requirement for COVID-19 vaccination." A complaint is typically the first step in a lawsuit.

According to documents obtained by The Post Millennial, the complaint names the City of Seattle, Fire Chief Harold Scoggins, former Mayor Jenny Durkan, and several human resources employees.

The complaint tells the stories of each of the firefighters. The stories are all similar in that the firefighters who applied for exemptions from taking the vaccine due to their sincerely held religious beliefs were granted a religious exemption but were then denied accommodations.

According to the complaint, the defendants "refused to engage Plaintiffs in a legally required interactive dialogue to discuss accommodations that would have kept Plaintiffs employed."

On August 9, 2021, Governor Jay Inslee issued Proclamation 21-14 which said that "State agencies...must provide any disability-related reasonable accommodations and sincerely held religious belief accommodations to the requirements of this Order that are required under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehabilitation Act), Title VII of the Civil Rights act of 1964 (Title VII), the Washington Law Against Discrimination (WLAD), and any other applicable law."

Additionally, "coinciding with the Governor's announcement... Defendant Mayor Jenny Durkan issued Mayoral Directive #9, on August 9, 2021, which required all city employees to be fully vaccinated as a condition of employment before October 18, 2021, in order to "...reduce the spread of COVID-19 in our communities."

Durkan stated in a memo announcing the vaccine mandate to City employees, dated August 9, 2021, that "[s]tarting Monday, October 18, 2021," those "who had applied and are verified to have a medical or religious exemption will be required to undergo COVID-19 testing weekly and be required to distance," adding "The City of Seattle likewise authorized testing and distancing as an accommodation to those who had an exemption to the vaccine."

According to the complaint, "This announcement came just four days after the CDC announced that the vaccine did not prevent transmission which Defendant Durkan was certainly aware of and influenced her statement that accommodations would be provided for religious and medically exempt employees."

The documents stated, "However, despite making that statement on August 9, 2021, coinciding with the CDC announcement on August 5, 2021, that the vaccine did not stop transmission, Defendant Durkan thereafter universally denied accommodation to all Plaintiffs, essentially rescinding an accommodation that she had previously granted," and added, "Defendants did not follow their own guidance or policy with respect to Plaintiffs, who were all found to have a sincerely held religious belief."

1-2

The complaint alleged that "Defendants stated it would be a two-step process to decide first if there was an exemption, and second, if that exemption could be accommodated after an interactive dialogue with Plaintiff. Defendants combined their process into one step, reviewed a job description, declared the employee posed a threat, and skipped the interactive dialogue."

Lawyers for the plaintiffs wrote, "This defied the terms of the Proclamation SFD supported, which required an interactive dialogue in accordance with Title VII, ADA, and WLAD. SFD created their own 'mandate within a mandate' in a rogue attempt to discriminate against religious objectors and denied that which the Proclamation demanded." They added that "Defendants ignored the terms of the Proclamation, while simultaneously ignoring the guidance provided by OFM detailing accommodation suggestions and implementing the Proclamation."

"Ironically, Defendants proceeded at warp speed to terminate Plaintiffs for alleged failure to comply with the Mandate, while Defendants themselves were failing to comply with the Mandate."

Previously, a whistleblower exposed that the Defendants "admitted that medical exemptions would be accommodated, but religious would not."

The complaint alleged that "Defendants did not consider other alternatives to full vaccination, such as personal protective equipment (PPE), distancing, testing, or other strategies used by a majority of the fire departments across the state that fully accommodated firefighters without termination, infra, especially given the failure of the vaccine to stop the spread or reinfection of those who were vaccinated," strategies that were later employed by the department when the virus continued to spread "despite the termination of all unvaccinated Firefighters."

According to the complaint, "Internal memos show SFD had actual knowledge of breakthrough cases before terminating the Plaintiffs."

The complaint also alleged that "...many firefighters at SFD utilized fraudulent vaccine cards, which Defendants are aware of, and thus kept their jobs."

Lawyers for the plaintiffs claim that documents requested have not been obtained from Scoggins and note that Judge Thomas Zilly, United States District Judge for the Western District of Seattle, previously sanctioned "...the City of Seattle for Defendant Scoggins' act of 'purging...thousands' of text messages, holding that the Court would instruct a jury in a wrongful death action that it may presume that the City of Seattle's deleted text messages were unfavorable to the City."

The firefighters are seeking unspecified damages from the defendants, but asked that they be "made whole."

Even though most COVID vaccine mandates across the US have been dropped, employment lawsuits related to the mandates continue to be filed and litigated. According to the Fisher Phillips COVID-19 Employment Litigation Tracker, there were still 4,544 active, pandemic-related employment cases as of last week. 2,724 of the cases are related to employment discrimination including wrongful terminations and only 18 percent have been resolved. 1,920 of the cases are related to the vaccine.

1-2

Over 300 Canadian Soldiers Launch \$500 Million Lawsuit Against Military For COVID Vaccine Mandates

JUNE 27, 2023 Matthew Horwood

Around 330 active or former members of the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) who say they were harmed by COVID-19 vaccine mandates **have filed a class-action lawsuit against high-ranking members of the Canadian military, asking for some \$500 million in damages.**

"The CAF shirked its own purpose and rushed an untested product onto its members, mislabeled this experimental gene therapy a 'vaccine,' knowingly made false statements of safety and efficacy, and facilitated its mandate with no option to refuse except for mandatory permanent removal from service," reads the statement of claim filed with the Federal Court on June 21.

"The actions of the CAF and CDS [Chief of the Defence Staff] has resulted in injury to the Plaintiffs, who have consistently worked to prevent this abuse of power from occurring and to protect the members and their families who are experiencing coercion, discrimination, and threat of loss of career and benefits in all instances."

The lawsuit was filed against Chief of the Defence Staff General Wayne Eyre, Vice Chief of the Defence Staff Lieutenant-General Frances Allen, Minister of National Defence Anita Anand, former deputy minister of national defence Jody Thomas, and others.

In the fall of 2021, the CAF imposed a COVID-19 vaccine mandate, with non-compliance subsequently leading to the loss of hundreds of members. They left through either voluntary release or expulsion under code 5(f), "unsuitable for further service," a dishonourable discharge reserved for soldiers with "personal weaknesses" or other issues deemed to impose an excessive burden on the CAF.

The CAF lightened the vaccine mandate in October 2022 by removing COVID-19 vaccination as a condition of service, but it kept in place a mandatory primary series of injections for numerous operational roles.

Orders

The lawsuit claims that the CAF abused its power by ignoring express legislative limits on its actions, allowing the physical and/or psychological torture of unvaccinated members under the command of CAF-commissioned officers, ignoring established law on the right to privacy and the right to choose medical treatment, and ignoring established law on informed consent and regarding religious and spiritual belief.

Other alleged abuses listed include deliberately failing to ensure officers were fully and correctly briefed on all legal and policy issues related to vaccine mandates and deliberately misusing the grievance system to indefinitely delay or stop relief sought by the members.

2-2

The lawsuit states that the CAF focused on **“political agendas and taking direction from political leaders that is detrimental to operational readiness and effectiveness” when it implemented the COVID-19 vaccine mandates.** It said the CAF gave the plaintiffs no way to meet the mandate by writing the directives in a way that blocked any possible means of complying with them.

The statement of the claim adds the allegation that the CDS used administrative measures to punish those who refused or could not comply, instead of following the legal process under the National Defence Act that would allow members to have their cases heard in independent hearings.

In addition, it said the CDS had full control over the grievance process, which meant members were denied fundamental justice.

Further, the lawsuit said Eyre stated he received orders from the government of Canada (GC) to enforce the vaccine mandate, which the statement of claim argues is unlawful.

The lawsuit says members faced severe consequences, including loss of career and loss of employment opportunities outside the CAF, along with loss of income, retirement pension, benefits, travel, and even basic participation in work or public life as a result of non-compliance with the vaccine mandates.

Moreover, the lawsuit says **coercive actions were allegedly taken by commanding officers to force compliance.** Examples given in the lawsuit include “forcing members to spend unnecessary extended periods of time outside in extreme winter conditions with no shelter or protection as well as forcibly confining members to small, cramped spaces with no respite for meals or personal hygiene needs.”

Daniel Le Bouthillier, head of media relations for the Department of National Defence, said that as a matter of process, “we do not comment on potential legal actions of this nature.”

Read more [here...](#)

3-1

Family Of College Student Who Died From COVID-19 Vaccine Sues Biden Administration

JUNE 02, 2023 - Zachary Stieber

The family of a college student who died from heart inflammation caused by Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccine has sued President Joe Biden's administration, alleging officials engaged in "willful misconduct."

U.S. Department of Defense (DOD) officials wrongly promoted COVID-19 vaccination by repeatedly claiming the available vaccines were "safe and effective," relatives of George Watts Jr., the college student, said in the new lawsuit.

That promotion "duped millions of Americans, including Mr. Watts, into being DOD's human subjects in its medical experiment, the largest in modern history," the suit states.

The Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act allows lawsuits against certain people if they have engaged in "willful misconduct" and if that misconduct caused death or serious injury.

COVID-19 vaccines are covered by the act due to a declaration entered during the Trump administration in 2020 after COVID-19 began circulating.

