

Grievance Details

15

Registration Number	: PMOPG/E/2021/0483615
Registration Date	: 01 Jul 2021
Letter Date	: NIL
Receive Date	: 01 Jul 2021
Grievance Category	: Public Grievances
Complainant's Name	: M.A.SHAIKH
Address	: 4, Gauri Compound, Near Gorai Khadi, LT Road,, Borivali Mumbai-400091
District	: Mumbai City
State/UT	: Maharashtra
Contact No.	: 7977675251
E-mail ID	: rashidkhanpathan81@gmail.com
Attachment	: <u>Open</u>

Grievance Description :

Sub 1 Immediate direction for implementation of Parliamentary Committees 72 Report and recommendations of investigation and prosecution of office bearers of toxic philanthropist and Vaccine Syndicates Bill Melinda Gates Foundation and the concerned officials of Indian Council of Medical Research ICMR responsible for death of 8 female children because of unauthorized unlawful unapproved vaccines 2 Immediate direction to the Central Bureau of Investigation CBI for registration of First Information Report FIR for investigation and strict action under sections 115 109 302 307 304 419 420 471 474 188 505 rw 120 B 34 of IPC sections of Disaster Management Act 2005 and other provisions of the special acts against all the antinational antihumanity elements bio terrorists Pharma Syndicates Tech Syndicates and Tech Bullies who are involved in offences against entire humanity which are genocide Mass Murders of the citizens caused by their acts of commission and omission related to Covid19 pandemic as detailed in the draft charges given in the present complaint 3 Immediate direction to concerned Authorities i To issue Lookout Notices Lookout Circulars LOC and arrest warrants against the accused whose involvement is exfacie proved ii To initiate action for attachment of movable and immovable properties of all of the accused and their companies iii To commence custodial interrogation of the accused iv To conduct a Lie Detector Test Brain Mapping Test Narco Analysis test of all the prime accused such as Dr Soumya Swaminathan Dr Randeep Guleria Mr Arvind Kejriwal Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus Dr Anthony Fauci Bill Gates Mark Zuckerberg Jack Dorsey and others on the grounds explained in this Representation cum Complaint

Classification(By PMO) : Public Grievance
Category(By PMO) : Not Provided

DFO Health & PW
 821+
 DMR
 82



CASE NUMBER BEFORE HON'BLE PRESIDENT OF INDIA: PRSEC/E/2021/16758

1. Hon'ble Shri Ram Nath Kovind,
President of India

2. Hon'ble Shri Narendra Modi,
Prime Minister of India

3. Hon'ble Shri Amit Shah,
Minister of Home Affairs of India

Sub: 1. Immediate direction for implementation of Parliamentary Committee's 72nd Report and recommendations of investigation and prosecution of office bearers of **'Toxic Philanthropist'** and **'Vaccine Syndicate's Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation'** and the concerned officials of Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) responsible for death of 8 female children because of unauthorized, unlawful & unapproved vaccines;

2. Immediate direction to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) for registration of First Information Report (FIR) for investigation and strict action under sections 115, 109, 302, 307, 304, 419, 420, 471, 474, 188, 505, n/w 120 (B) & 34 of IPC & sections of Disaster Management Act 2005 and other provisions of the special acts against all the anti-national, anti-humanity elements, bin terrorists, 'Pharma Syndicates', 'Tech Syndicates' and 'Tech Bullies', who are involved in offences against entire humanity which are genocide (Mass Murders) of the citizens, caused by their acts of commission and omission related to Covid-19 pandemic as detailed in the draft charges given in the present complaint.

3.	Confirmation of legality of Report by Parliamentary Committee by the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court of India.	7	17
4.	A1] Further attempt by accused who official to declare false pandemic: [B] The H1N1 swine flu pandemic was "fake," and its threat to human health was hyped, and that WHO's policies were influenced by vaccine manufacturers who benefited from the pandemic virus.	8	18
4A.	The American Frontline Doctors White Paper on Covid-19 experimental vaccine candidates.	8.1.A	24
5.	Chronology of offences committed by accused as per their conspiracy to commit mass murders i.e. genocide for creating market for unapproved vaccines by accused Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and other vaccine Syndicates.	9	32
6.	Role played by each accused in execution of the conspiracy	10	44
7.	Need for thorough and detailed investigation of some co-conspirators in 'Main Stream Media' (MSM) involved in the conspiracy.	11	52
8.	Need for issuing Non-bailable arrest warrants against all the accused.	12	52
9.	Need for immediate direction for attachment of all movable & immovable properties of the accused.	13	52
10.	Provisions of Indian Penal Code attracted in the present case.	14	52
11.	Scientific fraud regarding RT-PCR Test.	15	62
12.	Misconception of Asymptomatic transmission	16	70
13.	Scientific fraud regarding Mask:-	17	71
14.	Scientific fraud regarding vaccines and legal position for non-mandatory vaccinations,	18	77

v) 'A stitch in time will save nine.'

vii) 'Injustice anywhere is threat to Justice' everywhere.