"DOD's conduct and the harm caused as alleged within the four corners of the lawsuit speaks for itself," Ray Flores, a lawyer representing the Watts family, told The Epoch Times via email. "I have no further comment other than to say: My only duty is to advocate for my client. If the DOD conveys a settlement offer, I will see that it's considered."

The suit was filed in U.S. court in Washington.

The Pentagon and the Department of Justice did not respond to requests for comment.
Watts Suddenly Died

Watts was a student at Corning Community College when the school mandated COVID-19 vaccination for in-person classes in 2021. He received one Pfizer dose on Aug. 27, 2021, and a second dose approximately three weeks later.

Watts soon began experiencing a range of symptoms, including tingling in the feet, pain in the heels, numbness in the hands and fingers, blood in his sperm and urine, and sinus pressure, according to family members and health records.

Watts went to the Robert Packer Hospital emergency room on Oct. 12, 2021, due to the symptoms. X-rays showed clear lungs and a normal heart outline.

Watts was sent home with suggestions to follow up with specialists but returned to the emergency room on Oct. 19, 2021, with worsening symptoms despite a week of the antibiotic Augmentin. He was diagnosed with sinusitis and bronchitis.

While speaking to his mother at home on Oct. 27, 2021, Watts suddenly collapsed. Emergency medical personnel rushed to the home but found him unresponsive. He was rushed to the same hospital in an ambulance. He was pronounced deceased at age 24.

According to a doctor at the hospital, citing hospital records and family members, Watts had no past medical history on file that would explain his sudden death, with no known history of substance abuse or obvious signs of substance abuse. His mother described her son as a "healthy young male."

Dr. Robert Stoppacher, a pathologist who performed an autopsy on the body, said that the death was due to "COVID-19 vaccine-related myocarditis." The death certificate listed no other causes. A COVID-19 test returned negative. Dr. Sanjay Verma, based in California, reviewed the documents in the Watts case and said that he believed the death was caused by the COVID-19 vaccination.

Pfizer did not respond to a request for comment.

Watts Took Vaccine Under Pressure

The community college mandate included a 35-day grace period following approval by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) of a COVID-19 vaccine.

The Moderna, Pfizer, and Johnson & Johnson vaccines were given emergency use authorization early in the pandemic. The FDA approved the Pfizer shot on Aug. 23, 2021. It was the first COVID-19 vaccine approval. But doses of the approved version of the shot, branded Comirnaty, were not available for months after the approval.

Read more [here](#)...

4-1

COVID Victims' Families Sue EcoHealth Alliance For 'Funding, Releasing' Virus

ZEROHEDGE AUG 13, 2023

The families of four people who died from COVID-19 are suing EcoHealth alliance, the New York-based nonprofit that was conducting gain-of-function research on bat coronaviruses in Wuhan, China, before COVID-19 broke out across town. According to the Aug. 2 lawsuit filed before the New York Supreme Court in Manhattan, EcoHealth and its president, Peter Daszak, knew the virus was "capable of causing a worldwide pandemic."

Not only did EcoHealth help to create a 'genetically manipulated virus,' the lawsuit claims, it worked to cover up the origins of the outbreak.

"If we had known the source or origin of this virus and had not been misled that it was from a pangolin in a wet market, and rather we knew that it was a genetically manipulated virus, and that the scientists involved were concealing that from our clients, the outcome could have been very different," victims' attorney Patricia Finn told the NY Post.

The families of Mary Conroy, of Pennsylvania; Emma D. Holley, of Rochester, NY; Larry Carr, of Crossville, Tennessee; and Raul Osuna, of Bennington, Nebraska, are seeking unspecified damages.

"[The families of the deceased] are definitely in mourning, but moreover they're enraged because the truth of what really happened appears to be coming forward," Finn added.

Paul Rinker, of Pennsylvania, is also suing Midtown-based EcoHealth and Daszak over the "serious injuries" he suffered from his bout with the bug.

Finn is also suing EcoHealth and Daszak in Nassau and Rockland Counties on behalf of the families of other victims killed by the virus, as well as two who survived.

"This particular case is highly offensive because it appears they knew and concealed the origin of the virus," said Finn, adding "The treatment or approach taken in dealing with the virus could have been radically different than it was."

EcoHealth notably received a re-activated grant from the NIH for over \$576,000 in May to study how outbreaks of deadly viruses like SARS, MERS, and now COVID-19 originate from wildlife and transfers to humans, despite failing to meet the NIH's conditions for reinstatement.

As the Epoch Times noted;

The grant, titled "Understanding the Risk of Bat Coronavirus Emergence," was originally awarded in 2014 by Dr. Anthony Fauci's National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). Under the terms of the grant, EcoHealth Alliance, a government-funded nonprofit that purportedly engages in research to prevent pandemics, was awarded \$3.8 million over five years to assess the spillover potential of bat viruses "using reverse genetics, pseudovirus and receptor binding assays, and virus infection experiments in cell culture and humanized mice." Put in simple terms, NIAID was paying EcoHealth to genetically engineer and manipulate bat viruses in labs.

In May 2016, the grant was suspended after Erik Stemmy, a NIAID program officer, noticed that federal government funds may have been used for prohibited gain-of-function experiments at the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) in China. At the time, the Obama administration had put in place a moratorium on gain-of-function experiments. However, for reasons that remain unclear, the suspension was lifted in July 2016. At the time, EcoHealth's president, Peter Daszak, thanked NIAID in an email for lifting the gain-of-function funding pause.

As part of the conditions of the grant, EcoHealth had to file regular activity reports. However, starting in 2018, EcoHealth stopped submitting these reports. EcoHealth would later blame technical difficulties for their failure to submit. The missing reports comprised the critical 2018-2019 timeframe right before the outbreak of COVID-19 in Wuhan.

* * *

More:

4-2

In 2014, the Obama administration temporarily suspended federal funding for **gain-of-function** research into manipulating bat COVID to be more transmissible to humans. Four months prior to that decision, the NIH effectively shifted this research to the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) to EcoHealth, headed by Peter Daszak.

Notably, the WIV "**had openly participated in gain-of-function research in partnership with U.S. universities and institutions**" for years under the leadership of Dr. Shi 'Batwoman' Zhengli, according to the *Washington Post's* Josh Rogin. Yet, after Sars-CoV-2 broke out in the same town where Daszak was manipulating Bat Covid, *The Lancet* published a screed by Daszak (signed by over two-dozen scientists), which insisted the virus could have *only* come from a natural spillover event, likely from a wet market, and that the scientists "**stand together to strongly condemn conspiracy theories** suggesting that COVID-19 does not have a natural origin." *The Lancet* only later noted Daszak's conflicts of interest.

Meanwhile, as we noted late last year, a Senate Committee on Health Education, Labor and Pensions interim report from October 27, 2022 titled "An Analysis of the Origins of the COVID19 Pandemic" concluded that the origins of Covid were more likely based in a lab as part of a "research related incident" and not zoonotic.

The report was the result of a "bipartisan Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Committee oversight effort into the origins of SARS-CoV-2". It provides a lengthy analysis that reviews "publicly available, open-source information to examine the two prevailing theories of origin of the SARS-CoV-2 virus".

Insanity...

5-1

4 Doctors Sue Washington Medical Commission Over Right to Free Speech

A Superior Court judge in Washington last week heard arguments in a lawsuit brought by four doctors who allege their state's medical licensing commission illegally adopted a COVID-19 misinformation policy, subjected them to unfair punitive action and violated their constitutional right to freedom of speech.

Suzanne Burdick, Ph.D. 08/31/23

Lawyers representing four doctors who sued the Washington Medical Commission (WMC) after it punished three of them for allegedly spreading COVID-19 misinformation and for treating patients with ivermectin and other off-label drugs last week argued in support of their plaintiffs' motion for declaratory and injunctive relief. The fourth doctor joined the lawsuit after relinquishing her license over concerns of the WMC's investigations of her colleagues.

"Last week we asked the court to declare the WMC's COVID-19 Misinformation Position Statement as invalidly adopted and to tell the WMC to cease any enforcement under the position statement," said Simon Peter "Pete" Serrano, one of the lawyers representing the plaintiffs.

The Superior Court of Washington in and for Benton and Franklin Counties held the hearing.

Turner et al. v. Washington Medical Commission alleges that the WMC broke its own rulemaking process when it adopted a rule that doctors must adhere to the commission's COVID-19 Misinformation Position Statement or be subject to penalties.

The lawsuit further alleges the WMC's COVID-19 Misinformation Position Statement violates the doctors' rights to free speech as protected by the Washington Constitution and the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution.

Plaintiffs Dr. Michael Kwame Turner, Dr. Richard "Rick" Wilkinson and Dr. Ryan Cole, all licensed in Washington, were disciplined by the WMC, including being put on probation and issued a \$15,000 fine for allegedly spreading COVID-19 misinformation.

The fourth plaintiff, Dr. Renata Moon, was not disciplined by the WMC but was negatively affected by its position statement.

The WMC's statement "supports the position taken by the Federation of State Medical Boards regarding COVID-19 vaccine misinformation" and states that doctors "may be subjecting their license to disciplinary action" if they grant "exemptions to vaccination or masks that are not based in established science or verifiable fact."

The Silent Majority Foundation (SMF), an organization that seeks to protect people's constitutional rights, on July 12 filed the suit on behalf of the four doctors.

Judge Joseph Burrowes heard arguments by the plaintiffs in which they stated why the WMC's position statement was invalidly adopted and should no longer be enforced. Judge Burrowes also heard defendants' opposing arguments. He is expected to rule within 90 days.

Serrano said he was "hopeful" that the judge might rule that the WMC "invalidly and improperly adopted" the position statement.

This would mean the WMC could no longer legally enforce it and would require that the WMC adopt the statement properly by adhering to its rulemaking procedure.

The WMC's rulemaking procedure lasts at least 30 days and involves giving public notice and soliciting public comments before adoption. "They didn't do any of that when they adopted the position statement," Serrano said.

"The case has tremendous importance," Serrano, SMF's director and general counsel, told The Defender, "because if we're successful, then it gets us back to square one where doctors' rights to free speech are maintained or retained."

Turner, an integrative medicine physician, agreed.

52-1

5-2

"Our suit is a landmark event that should concern (and encourage) every person who cares about our constitutional rights and, specifically, the issue of medical freedom," Turner told The Defender.

Turner said he and his fellow plaintiffs are not the only doctors to file lawsuits that challenge attempted government overreach and seek to stop the state from intimidating healthcare providers. "This is exactly the same thing that has happened to Dr. Nass and many others," he said.

Dr. Meryl Nass on Aug. 17 sued the Maine Board of Licensure in Medicine and its individual members, alleging the board violated her First Amendment rights and her rights under the Maine Constitution.

Serrano said Judge Burrowes "asked some good questions" during last week's hearing that showed "he clearly understood the First Amendment implications, and to me, that's a move in the right direction.

Pediatrician fired for 'spreading misinformation' in congressional hearing

Moon, a pediatrician represented in the lawsuit, told The Defender she was "simply trying to uphold my Hippocratic Oath to 'do no harm'" when she spoke out about the dangers of the COVID-19 mRNA shots for children during a 2022 congressional hearing.

After voicing her concerns at the hearing, Washington State University — where she had taught since 2017 — filed a complaint against her with the WMC for allegedly promoting COVID-19 misinformation. In June, the university let her go by not renewing her appointment as a clinical associate professor of medicine.

"Imagine a world where your physician is punished for critically thinking and speaking about the dangers of a brand new medical product," Moon said. "Imagine a world with massive corruption and conflict of interest that has infiltrated every aspect of the highest levels of government."

"We have already arrived in that world," she said. "Look into the eyes of your children and grandchildren. What kind of a future will they have if this tyrannical system is allowed to continue unchecked?"

Moon added:

"I remain concerned about the extreme risk of giving this genetic mRNA shot to our nation's children.

"I spoke at the U.S. Senate hearing with the hope that our medical community would come together for a decent and honest discussion about the risks and benefits of administering this shot to children.

"Instead, it's clear that we have a chilling lack of free speech and complete disregard for safety."

Moon said her former medical school employer wrote a memo claiming it had an "ethical obligation" to report to the WMC what Moon had said during the Senate fact-finding hearing because she may have spread "misinformation."

"I ask you this," Moon said. "Have we completely lost the freedom to speak and to debate scientific data? Even at medical schools tasked with teaching future doctors? Especially at medical schools tasked with teaching our nation's future doctors?"

"We have entered a scary new world that previously was found only in our darkest nightmares."
WMC's COVID statement 'absurd and abusive'

According to Turner, the plaintiffs' lawsuit revolves around providing ivermectin and other early treatments to COVID-19 patients.

"Ivermectin and HCQ [hydroxychloroquine] were stigmatized by the media, mainstream medical organizations and state medical boards," Turner said.

When the WMC published its COVID-19 Misinformation Position Statement, it cited the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as establishing the "standard of care" and then "boldly warned practitioners to 'take note' that ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine are not FDA-approved for COVID," Turner said.

5-3

The WMC also provided a link for filing a complaint in order to "encourage" the public and other practitioners to report any deviation from this standard of care, he added.

Turner called the WMC's behavior "absurd and abusive" for three reasons. He said:

- 1) The FDA does not have the mandate, authority nor expertise to determine what specific medicine may or may not benefit a particular patient at a particular point in time.
- 2) "Off-label" medication use is common and appropriate in the right context.
- 3) Complaints were accepted and used as a basis for investigation that were not even filed by the patient nor his/her immediate family.

'There was never a complaint from a patient'

The plaintiffs also challenged the legality of the WMC's adoption of the position statement "through a Special Meeting with limited notice and without opportunity for public comment."

Wilkinson, an integrative practitioner with more than 40 years of experience, disagreed with the position statement and chose to "consistently treat people who needed help" by prescribing off-label drugs, including ivermectin and azithromycin. Seven complaints were filed against him.

"There was never a complaint from a patient," Wilkinson told The Defender. "All of the complaints came from the hospital or someone associated with the hospital."

After complaints were leveled against him, Wilkinson on Jan. 21, 2022, sent a letter to the WMC. "I spent a lot of time working on that letter to the state," he said.

Wilkinson continued:

"I discussed the fact, first of all, that I appreciated the licensing commission [and] that there are doctors who clearly do [harmful] things and we need somebody to monitor and take care of it ... I stated that I understand that you have gotten complaints about me and my work.

"I went on and talked about what I did do and I said very clearly that if I'm doing something bad for patients, then please have some of your people get in touch with me and demonstrate this to me with good data. I'm happy to change what I do."

"But did they ever contact me? They didn't," he said.

Wilkinson said one of the reasons complaints were filed against him with the WMC was because he "didn't speak positively" about the COVID-19 vaccine on his blog.

He wrote in an April 22, 2021, post:

"We have historically lived in a free country and, thus, the choices you make regarding your health have always been considered to be entirely up to you. Unfortunately, that freedom might be coming to an end with the rise of a tyrannical state.

"In my historical American perspective, the decision to get the COVID-19 'vaccine' should be entirely up to you and not coerced by some bureaucrat living in a distant city, mattering not whether that city is Olympia or Washington, DC."

"Should you get the 'vaccination'?" Wilkinson wrote. "Clearly, in my view, that should be entirely your choice. But if you would like my perspective, I would strongly urge you not to get the Covid 'vaccine' — at least not yet. Why? Because we really have no idea whether it is safe and whether the downsides might be significantly worse than any potential upside."

For his alleged offenses, the WMC placed Wilkinson on a five-year probation and issued him a \$15,000 fine.

Cole, a pathologist based in Idaho who is licensed in multiple states including Washington, also was a vocal critic of the COVID-19 vaccines.

Cole alleges he suffered loss of income and reputational loss due to WMC's punitive actions against him. "I have suffered other damages, including \$50,000 in attorney fees in the defense of my Washington license," Cole said.

mf-5

6-1

Fired NYC Teachers Who Refused Vaccine To Be Reinstated With Back Pay: Judge

SEP 09, 2023 ZEROHEDGE

A New York state judge on Wednesday ruled that 10 employees fired by the NYC Department of Education for refusing the Covid-19 vaccine must be *reinstated with back pay*.

In his ruling, State Supreme Court Judge Ralph J. Porzio found that the city acted illegally when it denied religious exemptions to certain city teachers - who went to Children's Health Defense to sponsor a lawsuit against the department following failed attempts to claim religious accommodation for the mandate.

"This Court sees no rational basis for not allowing unvaccinated classroom teachers in amongst an admitted population of primarily unvaccinated students," wrote Porzio, adding "As such, the decision to summarily deny the classroom teachers amongst the Panel Petitioners based on an undue hardship, without any further evidence of individualized analysis, is arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable. As such, each classroom teacher amongst the Panel Petitioners is entitled to a religious exemption from the Vaccine Mandate."

Porzio also slammed the city's assertion that allowing teachers religious exemptions would place undue hardship on the city, calling the claim "arbitrary, capricious, and unreasonable."

In the order, he granted relief to 10 plaintiffs who completed the administrative steps to request an exemption. He denied relief to six plaintiffs because they did not complete the administrative process.

As part of his ruling, Judge Porzio made reference to Mayor Eric Adams's lifting of a vaccine mandate for some private employees in 2022, notably celebrities and athletes. He said the decision was evidence that the mandate for public workers was done on an arbitrary basis.

New York City imposed a COVID-19 vaccine mandate for all Department of Education workers that started on Oct. 1, 2021, and lasted until Feb. 10, 2023. Reports indicated that thousands of workers, teachers, and other staffers lost their jobs for not adhering to the mandate.

An attorney for the plaintiffs, Sujata Gibson, said that they have been "fighting for this since August of 2021 for these 10 people specifically. And we won and we won big for them," adding "They were reinstated with back pay, with no break in service, and attorneys' fees. That's huge."

"The judge's ruling yesterday, while not everything we wanted, is a precedent-setting victory, and a watershed moment in the teachers' fight," she added, noting that **thousands of other unvaccinated workers were similarly denied a religious exemption, and can now sue the city based on this new precedent.** Gibson added that **another class action lawsuit may be in the cards.**

"The court's ruling on class certification still leaves the door open to future relief for thousands of teachers negatively affected by the vaccine requirement," she said, adding "We intend to file a motion of reconsideration on a narrower basis."