-Martin Luther King

viii) When injustice becomes the law, resistance becomes the duty.

-Thomas Jefferson

viii) Mercy to the criminal is injustice to the victim.

x) Crime is contagious. If the Government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for law; It invites every man to become a law unto himself; It invites anarchy.

-Luis Brandeis

xi) If you are neutral in situations of injustice, you have chosen the side of the oppressor.

-Archbishop Desmond Tutu

xii) This world suffered a lot, not because of violence of bad people, but because of silence of good people.

-Napoleon Bonaparte

xiii) Where you see wrong or inequality or injustice, speak out, because this is your country. This is your democracy. Make it. Protect it. Pass it on.

-Thurgood Marshall

4. The point wise details of all the crucial aspects is given in following para's.

5. POINT NO 1:- FINDINGS OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ABOUT PREVIOUS OFFENCES OF MURDER THROUGH VACCINES AND IT COVERS UP BY 'TOXIC PHILANTHROPIST' AND 'VACCINE SYNDICATE KINGPIN BILL GATES IN CONSPIRACY WITH OFFICIALS OF INDIAN COUNCIL OF MEDICAL RESEARCH (ICMR)

ii) To initiate action for attachment of movable and immovable properties of all of the accused and their companies;

iii) To commence custodial interrogation of the accused;

iv) To conduct a Lie -Detector Test, Brain Mapping Test, Narco Analysis test of all the prime accused such as Dr. Soumya Swaminathan, Dr. Ranveer Guleria, Mr. Arvind Kejriwal, Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Dr. Anthony Fauci, Bill Gates, Mark Zuckerberg, Jack Dorsey and others on the grounds explained in this Representation-cum-Complaint.

4. Immediate direction to all the authorities to;

i) Seriously consider the American Frontline Doctors (AFLDS) White Paper on Covid-19 and experimental vaccine candidates.

ii) To not to force anyone for vaccination and strictly abide by the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts regarding the fundamental right of each citizen to his/her choice of treatment.

iii) To inform the public about real dangers of the vaccine.

iv) To inform the public about other proven, safe and more effective medicines.

v) To not to spread fear about any further wave without verifying science evidence.

5. Appropriate Direction as per the Report submitted by the Expert Committee to the office of Hon'ble Prime Minister with recommendations to not to administer vaccines on persons who have recovered from Covid-19 infection and have antibodies developed within their bodies.

6. Immediate direction for providing protection to all the Whistleblowers and their witnesses who have already exposed and continue to expose the Syndicate comprising of BIG PHARMA, BIG TECN and BIG SCIENCE.

regarding the proofs required to prosecute the conspirators.		
17. List of the specific area and issues requiring through investigation of all the accused, their toxic charity foundations and other various persons involved in the conspiracy.	21	112
18. Role of officials of I't Human Rights Division by their act of commission & omission in allowing the accused to commit the offence of genocide: Need for condemning and exposing the selective amnesia and double standard of United Nations Human Rights Division by intervening on 11 th June, 2021 for alleged violation of rights of twitter but wilfully keeping quiet for continuous gravest violation of fundamental rights of the people across the world by Twitter, YouTube, Facebook, etc. by not allowing the renowned doctors and public to discuss the effectiveness of medicines like 'Ivermectin' on social media, only because it is against the vested interest of Vaccine Syndicate.	22	113
19. Need for immediate passing a Special Act constituting a Special Court/Tribunal headed by former Chief Justice of India Shri R. M. Lodha to decide the similar cases of vaccine Syndicates in a time bound manner of 2 months from its filing only one appeal to special dedicated bench of Supreme Court to decide it within 3 weeks from filing.	23	115
20. Need for investigation in to cause for delay of around 8 years in investigation and prosecution of accused Bill Gates and others under Section 115, 304, 109, 302, 409, n/w 120(B) of Indian	24	116

the said program, they have mafadely, unauthorisedly, illegally and unlawfully conducted trials of HPV vaccines i.e. Human Papilloma Virus (HPV) on female school children in India.

5.2. The said program was funded by Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.

5.3. Said illegal act has resulted into death of 8 female children in states of Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh in the year 2010.

5.4. Government of India constituted a parliamentary committee of 31 members to enquire the matter.

5.5. The committee submitted its 72nd report on 30th August, 2013 in Rajya Sabha.

5.6. In the said enquiry report, it is specifically concluded that the program was to serve the ulterior, commercial interests of vaccine manufacturer to include the said vaccine in universal immunization programme which would have generated windfall profit for the manufacturer(s) by way of automatic sale year after year, without any promotional or marketing expenses.

5.7. The committee also concluded that the offices of Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR), in an unauthorized manner, had signed Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) in 2007 even before the vaccines were approved for use in the country, which actually happened in the year 2008.

The decision of ICMR of committing itself to promote the drug for inclusion in the Universal Immunization Programme (UIP) without an independent study regarding its utility was strongly objected. It was suggested that the investigation should be done by the premier investigation agency i.e. CBI, and appropriate legal action be taken against them.

5.8. A copy of 72nd Report of Parliamentary Committee dated 30.08.2013.

5.9. That, the important recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee asking for investigation and legal action against Bill Gates and officials of ICMR are as under:

"1.1. Coming to the instant case, it is established that PATH by carrying on the clinical trials for HPV vaccines in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat under the pretext of observational demonstration project has violated all laws and regulations laid down for clinical trials by the Government. While doing so, its

of oxygen and this panic and how & why the said hype got vanished after the investigation in 'Tool Kit' was commenced by the Delhi Police."

Ref: 1. Parliamentary Committee's 72nd Report.

2. Judgment of the Constitution Bench of Supreme Court reported in *Kalpana Mehta Vs. Union of India (2018) 75 SCC 1*.

3. Judgment passed by Supreme Court in *Common Cause Vs. Union of India (2018) 5 SCC 1*.

4. Affidavit filed by State of Goa before Bombay High Court exposing malfeasance of World Health Organization (referred to as WHO hereafter).

5. Notification dated 4th June 2021 issued by State Government of Assam.

Respected Sirs,

1. The present Representation-cum-Complaint is being sent without prejudice to one or anyone's rights to prosecute the accused individually and independently.

2. The present complaint is being subdivided into following parts:

Sr. No.	Particulars	Para Nos.	Page Nos.
1.	Findings of Parliamentary Committee about previous offences of murder through vaccines and it covers up by 'toxic philanthropist' and 'Vaccine Syndicate Kingpin' Bill Gates in conspiracy with officials of Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR).	5	7
2.	Recommendations by Parliamentary Committee for investigation against Bill Gates and other accused through premier investigation agency	6	13

recommendations given by Parliamentary Committee in 72 nd Report to Rajya Sabha.		
21. Need for investigating the role of former CJI Deepak Misra & other two Judges of the Supreme Court of India Shri Prashant Panjwani and Shri Rohinton Fali Nariman under Section 218, 219, 219(1) & 34 of Indian Penal Code for framing the questions related with disputed question of facts which are beyond the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution of India and actually in the domain of Investigating Agency and the trial court but mafadely framed in the Supreme Court only to delay. The adjudication and prosecution of accused Bill Gates and thereby to demoralize the victims and law loving citizens.	25	116
22. Main charge against all the accused	26	128
23. Request	27	131

3. The present Representation-cum-Complaint is advanced in line with my solemn constitutional duty towards nation and also towards entire humanity as enshrined under Article 51 A (h) of Constitution of India.

While taking up this noble cause, we are guided by the following principles:

i) Any problem well stated is a problem half solved.

- Charles Kettering

ii) Don't find out, just do. Give solutions. It requires wisdom to find solutions than just blaming.

-Swami Vivekananda

iii) Don't see 'who is Right' see 'what is Right'.

-Adi, Nitech Ojha

Included in the UIP of the Country. This is a serious breach of trust by any entity as the project involved life and safety of girl children and adolescents who were mostly unaware of the implications of vaccination. The violation is also a serious breach of medical ethics. This act of PATH is a clear violation of the human rights of these girl children and adolescents. It also deem it an established case of child abuse. The Committee, therefore, recommends action by the Government against PATH. The Committee also desires that the National Human Rights Commission and National Commission for Protection of Children Rights may take up this matter from the point of view of violation of human rights and child abuse. The National Commission for Women should also summons take cognizance of this case as all the poor and hapless subjects are females.

7.14. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare should without wasting time report the violations indulged in by PATH to international bodies like WHO and UNICEF so as to ensure that appropriate remedial action is taken against PATH under the laws of its country of origin in case of any violations of laws there.

7.15. The Committee also desires that the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare may take up the matter through the Ministry of External Affairs with the US Government so as to ensure that appropriate action is taken against PATH under the laws of its country of origin in case of any violations of laws there.

6.26. The Committee observe that the wrongful use of the NRHM logo for a project implemented by a private, foreign agency as well as the identification of this project with the UIP has adversely affected and damaged the credibility of the programme as well as that of the NRHM. The Committee, therefore, recommends that such practices of diverting public funds for advancing interests of a private agency should never be allowed in future. The Committee strongly recommends that

6.27. Besides, the Committee notes that no information had been provided to Indian authorities about funding of the project except that it was reportedly funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and that the vaccines had been donated by the manufacturers. The information regarding financial investments of ICMR and State Governments in the project was not provided, though the States clearly provided cold chain and manpower for immunization. The Committee, accordingly, observes that it might have been more prudent if the National Technical Advisory group on Immunization (NTAGI) had been brought into the picture right in the beginning to review and give its views on the study prior to its approval and implementation.