It comes months after a lawyer for another group of fired, unvaccinated New York City teachers claimed that Mayor Eric Adams's administration blacklisted employees who refused to get the vaccine with a special code. "Loosely speaking, it is like a scarlet letter," lawyer John Bursch told the New York Post earlier this year. "The employee's personnel file shows a [generic] problem code that could just as easily be [for] committing a crime as declining to take a vaccine for religious reasons. In some instances, when plaintiffs tried to obtain employment elsewhere, they were told that they were red-flagged because of the problem code," he said.

NYC Mayor Eric Adams rescinded the vaccine mandate for workers earlier this year, allowing some 1,700 fired workers to reapply for their jobs (without back pay or retroactive full benefits)

Nurse Injured By COVID-19 Vaccine Heading To Trial Against Former Employer

JUNE 07, 2023 Zachary Stieber

A nurse diagnosed with a COVID-19 vaccine injury is headed to trial in a case against her former employer. Danielle Baker, 43, is trying to compel Ohio's Hospice Inc. to pay worker's compensation for her COVID-19 vaccine injury, suffered after she went to get vaccinated in June 2021 because she believed the company would mandate vaccination.

A state officer rejected the claim, finding that Baker did not show her injury came "in the course of and arising out of her employment" because Ohio's Hospice had not yet mandated vaccination. The Ohio Industrial Commission refused to hear the appeal.

But a judge intervened in May, scheduling a trial date that sets up the possibility a jury could side with the nurse.

"It was a win," Baker told The Epoch Times' sister media NTD, recounting when she learned of the development. "I cried. We've been fighting this for a while."

Baker hopes to receive a large award based on lost wages and medical bills.

New Developments

Baker said she knew Ohio's Hospice would eventually mandate vaccination for employment—it did so in August 2021—and she did not want to lose her job, so she went to get Pfizer's shot.

Baker quickly began experiencing symptoms such as severe back pain and went to the hospital. **She eventually suffered loss of feeling in her extremities and was diagnosed with transverse myelitis, or spinal cord inflammation.** Multiple doctors have assessed that the condition was caused by the vaccine.

Ohio's Hospice Inc., which did not respond to requests for comment, has said in court filings that Baker's complaint was barred by statutes of limitations and that she has failed to "declare an injurious event that occurred at work and/or a diagnosis for any such event that occurred at work."

Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost, a Republican, has also opposed the legal action, arguing no valid claim has been offered.

But Miami County Common Pleas Judge Jeannine Pratt disagreed, at least for now. The judge has scheduled a trial that would start on Jan. 31, 2024, if the case is not thrown out or settled.

Baker said she is not inclined to accept a settlement.

"Unless they give something that I can't refuse I plan on taking it all the way," Baker told NTD.

James Gardner, a lawyer representing the nurse, said via email that "most cases are resolved, but the diverse positions taken by the parties in this case might make settlement difficult."

Nurse for 20 Years

Baker was a nurse for 20 years, primarily working in hospice care. She worked for 17 years at Ohio's Hospice.

After suffering the vaccine injury, she went on short-term disability, which eventually turned into long-term disability.

Ohio's Hospice ultimately said that there were no reasonable accommodations that could be made, so Baker was let go, though she was deemed eligible to rejoin the company at a later date.

Baker has continued receiving disability payments as she's unable to work because of her symptoms.

Read more [here...](#)

Family of 24-Year-Old Who Died After COVID Vaccine Files Groundbreaking Lawsuit Against Biden Administration

C. Douglas Golden June 4, 2023

The family of a 24-year-old college student who died after a dose of Pfizer's COVID vaccine is suing the Biden administration's Department of Defense in a groundbreaking action, which could have serious repercussions in the future.

According to a February 2022 [WETM-TV](#) report, George Watts Jr., a student at Corning Community College, succumbed to what the coroner called a rare complication of the shot.

"Because he wanted to take his classes in person, George Jr. needed to be fully vaccinated. He scheduled his vaccine appointment and received his first shot in August [2021] and his second in September," WETM reported. "His parents said he chose the Pfizer vaccine because it was recently fully approved by the Food & Drug Administration."

However, the Lockwood native apparently experienced flu-like symptoms, which didn't resolve after his second dose.

"I noticed he was starting to get puffy in the face like a sinus issue. ... He had a cough, and I decided to take him to the emergency room to see what was going on," said George Watts Sr., who said that his son was diagnosed with a sinus infection. After several visits, his parents said, the 24-year-old "began coughing up blood and experienced pain in his feet, hands, and teeth. He also became extremely sensitive to sunlight."

On Oct. 27, 2021, George Jr. collapsed in his room and died; the autopsy said his death was due to "COVID-19 vaccine-related myocarditis."

"I told him that I was going to take him to the emergency room the next day after I got out of work," George Sr. told WETM. "We never made that trip to the emergency room."

Now, he's taking a trip to court.

In a suit filed Wednesday, the family accused U.S. Department of Defense officials of "willful misconduct" by promoting the vaccines as "safe and effective."

The Pentagon, the family alleged in court documents, "caused accelerated production and then pushed out hundreds of millions of vaccines for hundreds of millions of Americans while engaging in a deliberate and calculated mass-deception campaign specifically designed to obfuscate the fact that [Operation Warp Speed's] vaccines weren't licensed 'safe and effective,' were merely experimental, and legally could only be characterized as 'may be effective but could not be pronounced safe.'"

While calling the vaccines "merely experimental" is perhaps pushing it, the jabs were only able to be used under emergency authorization at the time that Watts Jr. received his inoculations.

Full Food and Drug Administration approval of the Pfizer/BioNTech and Moderna COVID vaccines didn't come until February 2022, as [Johns Hopkins Medicine](#) noted.

"By intentionally blurring the line of the critical distinction between 'licensed' and 'experimental,' DOD duped millions of Americans, including Mr. Watts, into being DOD's human subjects in its medical experiment, the largest in modern history," the lawsuit continued.

"While Mr. Watts cared about the safety of OWS' vaccines, DOD sadly did not." The Department of Defense is being listed as the defendant in the case because of "its leadership role in Operation Warp Speed ... later renamed the HHS-DOD COVID-19 Countermeasures Acceleration Group."

8-2

"Through its officials, the DOD directed and oversaw vaccine development, and directed supply, production, and distribution with HHS to provide support," the lawsuit said.

While families and loved ones can't sue vaccine makers like Pfizer and Moderna over vaccine side effects or subsequent injuries and deaths, the suit claimed that the Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act allows government entities — including the Pentagon — to be sued if they engaged in "willful misconduct."

Now, will the Watts family — and others like them — get their day in court to try and make the case young men and women were used as "human subjects" by forcing them to take vaccines for a disease that posed very little risk to them? That remains to be seen, of course; the suit contains quite loaded language. That said, Watts Jr.'s death wasn't a total one-off.

"Anything that can trigger an inflammatory response can trigger myocarditis. Usually, patients present with chest pain and sometimes shortness of breath," Dr. Liviu Klein, Chief of the Advanced Heart Failure and Transplant at the University of California, San Francisco, said in an interview with WETM.

Referencing a 2022 study published in the Journal of the American Medical Association, which found men under 30 were the most likely candidates to develop myocarditis after receiving a series of mRNA COVID-19 jabs, Klein said the difference between the reaction to the COVID inoculation and other vaccines was significant.

"The number of patients [males under 30] that were diagnosed with myocarditis [was] 50 per million doses of administered, so 50 out of a million," Dr. Klein said. "Just to put it in reference, a normal person [who is vaccinated] would probably be in the range of 10 per million of getting myocarditis."

So, of course, one question is whether this sees the light of day in a court of law. But here's a better question we should be asking: Why were perfectly healthy people like George Watts Jr. being forced to take a vaccine that didn't prevent an illness that posed very little risk to them in the first place, especially when the vaccine itself cost this 24-year-old his life?

George Watts Jr. v. [unclear]
EXHIBIT 12

Biden Admin Stiffing COVID Vaccine-Injured Americans Over Medical Claims

JUNE 29, 2023 Christian Britschgi

In April 2021, Adele Fox received a single shot of the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine. Within a few hours, the 60-year-old resident of Portsmouth, New Hampshire, started feeling shooting pains in her legs, arms, and neck. **The pain didn't abate over the next few days. Instead, it got worse and was accompanied by nausea and debilitating fatigue.**

Within a few weeks, **neurologists affiliated with Massachusetts General Hospital diagnosed her with several serious conditions they say were a result of her COVID-19 vaccine**, including small-fiber neuropathy (which causes a painful tingling in the extremities) and Sjögren's Syndrome (which leaves patients pained and fatigued, and in extreme cases, can damage internal organs).

This shot, which was supposed to get Fox back to normal, instead left her with diminished ability to work and enjoy life. Persistent physical therapy and experimental treatments she's taken since have done little to alleviate her symptoms. "I used to do so much, and now it's a struggle," she says. "Sometimes you just get down."