7.11. The Committee is concerned that if PATH can set up an office in India so easily without getting the required mandatory approvals/permissions, then individuals and entities inimical to the interest of the country can do the same. The Committee expresses its concern that paper and shell companies can be easily registered in many jurisdictions and then set up a place of business in India as "Liaison offices" with no questions being asked. It is surprising that security and intelligence agencies did not raise an eyebrow on the way a foreign entity entered India virtually incognito through the backdoor. The Committee desires that such incidents should not be allowed in future. The Government should tighten the rules lest one day foreign citizens, with deep roots in organizations/institutions inimical to India, set up offices in the country to engage in anti-national and/or unlawful activities.

6.29. Considering the above lapses and irregularities committed by PATH during the course of conducting the trials on hapless tribal children in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat, the Committee is convinced that the authorities concerned did not exercise due diligence in scrutinizing the publicity material of PATH. Blurring the distinction between the UIP and PATH project due to the involvement of the State Governments in the project and ignoring the financial contribution of ICMR and the State Governments are very serious issues. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Ministry should investigate into the above acts of omissions and commissions and take necessary action against those who are found responsible for breach of rules and regulations.

5.10. That, the legal value of the above report and its use as per section 74 of the Evidence Act is again confirmed by the Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in the case of *Kalpana Mehta Vs. Union Of India* (2018) 7 SCC 1.

The above order is passed after hearing the Bill Gates entity - PATH.

5.11. Even otherwise, as per Section 35 of the Evidence Act, and as per the law laid down by the *Full Bench in P.C. Reddiah's case AIR 1972 SC 608*, it is clear that the findings can be based on above said report.

5.12. The findings of above mentioned Committee and considering all other material available on record, it is sufficient to draw a conclusion that the accused Bill Gates is a habitual offender and he along with his organized crime syndicate, needs to be punished forthwith by constituting a special court or Tribunal headed by former CJ R.M. Lodha or any other deserving Judge with special provisions of disposing of each claim within 2 months fixed as maximum time limit and allowing only one appeal before a special Bench of the Supreme Court and that too be decided within 3 weeks of filing.

POINT NO. 2 :- RECOMMENDATIONS BY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE FOR INVESTIGATION AGAINST BILL GATES AND OTHER ACCUSED THROUGH PREMIER INVESTIGATION AGENCY I.E. CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION (CBI).

6. EIGHTH MEETING

(2009-13)

The Committee met at 11.00 A.M. on Tuesday, the 6th April, 2010 in Room No. 139, First Floor, Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

due diligence in scrutinizing the publicity material of PATH. Blurring the distinction between the UIP and PATH project due to the involvement of the State Governments in the project and ignoring the financial contribution of ICMR and the State Governments are very serious issues. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Ministry should investigate into the above acts of omissions and commissions and take necessary action against those who are found responsible for breach of rules and regulations;

6.10. The Committee finds the entire matter very intriguing and fishy. The choice of countries and population groups, the monopolistic nature, at that point of time, of the produce being pushed; the unlimited market potential and opportunities in the universal immunization programmes of the respective countries are all pointers to a well planned scheme to commercially exploit a situation. Had PATH been successful in getting the HPV 4 vaccine included in the universal immunization programme of the concerned countries, hit would have generated windfall profit for the manufacturer(s) by way of automatic sale, year after year, without any promotional or marketing expenses. It is well known that once introduced into the immunization programme it becomes politically impossible to stop any vaccination. To achieve this can effortlessly without going through the arduous and strictly regulated route of clinical trials; PATH resorted to an element of subterfuge by calling the clinical trials as "Observational Studies" or "Demonstration Project" and various such expressions. Thus, the interest, safety and well being of subjects were completely jeopardized by PATH by using self-determined and self-serving nomenclature which is not only highly deplorable but a serious breach of law of the land. The Committee is not aware about the strategy followed by PATH in the remaining three countries viz. Uganda, Vietnam and Peru. The Government should take up the matter with the Governments of these countries through diplomatic channels to know the truth of the matter and take appropriate necessary action, accordingly. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the responses of these countries in the matter.

6.11. The Committee feels that there was serious dereliction of duty by many of the institutions and individuals involved. The Committee observes that ICMR representatives, instead of ensuring highest levels of ethical standards in research studies, apparently acted at the behest of the PATH in promoting the interests of

acts of omissions and commissions and take necessary action against those who are found responsible for breach of rules and regulations.

2.5. The Committee finds the entire matter very intriguing and fishy. The choice of countries and population groups, the monopolistic nature, at that point of time, of the produce being pushed; the unlimited market potential and opportunities in the universal immunization programmes of the respective countries are all pointers to a well planned scheme to commercially exploit a situation. Had PATH been successful in getting the HPV 4 vaccine included in the universal immunization programme of the concerned countries, this would have generated windfall profit for the manufacturer(s) by way of automatic sale, year after year, without any promotional or marketing expenses. It is well known that once introduced into the immunization programme it becomes politically impossible to stop any vaccination. To achieve this can effortlessly without going through the arduous and strictly regulated route of clinical trials; PATH resorted to an element of subterfuge by calling the clinical trials as "Observational Studies" or "Demonstration Project" and various such expressions. Thus, the interest, safety and well being of subjects were completely jeopardized by PATH by using self-determined and self-serving nomenclature which is not only highly deplorable but a serious breach of law of the land. The Committee is not aware about the strategy followed by PATH in the remaining three countries viz. Uganda, Vietnam and Peru. The Government should take up the matter with the Governments of these countries through diplomatic channels to know the truth of the matter and take appropriate necessary action, accordingly. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the responses of these countries in the matter.

3.18. The Committee feels that there was serious dereliction of duty by many of the Institutions and individuals involved. The Committee observes that the

Department of Health Research informed the Committee that the Drug Controller General of India had given approval for marketing of HPV vaccine in India as per schedule 'Y' of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act and then a post-marketing surveillance. The Committee was informed that the proposal for trial had come two years back, before the ICMR through PATH, an American NGO. Attention of the Secretary was drawn to DCGI guidelines whereunder third phase trial cannot be conducted on children until a similar trial was conducted on adults. It was admitted by the Secretary that the DCGI guidelines were not adhered to in the present case. The Committee was assured that State Governments of Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat would be asked to get the ongoing clinical trial stopped immediately. Taking serious view of procedural and ethical lapses on the part of the Ministry, the Committee sought the matter of allowing trial of the vaccine as also the approval for its marketing in the country to be enquired into by a premier investigating agency and to take further appropriate action in the matter. It also asked that findings of the investigating agency and the follow-up action taken in this regard may be furnished to the Committee at the earliest.

6.3. Coming to the instant case, it is established that PATH by carrying out the clinical trials for HPV vaccines in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat under the pretext of observation/demonstration, project has violated all laws and regulations laid down for clinical trials by the Government. While doing so, its sole aim has been to promote the commercial interests of HPV vaccine manufacturers who would have reaped windfall profits. Had PATH been successful in getting the HPV vaccine included in the UIP of the Country, This is a serious breach of trust by any entity as the project involved life and safety of girl children and adolescents who were mostly unaware of the implications of vaccination. The violation is also a serious breach of medical ethics. This act of PATH is a clear cut violation of the human rights of these girl children and adolescents. It also deems it an established case of child abuse. The Committee, therefore, recommends action by the Government against PATH. The Committee also desires that the National Human Rights Commission and National Commission for Protection of Children Rights may take up this matter from the point of view of the violation of human rights and child abuse. The National Commission for Women should also assume cognizance of this case as all the poor and hapless subjects are females.

in the matter. The Committee strongly recommends that the Ministry may review the activities of ICMR functionaries involved in PATH project.

6.12. The Committee notes that once this matter was taken up by it, the Government appointed an Inquiry Committee on 15 April, 2010 to inquire into "alleged irregularities in the conduct of the studies using HPV vaccines by PATH in India". The Committee has noted the serious conflict of interest of members of this Inquiry Committee with the subject matter. The Committee, therefore, strongly deprecates the Government for appointing a committee to inquire into such a serious matter in such a causal manner even without ascertaining as to whether any of the members of the said Inquiry Committee were having any conflict of interest with the subject matter.

6.13. The Committee, accordingly, concludes that most, if not all consent forms, were carelessly filled-up and were incomplete and inaccurate. The full explanation, role, usefulness and pros and cons of vaccination had not been properly communicated to the parents/guardians. The Committee observes that there is a gross violation of the consent and legal requirement of consent which had been substantiated by the experts. The Committee takes a serious view of the violations and strongly recommends that on the basis of the above facts, PATH should be made accountable and the Ministry should take appropriate action in the matter including taking legal action against it for breach of various laws of the land and possible violations of laws of the Country of its origin.

6.14. Considering the above lapses and irregularities committed by PATH during the course of conducting the trials on hapless tribal children in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat, the Committee is convinced that the authorities concerned did not exercise due diligence in scrutinizing the publicity material of PATH. Blurring the distinction between the UIP and PATH project due to the involvement of the State Governments in the project and ignoring the financial contribution of ICMR and the State Governments are very serious issues. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Ministry should investigate into the above acts of omissions and commissions and take necessary action against those who are found responsible for breach of rules and regulations.

arise on the part of ICMR to go in the PPP mode with PATH, as such an involvement gives rise to grave Conflict of Interest. The Committee takes a serious view of the role of ICMR in the entire episode and is constrained to observe that ICMR should have been more responsible in the matter. The Committee strongly recommends that the Ministry may review the activities of ICMR functionaries involved in PATH project.