With her medical bills mounting and her condition not improving, Fox sought compensation for her damaged health. Federal liability protections prevent the vaccine-injured from directly suing vaccine manufacturers like Johnson & Johnson. Instead, claimants have to go to the federal government for compensation.

But as Fox would soon learn, **the government has two starkly different injury programs for vaccines.** One operates like a civil court with a neutral judge, lawyers on both sides, and a guaranteed right of appeal. In recent decades, it has approved about 75% of claims and pays out hundreds of millions of dollars per year.

The other, which handles COVID-19 vaccines, has rejected almost every claim brought to it, awarding less than \$10,000 since the pandemic. And in a nation nearly numb to the pandemic's toll and its scandals, the program is adding seething frustration atop lasting injury to Fox and people like her in a little reported aftermath to the government's much criticized performance on vaccines – ranging from erratic booster advice to broad-brush vaccine mandates that cost people their jobs.

Fox filed her claim two years ago, submitting hundreds of pages of medical documents about her condition and diagnoses. **She's nevertheless one of the 10,887 people still waiting on a decision.** "You're not even hearing anything from the organization that's supposed be helping you," she says. "The phone keeps ringing, no one is emailing, nobody is doing anything."

The federal agency overseeing the program, the Health Resources and Services Administration, said in a statement to RealClearInvestigations that the current number of claims "significantly exceeds the previous volume in the program" and that the program has "hired additional staff to address this growth in claims, and the President's budget requests additional funding to support the additional staffing needed to process claims."

Tale of Two Compensation Programs

The government's two contrasting vaccine compensation programs are similarly named and thus easily confused. The first, Vaccine Injury Compensation Program (VICP) was created in the 1980s and covers most routine vaccines. The second, the Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program (CICP), is a result of war-on-terror legislation in 2005 and now covers COVID-19 vaccines. Their bureaucratic differences help explain why a nation that has spent trillions of dollars on COVID relief programs has provided almost no assistance to people harmed by the vaccines that the government encouraged, and sometimes required, them to take.

The earlier program was supposed to shore up pharmaceutical companies' willingness to make childhood vaccines in the face of persistent vaccine injury lawsuits, while also giving the vaccine-injured a fair and expedited process for compensation. **The vaccine-injured would not sue pharmaceutical companies.** Instead, they'd petition the government in Federal Claims Court, where special masters (judges) would decide cases. Compensation came from a government-administered trust fund paid for by excise taxes levied on vaccine manufacturers.

Between 2006 and 2021, this court adjudicated cases from 10,602 petitioners and issued compensation to 7,618 of them. The compensation trust fund sits at \$4 billion and pays out about \$200 million in compensation and attorneys' fees each year.

9-2

This earlier program bears little resemblance to the Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program, where the COVID-vaccine cases of Fox and many others are languishing.

It was meant to incentivize pharmaceutical companies to be part of the federal response to one-off, one-in-a-million events like a bioweapon attack or an outbreak of a deadly pandemic. Although almost one billion doses of COVID-19 vaccines have been administered in the United States, and health authorities say boosters could become as common as the annual flu shot, it remains the only way people harmed by the shot can receive compensation.

It's far from guaranteed they'll get it.

Before the pandemic, this program received a little over 500 claims and had paid out compensation to only 30 people – mostly for H1N1 (swine flu) vaccine injuries. In just the past two years, it has been asked to make decisions on over 10,000 injury claims related to COVID countermeasures.

As of June, it made decisions on just 919 of these COVID-related claims and rejected 894 of them. It has so far paid out only \$8,593 in compensation to just four people who were injured by a COVID vaccine. The program has deemed another 20 people eligible for compensation, but has yet to pay them.

It's not a judicial process either. Rather, **it's an administrative process overseen by Health Resources and Services Administration**, which is housed within Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). People file a claim and government medical reviewers decide whether to pay out or not. That's an awkward arrangement, given that HHS is deciding whether to pay for damages caused by products it approved and in some cases mandated.

Because it's an administrative process, there's no right to counsel and no neutral arbitrator. A denied claimant can file for reconsideration with HRSA, but otherwise has no right to appeal.

Unlike the earlier program, the CICIP offers no compensation for pain and suffering and doesn't pay attorneys' fees. Most successful claimants have received compensation totaling a few hundred dollars or a few thousand dollars. The highest award for a COVID-19 vaccine injury sufferer was \$3,957.66 to a person who got myocarditis (a heart condition) from a vaccine.

It also has shorter filing deadlines. People have to file a claim within one year of vaccination, a much shorter window than the earlier program's standard of three years from the onset of symptoms. **Of the 894 claims that CICIP has rejected, 444 of them were for missing the filing deadline.**

CICIP also only awards compensation in cases where there's "compelling, reliable, valid, medical, and scientific evidence" that someone's injury is linked to a covered countermeasure. HRSA describes this as "a high evidentiary standard." Renée Gentry, a practicing vaccine injury lawyer who directs the Vaccine Injury Litigation Clinic at George Washington University, says it's a much higher bar than what the earlier vaccine injury compensation program requires, which contributes to a much lower rate of successful claims.

The Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program's nature as a small emergency program has seen its capacity strained by a flood of COVID-related injury claims. Of the 11,806 COVID-related claims filed, 10,887 are still pending. Those four cases where COVID compensation was paid out didn't come until after April 2023, over two years since the first vaccines were administered.

Pain and Suffering

The shortcomings of CICIP are all too apparent for the people who are forced to wade through it. Even folks who seem to have done everything right are left waiting or disappointed by the program.

Fox filed her claim in May 2021, which was relatively early in the immunization campaign. She also had clear diagnoses from well-credentialed doctors linking her conditions to her COVID-19 vaccination. Fox says she provided the program with no shortage of documentation as well.

After filing all that paperwork, she hasn't been idle either. After months of not hearing anything back from CICIP, Fox started to reach out repeatedly to anyone she thought might be able to move the needle. She spoke repeatedly with representatives from Sen. Jeanne Shaheen's and Rep. Chris Pappas' offices. She also kept calling program administrators, trying to figure out what was taking so long.

"I'm sure they saw my number, and said 'Ah, Fox, oh no, not her [again]'," she jokes.

Her congressional representatives did reach out to CIGP on her behalf. That was at least effective at getting program administrators to call Fox personally twice, once in July 2022 and again in June 2023. But each time, they could only offer her reassurance that her paperwork had been received. On both calls, Fox says she was told that the program was vastly overburdened by the flood of COVID-19 claims it had received. She, like thousands of others, would have to wait.

The few decisions on COVID-19 claims that have trickled out haven't offered much relief to the people who've received them. That includes Cody Flint, one of the 894 people who've had their COVID-related claims rejected.

Flint was vaccinated in February 2021, when he received a single Pfizer dose. He says that he started to feel headaches and had affected vision within 30 minutes of the shot. He was still experiencing symptoms two days later when he headed to his job as a crop-dusting pilot.

While flying that day, he started to experience extreme tunnel vision, followed by a sensation he describes as "a bomb [going] off in my head." He barely managed to get his plane back to his runway, where his coworkers found him slumped over his controls and shaking.

He was diagnosed with perilymphatic fistula (or tear of the inner ear) caused by elevated intracranial pressure – which could only be relieved through repeated draining of his spinal fluid. Given the timing of his symptoms and the fact that he'd passed a flight physical just a couple weeks prior, his doctors said his condition was almost certainly caused by the vaccine. His injury prevented him from returning to work as a pilot, and his mounting medical bills saw him draw down all of his savings.

In April 2021, Flint filed a claim. In May 2022 – just a few weeks after Sen. Cindy Hyde-Smith asked HHS Secretary Xavier Becerra about his case specifically in a committee hearing – Flint's claim was rejected. **The program's medical reviewers told Flint that it was more likely his injuries were caused by barotrauma from flying a plane.**

He petitioned for a reconsideration of his case. His doctors argued that there was no way he'd have experienced barotrauma from flying just a few hundred feet off the ground. Commercial airliners, they noted, are pressurized at 6,000 to 8,000 feet of elevation. Flint's lawyers also submitted recent studies linking the symptoms he'd experienced to COVID-19 vaccinations.

Nevertheless, a separate medical reviewer at HRSA upheld the CIGP's initial denial in January 2023. That letter succinctly stated that HHS has "no appeals process beyond this reconsideration" and "there is no judicial review of a final action concerning CIGP eligibility."

Efforts at Reform

The federal government's liability protections for COVID-19 vaccines aren't scheduled to expire until the end of 2024. Once they do, those claiming a vaccine injury will be able to pursue claims against vaccine manufacturers in state courts.

While liability protections remain in effect, the federal program is injured claimants' only potential source of compensation. Whether or not the HRSA succeeds in boosting staffing in line with its statement to RCI, those seeking compensation have started to get organized. They've formed the group React19, which is dedicated to advocating for additional research into the side effects of COVID-19 vaccines. It's grown into a network of tens of thousands of people who say they suffered adverse injuries from the shot. Flint, the pilot, is on its board of directors.

"It's a very pro-vaccine community," says Christopher Dreisbach, the group's legal affairs director. **"You say anything about vaccine injuries, you're branded as anti-vaxxers.** We are pro-science, we are not political. We're just dealing with a very politicized issue."

He says the politicization of vaccines has made their efforts at compensation reform a challenge.