6.16. The Committee notes that once this matter was taken up by it, the Government appointed an Inquiry Committee on 15 April, 2010 to inquire into "alleged irregularities in the conduct of the studies using HPV vaccines by PATH in India". The Committee has noted the serious conflict of interest of members of this Inquiry Committee with the subject matter. The Committee, therefore, strongly deprecates the Government for appointing a committee to inquire into such a serious matter in such a causal manner even without ascertaining as to whether any of the members of the said Inquiry Committee were having any conflict of interest with the subject matter of inquiry.

6.17. The Committee, accordingly, concludes that most, if not all consent forms, were carelessly filled-up and were incomplete and inaccurate. The full explanation, role, usefulness and pros and cons of vaccination had not been properly communicated to the parents/guardians. The Committee observes that there is a gross violation of the consent and legal requirement of consent which had been substantiated by the experts. The Committee takes a serious view of the violations and strongly recommends that on the basis of the above facts, PATH should be made accountable and the Ministry should take appropriate action in the matter including taking legal action against it for breach of various laws of the land and possible violations of laws of the Country of its origin.

6.29. Considering the above lapses and irregularities committed by PATH during the course of conducting the trials on hapless

5. The Committee also desires that the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare may take up the matter through the Ministry of External Affairs with the US Government so as to ensure that appropriate action is taken against PATH under the laws of its country of origin in case of any violations of laws there.

6.6. The Committee observes that the wrongful use of the NRHM logo for a project implemented by a private, foreign agency as well as the identification of this project with the IIP has adversely affected and damaged the credibility of the programme as well as that of the NRHM. The Committee, therefore, recommends that such practices of diverting public funds for advancing interests of a private agency should never be allowed in future. The Committee strongly recommends that strict action should be taken against those officials responsible for such lapses.

6.7. Besides, the Committee notes that no information had been provided to Indian authorities about funding of the project except that it was reportedly funded by Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and that the vaccines had been donated by the manufacturers. The information regarding financial investments of ICMR and State Governments in the project was not provided, though the States clearly provided cold chain and manpower for immunization. The Committee, accordingly, observes that it might have been more prudent if the National Technical Advisory group on Immunization (NTAGI) had been brought into the picture right in the beginning to review and give its views on the study prior to its approval and implementation.

6.8. The Committee is concerned that if PATH can set up an office in India so easily without getting the required mandatory approvals/permissions, then individuals and entities inimical to the interest of the country can do the same. The Committee expresses its concern that paper and shell companies can be easily registered in many jurisdictions and then set up a place of business in India as "Liaison offices" with no questions being asked. It is surprising that security and intelligence agencies did not raise an eyebrow on the way a foreign entity entered India virtually incognito through the backdoor. The Committee desires that such incidents should not be allowed in future. The Government should tighten the rules lest one day foreign citizens, with deep roots in organizations/institutions inimical to India, set up offices in the country to engage in anti-national and/or unlawful activities.

7.1. Constitution Bench of the Supreme Court in the case between *Kalpana Mehta Vs. Union of India* (2018) 7 SCC 1, has clarified that the Parliamentary report is admissible in evidence under Section 74 of Evidence Act.

7.2. That, as per Section 35 of the Evidence Act and as per law laid down by the Full Bench of Supreme Court in *P.C. Reddiah's case AIR 1972 SC 608*, the above-mentioned report is sufficient for prima-facie conclusions against the Vaccine Syndicates.

8. POINT NO. 4 R- [A] EARLIER ATTEMPT BY ACCUSED WHO OFFICIAL TO DECLARE FALSE PANDEMIC.

[B] THE H1N1 SWINE FLU PANDEMIC WAS "FAKE," AND ITS THREAT TO HUMAN HEALTH WAS HYPER, AND THAT WHO'S POLICIES WERE INFLUENCED BY VACCINE MANUFACTURERS WHO BENEFITED FROM THE PANDEMIC VIRUS.

8.1. Swine flu, Bird flu 'never happened': Probe into H1N1 'false pandemic' Link:-<https://youth4youth360.org/2020/04/01/swine-flu-bird-flu-never-happened-probe-into-h1n1-false-pandemic/>

8.2. Dr. BM Hegde has said that H1N1 pandemic was a health scare, a myth created by big Pharma to sell the drug Tamiflu and the H1N1 lab test. He says that the Dr. Asstt. Prof. Huss who created this pandemic scare for a mere USD 10000 and was known as Dr Flu who was criminally prosecuted and was in jail. He also said that the WHO Chief had colluded with the big pharma.

There is indeed a European commission investigation into this, but most of the related news seem to have been removed, except a few official TV news channels.

Refer the article titled "European Parliament to Investigate WHO and "Pandemic" Scandal By F. William Engdahl"

<https://healthcare-in-crisis.com/news/european-parliament-to-investigate-who-pandemic-scandal.html>

8.3. The Council of Europe member states will launch an inquiry in January 2010 on the influence of the pharmaceutical companies on the global swine flu campaign, focusing especially on extent of the pharma's industry's influence on WHO. The

8.4. The step is a long overdue move to public transparency of a "Golden Triangle" of drug corruption between the WHO, the Pharma industry and academic scientists that has permanently damaged the lives of millions and even caused deaths.

8.5. The parliament motion was introduced by Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg, former SPD Member of the German Bundestag and now chairman of the Health Committee of PACE (Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe). Dr. Wodarg is a medical doctor and epidemiologist, a specialist in lung disease and environmental medicine, who considers the current "pandemic" Swine Flu campaign of the WHO to be "one of the greatest medicine scandals of the Century."¹¹¹

8.6. The text of the resolution just passed by a sufficient number in the Council of Europe Parliament says among other things, "In order to promote their patented drugs and vaccines against flu, pharmaceutical companies influenced scientists and official agencies, responsible for public health standards to alarm governments worldwide and make them squander tight health resources for inefficient vaccine strategies and needlessly expose millions of healthy people to the risk of an unknown amount of side-effects of insufficiently tested vaccines. The "bird-flu" campaign (2005/06) combined with the "swine-flu" campaign seem to have caused a great deal of damage not only to some vaccinated patients and to public health budgets, but also to the credibility and accountability of important international health agencies."

8.7. The Parliamentary inquiry will look into the issue of "false pandemic" that was declared by WHO in June 2009 on the advice of its group of academic experts, SAGE, many of these members have been documented to have intense financial ties to the same pharmaceutical giants such as GlaxoSmithKline, Roche, Novartis, who benefit from the production of drugs and untested H1N1 vaccines. They will investigate the influence of the pharma industry in creation of a worldwide campaign against the so-called H1N1 "Asian Flu" and H1N1 Swine Flu. The inquiry will be given "urgent" priority in the general assembly of the parliament.

8.8. In his official statement to the Committee, Dr. Wodarg criticized the influence of the pharma industry on scientists and officials of WHO, stating that it has led to the situation where "unnecessarily millions of healthy people are exposed to the risk of poorly tested vaccines," and that, for a flu strain that is "vastly less harmful" than all previous flu epidemics.

http://www.coe.int/t/dg1/justice_silence/epidemiology/WHO/report_en.pdf

The report explains that the WHO's description of the definition of a "pandemic" was actually changed in May 2009, after the first cases of swine flu were reported. The change seems to have removed the requirement that a virus's impact be severe, before a pandemic was declared.

The report cites concerns within the scientific community that the WHO rapidly moved towards declaring "pandemic level 6" in June 2009, when swine flu presented "relatively mild symptoms." It went on to state that the declaration of the pandemic was only made possible by "changing the definition" and by "lowering the threshold for its declaration."

But it was this all-important declaration which triggered pre-pandemic planning that would prove highly lucrative to industry: "pharmaceutical companies had a strong vested interest in the declaration of a pandemic" the report states.

At the same time, the membership list of the WHO's 16-member "Emergency Committee", instrumental in declaring the pandemic, remains secret - a lack of transparency strongly attacked by the report.

Last week the British Medical Journal (BMJ) published its own journalistic investigation, revealing that specialists with financial links to the drug industry were intimately involved in WHO pre-pandemic planning. For example, the WHO guidance for anti-viral medicines, including Roche's Tamiflu, "was authored by an influenza expert who at the same time was receiving payment from Roche." BMJ also exposed the identities of three members of the secret "Emergency Committee", including one with financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry.

As part of the call for a major clean-up, both the BMJ and the Council of Europe want health decision-making bodies to be entirely free of members with financial ties to drug makers.

Chairman of Australia's influenza Socialist Group (ASG) Alan Taylor claims of prior coronavirus vaccine attempts such as SARS-CoV-1, the virus that is 78% identical to SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19). Prior coronaviruses and other respiratory viruses have failed due to the scientific pharmaceutical know as pathogen priming that makes the vaccine recipient more likely to suffer a sudden fatal outcome due to massive cytokine storm when exposed to the wild virus. In addition to pathogenic priming there are above other potential safety issues that are being minimized. While we are hopeful that the vaccine is both effective and safe, hope is not science. Because these experimental vaccines have not been tested in accordance with the usual standards, we have serious concern about safety.

Is AFLDS suggesting that the COVID vaccine is unsafe? No. We are saying that by definition it is unsafe to widely distribute an experimental vaccine, because taking a vaccine is completely different than taking an ordinary medication. In contrast to taking a medication for an actual disease, the person who takes a vaccine is typically completely healthy and would continue to be healthy without the vaccine. As the first rule of the Hippocratic Oath is: do no harm, vaccine safety must be guaranteed. That has not yet happened. More studies of the vaccine's safety and efficacy should be conducted and published, and more transparency about possible risks provided to the public before Americans enter the largest experimental medication program in our history.