When the CIGP, and the 2005 Pandemic Response and Emergency Preparedness (PREP) Act that created it, were first being debated, Republican lawmakers were its main advocates, while its main critics were Democrats. The partisan politics of the program and liability protections for pharmaceutical companies has done a 180 since COVID.

In 2005, Rep. Sheila Jackson Lee argued during the House floor debate on the PREP Act that the law's liability shield would leave injured healthcare workers with little protection or chance of compensation. Come 2023, she would return to the floor of the

House to argue in favor of mandating those same healthcare workers receive a vaccine covered by the PREP Act's liability shield.

The PREP Act's harshest critics during COVID, meanwhile, have mostly been Republicans.

"I call the PREP Act medical malpractice martial law," says Rep. Thomas Massie, who complains that its liability shield is both incredibly broad and improperly preempts state law. "I think it's sort of anathema to the way our government is set up. I found it hard to believe that Congress would pass something, much less that a Republican president would invoke it."

In March 2022, Sen. Mike Lee introduced a bill that would have amended CIRC to give claimants the same framework for pursuing compensation as the VICP. They could file in Federal Claims Court and receive an expedited, judicial adjudication of their injury claim.

Gentry argues that it would be far simpler to just move the COVID-19 vaccines into the VICP program, which already has a successful track record of adjudicating injury claims. In order for that to happen under the law that created the VICP, the CDC needs to recommend the vaccines for routine administration to children (which has already happened) and vaccine manufacturers would have to start paying excise taxes. That latter condition will require action from Congress.

VICP needs a number of updates as well, says Gentry, including expanding the number of special masters to handle the backlog of cases and increasing the available levels of compensation (which haven't been updated since the 1980s).

Increasing the number of special masters is particularly important if the VICP program is going to be expected to process tens of thousands of COVID claims, she says. But she argues it's the best way of getting the vaccine injured out of CIRC and into a program that will work for them. "If you're taking away someone's constitutional right to sue, you really have to give them a reasonable and meaningful alternative and that's what this program is, for all of its faults," says Gentry. While efforts at reform in Washington lumber on, React19 has started a privately funded compensation program that's thus far paid out \$552,000.

"Is that making a meaningful difference to all the vaccine injured everywhere? No, that's not enough," says Dreisbach, but he notes that it's far more than what CIRC has paid out. "That should be pretty embarrassing to the federal government."

Pfizer and Moderna Face Legal Action in Australia Over Alleged Failure to Obtain Necessary "Genetically Modified Organisms" Licenses in COVID-19 Vaccines

Jim Hoft Jul. 21, 2023

A lawsuit was filed in Australia's Federal Court on July 6, 2023, accusing pharmaceutical giants Pfizer and Moderna of dealing with Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) without the requisite licenses. The court case, identified as *Julian Fidge v. Pfizer Australia Pty Ltd & Anor*, marks a milestone in the ongoing global discourse around the risks of the experimental COVID-19 vaccines.

From the [news release](#):

"To paraphrase a line about the devil:

... the greatest trick Pfizer and Moderna ever pulled was to convince the world their products don't enter the nucleus, and alter chromosomal DNA, forever

With a heavy heart I can now share with you the new legal proceedings we launched on 6 July, naming Pfizer and Moderna as the Defendants; our planet's new IG Farbens producing a more subtle Zyklon B (said with respect to those affected by the latter).

The **Letters of Demand** we sent to Pfizer, Moderna, the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator, and the TGA, contain an abundance of references referring to the long established science surrounding the real dangers these transfection products were always known to pose to humanity."

The lawsuit led by Julian Gillespie LLB, B Juris, with instructing solicitor Katie Ashby-Koppens argue that the vaccines developed by Pfizer and Moderna, including both monovalent and bivalent vaccines, are or contain GMOs, and "that they have failed to apply for the necessary licenses."

Central to this argument is the assertion that the lipid nanoparticle (LNP) -modRNA and -modDNA complexes present in the vaccines fulfill the Australian legal definitions of a genetically modified organism, pursuant to the **Gene Technology Act 2000** (GT Act).

"In a nutshell: the LNP-modRNA complexes produced by Pfizer and Moderna satisfy Australian legal definitions for being properly deemed **Genetically Modified Organisms**, or GMOs. Almost identical legal definitions are found in many other countries, including the EU. There are over four decades of science acknowledging how easily synthetic and natural RNA can integrate with genomic DNA.

The subsequent discovery by Kevin McKernan of grossly excessive synthetic DNA contamination in the vials of both companies only makes a very bad situation much worse, as that modDNA also satisfies the same legal definitions for being yet another form of GMO, while possessing superior traits for effectively undergoing genomic integration, and DNA disregulation.

In Australia it is a serious criminal offence to 'deal' with GMOs without a GMO licence first being granted by the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator."

Both Pfizer and Moderna have been accused of a 'willful blindness' to the legislative requirements. The lawsuits accuse the companies of bypassing the necessary processes to seek a GMO license from the Australian Office of the Gene Technology Regulator (OGTR) before pursuing provisional approval from the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA).

AstraZeneca, another vaccine producer, is cited as a contrast, having properly sought a GMO License before seeking TGA approval for its COVID-19 vaccine.

"This constituted a gross and heinous failure by Australia's Gene Technology Regulator, assisted by the Secretary of Health not pausing to ask whether these drugs were not always meant to be first regulated by the OGTR, prior to being possibly cleared to proceed to apply for provisional approval with the TGA.

This utter failure by GMO regulators occurred about the globe when the C19 drugs were hustled to the front of approval ques, where now thanks to their transparent failures we can thank them for ensuring the Human Genome has been irreparably poisoned."

The lawsuit seeks an urgent injunction against Pfizer and Moderna to prevent any further 'dealings' with their products in Australia, which would effectively stop further vaccinations. Further to that, it also seeks to investigate what health officials and regulators knew about these products when they first came up for approval.

"If we can achieve that we can then start asking the real questions of what Brendan Murphy and his army of highly paid PhDs knew when Pfizer and Moderna first 'came a knockin', while also asking what Australia's Gene Technology Regulator, Raj Buhla, was doing when these drug manufacturers turned up seeking approvals, where there has been two decades of established science showing these transfection products being perfectly suited for targeting and altering genomes. There is no room for pleas of ignorance; the actions of Murphy and Buhla amount to an intentional dereliction of duty rising to some form of criminal culpability."

Further muddying the waters is the recent discovery by genomics expert Kevinn McKernan of extensive DNA cell-substrate contamination in both Pfizer's and Moderna's vaccines.

Read more from [MAAT'S Method](#):

DNA Contamination

Compounding the above is the recent discovery by genomics expert Kevinn McKernan of dangerously excessive DNA cell-substrate contamination. This discovery has now been independently verified by other internationally recognised laboratories using different vials, evidencing gross, pre-existing, and continuing global supply contamination by Pfizer and Moderna.

The synthetic DNA (modDNA) contamination is anywhere between 18-70 times above legal limits.

However, this contamination is much worse than contemplated by outdated regulations, as the modDNA is also encapsulated in LNPs, thus ensuring bio-distribution throughout human bodies, and transfection into cells of all major types of organs, including the brain, heart, ovaries, testes, liver, spleen, eyes, and unborn children.

For the purposes of the GT Act, this excessive contamination also fulfils the legal definitions for being correctly deemed Genetically Modified Organisms, and perhaps the worst type of GMO, as genomic integration with chromosomal DNA does not require reverse-transcription, and some of this modDNA (by Pfizer) has the opportunity of becoming 'replication competent' (self replicating) in certain persons known to be infected with SV40 related viruses.

Perversely, and as a strict matter of law, both Pfizer and Moderna were/are required to possess GMO Licences to 'deal' with their LNP-modDNA contamination in Australia, though any organisation responsible for such licensure (the OGTR in this instance) would never allow any product into their country that contains this form of GMO contamination. This form of GMO contamination alters the course of humanity, and what it means to be human.

By these proceedings the Applicant (Dr Julian Fidge) together with the legal team who discovered and created the proceedings (Julian Gillespie, Katie Ashby-Koppens and Peter Fam), now seek to present the above facts to the court.

In the event the court follows and accepts the evidence that the C-19 products contain GMOs, and as a consequence both Pfizer and Moderna are seen to be committing ongoing Serious Criminal Offences by dealing with GMOs in Australia without a licence, the court should find itself compelled to issue an Injunction under section 147 preventing Pfizer and Moderna from any further dealings in Australia, which outcome would also require the halt of any further use of the Pfizer and Moderna C-19 products in Australia.

11-1

Landmark Pre-Trial Hearing Granted in Worker's Compensation Lawsuit: Ohio Nurse Coerced to Receive COVID-19 Vaccine, Resulting in Severe Neurological Disorder

Jim Hoft Jul. 24, 2023

Danielle Baker, an experienced registered nurse, is gearing up to take her former employer, Ohio's Hospice Inc., to court after she was coerced to receive the Pfizer mRNA COVID-19 vaccine. After developing a serious neurological condition known as "transverse myelitis" post-vaccination, Baker will see her day in court early next year.

Baker is a seasoned healthcare professional specializing in hospice and palliative care for two decades. She spent the last 17 years caring for her patients in hospice care.

However, her life took a drastic turn in June 2021, when her employer allegedly issued a directive, mandating COVID-19 vaccination by July 2021 for all employees intending to maintain their benefits. Pressed by the need to provide for her family, Baker reluctantly received the Pfizer vaccine.

"In 2021, we began getting bombarded with emails filled with facts about the safety and effectiveness of the jab, encouraging us all to become vaccinated. The emails started to become more demanding, questioned our morals and values, started large incentives and then finally telling the staff that the "safety net" that was set up for those who came down with Covid or had vaccine reactions would be pulled starting July 2021 unless you took the vaccination. It was well known the mandate would be put into effect August 1st 2021. Despite my gut instinct, I took it as I needed my income and career. That's when my life changed forever," Baker revealed on her GiveSendGo campaign.

Please help and donate to Danielle Baker [here](#).

Baker received her first dose of the vaccine on June 4, 2021. Her condition began to deteriorate rapidly following her second dose on June 26.

"I had gotten my second shot on June 26 and ended up in the emergency room within 24 hours. From that point, I never got better," Baker said.

Within 2.5 weeks following the second dose, she developed severe neurological problems, demyelination of the spine, and was diagnosed with transverse myelitis, a condition her neurologist, Dr. Jon Durrani, affirmed was due to the vaccine.

"On July the 17th is when I developed a severe back pain and I started to lose the feeling and function in all of my extremities over the next four days," Baker said.

According to NIH, "transverse myelitis is a neurological disorder caused by inflammation of the spinal cord, the part of the central nervous system that sends impulses from the brain to nerves in the body."

Per Mayo Clinic, "transverse myelitis interrupts the messages that the spinal cord nerves send throughout the body. This can cause pain, muscle weakness, paralysis, sensory problems, or bladder and bowel dysfunction."

11-2

Baker's worker's compensation lawsuit (*Danielle Baker v Ohio's Hospice, Inc, et al, Case No. 23 CV 117*) has been fought tooth and nail by her former employer, seeking its dismissal.

However, Judge Jeannine Pratt sided with Baker, stating that her case deserves to be heard. The pre-trial hearing is slated for January 11, 2024, at the Miami County Courthouse in Troy, OH.

"I have a battle, that's for sure. My publicist is Kevin Tuttle. He has volunteered his time to help me as I don't have funds to pay for the help," Baker told The Gateway Pundit.

"I worked as a hospice RN on the front lines of the so-called pandemic. Seeing the horror of what they did to our elderly population was trauma enough. In June of 2021, after heavy coercion from Ohio's Hospice, I took the Pfizer series and began my descent into the hell that is now my life. I am now completely disabled and actively advocate for others that have been impacted by everything in regard to Covid," she added.

Since her adverse reaction to the vaccine, Baker's life has been a continuous struggle. From being unable to work to difficulties in completing even basic daily tasks, her condition is a stark contrast to the active life she once led.

She has sought treatment from three core physicians and consulted numerous others in an attempt to find relief from her debilitating symptoms, to no avail.

During her last hospital admission, physicians unfamiliar with her case suggested she was suffering from a psychological problem and recommended a psychiatric evaluation.

Baker's situation is unique in Ohio as she is one of the first nurses in the state to be on disability due to the COVID-19 vaccine. She hopes her case will set a precedent and help others in similar situations to seek the justice they deserve.

"Not only was I left without a job and career, I am now permanently disabled. I am engaged in a battle with my former employer in attempts to be fairly compensated but they are winning the battle. They of course have access to large sums of money to fight me and it doesn't look like they will honor the safety net. We live at just above poverty level so other than social security disability we do not qualify for other assistance," said Baker.

"No one should ever be coerced, bribed, threatened and/or mandated to have a medical procedure done for the benefit of their employer," she added.

"I proudly worked for Ohio's Hospice for 17 years, never imagining that this agency that profits up to \$49 million a year would turn their back on me when I needed them the most. Instead, they have left me and my family in financial ruins. This is just the tip of the iceberg, and we plan on flipping it upside down by setting precedent for others when we rightfully win this case."

Listen to Baker's testimony to the January 2023 committee that voted to allow the Covid shots onto the childhood schedule:

Baker's case is considered a landmark, and it has the potential to set positive precedent in similar cases across the country. As her pre-trial hearing approaches, the healthcare community and the world will be watching closely. Our first "required settlement meeting" to take place December 2023: pic.twitter.com/ramJXQpiB7

— The Coerced Nurse (@homcrn_baker) July 22, 2023

12-1

Landmark Case in Germany: BioNTech Faces Lawsuit Over COVID-19 Vaccine Side Effects

Jim Hofl June 12, 2023

In a landmark development, **BioNTech SE**, the German biotechnology company that partnered with **Pfizer Inc.** to produce one of the first COVID-19 vaccines, is now facing its first legal challenge in Germany over vaccine side effects.

In an unprecedented case that could potentially spark hundreds of similar claims across Germany, the plaintiff – a woman who has chosen to remain anonymous due to Germany's privacy laws – is suing BioNTech for a minimum of €150,000 (\$161,500) in damages.

According to Reuters, she cites "damages for bodily harm as well as compensation for unspecified material damage," as detailed by Hamburg's regional court and the law firm representing her, Rogert & Ulbrich.

Side effects listed in the suit include upper-body pain, swollen extremities, fatigue, and sleeping disorders attributed to the BioNTech Pfizer vaccine.

The landmark case's first hearing will take place on Monday.

More lawsuits are coming in Germany. Rogert & Ulbrich reports filing about 250 cases for clients seeking damages for COVID-19 vaccine side effects. Another law firm, Caesar-Preller, claims to represent 100 cases, collectively covering almost all such cases in Germany. A few similar cases have been filed in Italy.

Reuters reported:

Tobias Ulbrich, a lawyer at Rogert & Ulbrich, told Reuters he aimed to challenge in court the assessment made by European Union regulators and German vaccine assessment bodies that the BioNTech shot has a positive risk-benefit profile.

German pharmaceutical law states that makers of drugs or vaccines are only liable to pay damages for side-effects if "medical science" shows that their products cause disproportionate harm relative to their benefits or if the label information is wrong.

BioNTech, which holds the marketing authorisation in Germany for the shot it developed with Pfizer <PFE:N>, said it concluded after careful consideration that the case was without merit.

"The positive benefit-risk profile of **Comirnaty** remains positive and the safety profile has been well characterised," the biotech firm said, referring to the vaccine's brand name.

It noted about 1.5 billion people had received the shot across the world, including more than 64 million in Germany.

The European Medicines Agency (EMA) also claimed that BioNTech's Comirnaty, the most prevalent vaccine in the Western world, is "safe for use."

EMA claimed that vaccines have helped save almost '20 million lives globally' in the first year of the pandemic alone. While acknowledging a 'rare' risk of myocarditis and pericarditis, two types of heart inflammation, primarily in young males post-vaccination, the EMA affirms that safety monitoring was not compromised during fast-track assessments.

Reuters reported that the liability issue remains uncertain, especially regarding who would pay legal costs or compensation if the plaintiff wins. EU's bulk purchase agreements with vaccine manufacturers, including BioNTech-Pfizer, reportedly contain full or partial liability waivers for legal costs and potential compensation, which could force EU governments to bear some costs.

Germany, like many countries, has a no-fault compensation program for individuals who suffer permanent harm from vaccines. However, participation in this program does not preclude an individual from seeking damages separately.

In contrast, the United States has granted manufacturers immunity from liability for COVID vaccines receiving regulatory approval.

13-1

Washington Doctor Facing Probe For Criticizing COVID Policies Wins Emergency Injunction

MAY 28, 2023 Caden Pearsen

A Washington state appeals court has granted an emergency injunction to a retired doctor facing disciplinary action from the Washington Medical Commission (WMC) over articles he wrote against the official COVID-19 narrative in 2021.

Dr. Richard J. Eggleston, a retired ophthalmologist in Clarkston, Washington, faces disciplinary action over articles published in the Lewiston Tribune he wrote challenged the prevailing information and guidance regarding the pandemic.

During the pandemic, doctors could be accused of spreading misinformation if they provided advice contrary to the official information. This included, for example, advocating or prescribing treatments such as ivermectin or disagreeing with the effectiveness of face masks and vaccines.

The United States officially ended the pandemic emergency on May 11.

The WMC filed charges against Dr. Eggleston, accusing him of unprofessional conduct, including spreading false information and misinformation about the SARS-CoV-2 virus and its treatments. They assert that his actions violated state laws related to moral turpitude, misrepresentation, and interference with an investigation.

In response to the charges, Dr. Eggleston has maintained his innocence and has argued that his articles are protected under the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech. He sought to have the disciplinary proceedings dismissed on the grounds that the statutes applied by the WMC infringed upon his constitutional rights.

Despite a separate, initial motion to dismiss being previously denied, the recent emergency injunction granted by the appeals court now provides a temporary reprieve for Dr. Eggleston. The injunction halts the disciplinary proceedings while the court further examines the case.

The WMC wants to carry out the fact-finding hearing, they say, to protect public health and fulfill its disciplinary responsibilities for the medical profession "and to resolve issues of fact and credibility that require the expertise of the Commission to resolve," according to a court filing ([pdf](#)).

Court Commissioner Hailey L. Landrus noted in her ruling that while putting a stay on the proceeding would inconvenience the commission—as lawyers for the WMC argued—it doesn't demonstrate harm to the public.

'Chilling Effect' on Free Speech

Dr. Eggleston, on the other hand, argued that he sought to halt the disciplinary proceedings to assert his First Amendment right to free speech.

Landrus favored the retired doctor's argument, saying public dialogue by professionals receives strong First Amendment protection, and the mere fact of prosecution can have a "chilling effect" on the exercise of these rights for Dr. Eggleston and other medical professionals.

"Dr. Eggleston has a competing interest in enjoining the disciplinary proceedings in order to seek First Amendment protection for his speech, which is the reason for the administrative proceedings in the first place. Denying a stay would, according to Dr. Eggleston, violate his constitutional right to free speech," Landrus said in her ruling.

"Balancing the parties competing interests and hardships favors Dr. Eggleston," the court commissioner added.

She found that it would be more efficient to review the trial court's decision on the injunction instead of proceeding with a lengthy administrative hearing. Granting the injunction could potentially resolve the entire proceedings, saving time and resources, she noted.

The court's decision to grant the emergency injunction comes as a significant development in Dr. Eggleston's ongoing legal battle with the WMC.

13-2

The granted stay of the proceedings will delay hearings scheduled to commence this week, Wednesday through Friday. This delay provides a short window of opportunity for the WMC to withdraw the charges against Dr. Eggleston. However, if the WMC chooses not to withdraw the charges, the legal process will proceed as planned.

"I'm very happy to see that this part of the legal system understands this First Amendment issue and basic rights to get accurate information from a physician," Dr. Eggleston told The Defender.

The legal team representing Dr. Eggleston expressed their satisfaction with the court's ruling to grant the stay of proceedings. Todd Richardson, one of Dr. Eggleston's lawyers, emphasized the significance of protecting First Amendment rights.

"As Americans, if we don't conscientiously defend these foundational rights and freedoms, we may soon wake up to realize we have lost them," he told The Defender.

The Epoch Times contacted WMC for comment.

14-1

Pediatrician Fired After Raising Alarm On COVID Vaccines During US Senate Event

JULY 30, 2023 *Zachary Stieber and Jan Jekielek*

A medical expert was terminated by one of her employers after raising concerns about the safety of COVID-19 vaccines during an event held by a U.S. senator, according to newly disclosed documents.

After Dr. Renata Moon (who will appear on "American Thought Leaders" premiering Mon. Aug. 30, 7:30pm ET) testified during the December 2022 event on Capitol Hill, **Washington State University officials told her that they were alerting a state medical commission because she allegedly promoted misinformation, one of the documents shows.**

The Washington Medical Commission (WMC) has said that doctors who offer misinformation about COVID-19 vaccines, treatments, and preventative measures "erode the public trust in the medical profession and endanger patients," that people should lodge complaints against doctors who allegedly provide misinformation, and that it may revoke the licenses of doctors who are found to have spread misinformation.

Drs. Jeff Haney and James Record, Washington State University officials, referenced the commission in a letter to Dr. Moon dated March 3, 2023.

"The WMC has asked the public and practitioners to report possible spread of misinformation. There are components of your presentation that could be interpreted as a possible spread," they wrote. "As such, we are ethically obligated to make a report to the WMC to investigate possible breach of this expectation."

The university informed Dr. Moon in June 2023 that it was effectively firing her by not renewing her appointment as a clinical associate professor of medicine, according to other documents reviewed by The Epoch Times.

"At this time, the needs of the college are moving in a different direction and your participation is no longer required," Drs. Haney and Record wrote.

More detailed reasoning was not provided.

"This is not about my personal situation with the school. This is about freedom of speech for all Americans," Dr. Moon told The Epoch Times in an email.

"We must create an ethical healthcare system that is concerned only with the well being of individual patients and not the financial interests of massive corporations. We are dealing with conflicts of interest that are larger than any of us ever imagined."

Testimony

Sen. Ron Johnson (R-Wis.) convened Dr. Moon and other experts, including Drs. Peter McCullough and Robert Malone, to talk about COVID-19 vaccines. The event was titled, "COVID-19 Vaccines: What They Are, How They Work, and Possible Causes of Injuries."

Dr. Moon testified that she had only seen two or three cases of myocarditis, a form of heart inflammation, while practicing for more than 20 years. But after the COVID-19 vaccines were rolled out, she said, she has been seeing more cases, and heard about others from fellow doctors.

"There's clearly been a massive increase," Dr. Moon said.

Dr. Moon also pulled out the package insert for the vaccines, or a piece of paper that typically outlines warnings, ingredients, and other information for a vaccine. The insert for the COVID-19 vaccines has no information and says, "intentionally blank," the U.S. Food and Drug Administration has acknowledged.

14-2

"How am I to give informed consent to parents when this is what I have?" Dr. Moon said.

Regulators say people can access the information that is usually on the paper on the administration's website. One of the vaccine manufacturers has said that the COVID-19 vaccine inserts were left blank because the information was being updated during the COVID-19 pandemic.

"I have a government telling me that I have to say 'safe and effective' and if I don't, my license is at threat. We're seeing an uptick in myocarditis. We're seeing an uptick in adverse reactions. We have trusted these regulatory agencies—I have—for my entire career up until now," Dr. Moon testified.

"Something is extremely wrong, and that is the anecdotal story that I have."

Myocarditis is caused by the COVID-19 vaccines, U.S. officials have confirmed. The heart inflammation primarily affects younger males and can cause death.

"It's my obligation to speak out. It's the obligation of any physician who thinks that there is a problem with a product to speak about that product, whether, honestly, whether they're right or wrong," Dr. Moon said on EpochTV's "ATL: Now."

"And in this case, everything I said was completely factual."



Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine
Department of Medical Education and Clinical Sciences

MEMORANDUM

TO: Renata Moon

FROM: Jeff Haney, Chair, Department of Medical Education and Clinical Sciences
James R. Record, Interim Dean, Elson S. Floyd College of Medicine

DATE: March 3, 2023

SUBJECT: Your Public Engagement on Dec. 7th, 2022

Dr. Moon, it was brought to our attention that you participated in an event entitled: "Covid-19 Vaccines: What They Are, How They Work, and Possible Causes of Injuries". The event was described using the following phrases, "Senator Ron Johnson Hosts Expert Forum on Covid Vaccines" and "World-renowned experts in Public Health, Science, Medicine, Law, and Journalism, in a public forum". Based on review, the event took place in the U.S. Senate's Hart Building on Capitol Hill in Washington, D.C. at 12:00 pm EST on Dec. 7th, 2022. Considering this information and review of the recording of the session, there are several concerns related to your responsibilities as a faculty member:

- Failure to request and report absence - In review of our systems, you did not request or report the absence for the days you were scheduled for teaching responsibilities. Further, in this circumstance, your activity impacted a cohort of learners and workload for faculty and staff that had to account for your absence, thereby possibly violating Sec. II.B.2 of the Faculty Manual.
- Possible inappropriate representation of Faculty Role and College/University. The Faculty Manual protects our academic freedoms and reminds us of our responsibilities when identifying as faculty. "When they (faculty) speak or write as citizens, they should be free from institutional censorship or discipline, but their special position in the community imposes special obligations. As scholars and educational officers, they should remember that the public may judge their profession and their institution by their utterances. Hence, they should at all times be accurate, should exercise appropriate restraint, should show respect for the opinions of others, and should make every effort to indicate that they are not speaking for the institution." (Faculty Manual, Section II.A). In your participation, it was not clear that you were not speaking on behalf of the institution, which may implicate Sec. II.A of the Faculty Manual.
- Possible ethics policy breach - "The Ethics in Public Service Law, RCW 42.52, establishes a single code of ethics applicable to all state officers and state employees. Washington State University faculty members are state employees and are subject to the ethics law and rules, as well as Washington State University ethics policies." (Faculty Manual, II.D). RCW 42.52.020 dictates that state employees cannot engage in activities that are incompatible with public duties. By attending the forum without taking proper leave, you may have violated this statute. This matter will be forwarded to the WSU Office of Internal Audit for additional review.
- Physician Professionalism - the Washington Medical Commission (WMC) supports the position taken by the Federation of State Medical Boards (FSMB) regarding COVID-19 vaccine misinformation. "Spreading inaccurate COVID-19 vaccine information contradicts that responsibility, threatens to further erode public trust in the medical profession and puts all patients at risk." The WMC has asked the public and practitioners to report possible spread of misinformation. There are components of your presentation that could be interpreted as a possible spread, as such we are ethically obligated to make a report to the WMC to investigate possible breach of this expectation.
- Expectations of Medical Education - There were components of the roundtable that were inconsistent with expectations of the evidence based medical education expected in developing a future generation of physicians. The expressed views will require us to review your teaching assignments in the frame of the education our students.

We will be working with you, the appropriate leaders in the University system, and possibly the Washington State Executive Ethics Board to determine appropriate next steps for each item listed.

cc: Laura Hill, Senior Vice Provost