Is AFLDS arguing that the COVID vaccine is ineffective? After it has been proved safe, the vaccine might be demonstrated to be effective in COVID-19 in certain categories, although we do not know that yet with a high degree of confidence. That is because the only group that really may benefit is the advanced elderly, and there is very limited data on efficacy and almost none on safety in this group. For healthy persons ≤ 69, it is impossible to state that a vaccine is effective simply because the lethality of the virus itself is virtually nonexistent. See pg. 12.

not the actual risk of a disease, as the basis to declare "Pandemic." By classifying the swine flu as pandemic, nations were compelled to implement pandemic plans and also purchase swine flu vaccines. Because WHO is not subject to any parliamentary control, Wodarg argues it is necessary for governments to insist on accountability. The inquiry will also look at the role of the two critical agencies in Germany issuing guidelines on the pandemic, the Paul-Ehrlich and the Robert-Koch Institute.

8.10. William Engdahl is author of Full Spectrum Dominance: Totalitarian Democracy in the New World Order.

He may be contacted through his website www.engdahl.org/corporatism.net

8.11. William Engdahl is a frequent contributor to Global Research (Global Research Article by F. William Engdahl)

Link: <https://www.globalresearch.ca/article/f. william-engdahl/>

8-B-1. The H1N1 swine flu pandemic was "fake," and its threat to human health was hyped, and that WHO's policies were influenced by vaccine manufacturers who benefited from the pandemic virus.

Ray Moynihan who is an award-winning health journalist, author, documentary-maker and academic researcher in his opinion titled as "Was the swine flu a fake pandemic?" has explained the frauds of WHO in a dignified language. The Council of Europe report found "overwhelming evidence that the seriousness of the pandemic was vastly overrated". WHO rapidly moved towards declaring "pandemic level 6" in June, 2009, when swine flu presented "relatively mild symptoms". The declaration of the pandemic was only made possible by "changing the definition" and by "lowering the threshold for its declaration." pharmaceutical companies had a strong vested interest in the declaration of a pandemic! The membership list of the WHO's 16-member "Emergency Committee", instrumental in declaring the pandemic, remains secret - a lack of transparency strongly attacked by the report.

British Medical Journal (BMJ) published its own journalistic investigation, revealing that specialists with financial links to the drug industry were intimately involved in WHO pre-pandemic planning. For example, the WHO guidance for anti-

H1N1 says he sits on a number of committees offering advice to the Australian government, including on swine flu.

The WHO strongly rejects that decisions were unduly influenced, though it has commenced a high-level external investigation. Even Australia has a review, though not an external public inquiry.

The Council of Europe report found "overwhelming evidence that the seriousness of the pandemic was vastly overrated" at the outset. Indeed, very early on there was a private view among elites that even if swine flu wasn't so serious, it was a good test run. The exercise has certainly proved lucrative to industry, but at what cost to the credibility of agencies supposed to be protecting public health, not promoting private wealth."

8-B-2. WHO's chief accuser of late is Wolfgang Wodarg (pictured above left), a German physician and former member of the German Parliament for the Social Democratic Party, who has called the pandemic a "fake"—because the virus isn't very different from existing strains—and who has suggested that big pharma coaxed WHO into declaring a pandemic so that it could produce and sell vaccine. "WHO in cooperation with some big pharmaceutical companies and their re-defined pandemics and lowered the alarm-threshold," Wodarg says in a statement on his Web site.

Wodarg—whose [resume](#) says he studied medicine in Berlin and Hamburg and was trained in epidemiology at Johns Hopkins University—is also a member of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, and on 14 December he and other members of that group's Social, Health and Family Affairs Committee signed a [motion](#) that bluntly stated:

In order to promote their patented drugs and vaccines against flu, pharmaceutical companies have influenced scientists and official agencies, responsible for public health standards, to alarm governments worldwide. They have made these squander tight health care resources for inefficient vaccine strategies and needlessly exposed millions of healthy people to the risk of unknown side-effects of

the lie to the American and European people that hydroxychloroquine is an unsafe medication. This incredibly safe medication, which halts SARS-CoV-2, was rebranded as unsafe in 2020. This disinformation campaign largely succeeded – until America's Frontline Doctors came forward. We revealed four levels of censorship regarding HCQ safety: the scientists, the media, Big Tech, and the government itself.

The Scientists: The two most famous medical journals in the world were caught red-handed publishing fraud. The sheer number and magnitude of the things that went wrong or missing in their 1 studies were too enormous to attribute to mere incompetence. The data upon which these studies were based were so ridiculously erroneous that it only took two weeks for an eagle-eyed physician to publicly demand an explanation by passing a fraudulent 2 headline maligning HCQ, the third most famous medical journal in the world, Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), literally printed evidence of a crime. 3

Big Tech Censorship: Physician writings that explained the safety of HCQ were disappeared from the internet without a trace. 19

The reasons for the lies exceed the scope of this paper, but it is impossible to discuss any COVID-19 medications without understanding that there would be no international discussion on other treatments or vaccines, if all people hadn't been massively lied to that a cheap, safe drug was unsafe.

II. COVID-19 Medical Myths: Low Infection Fatality Ratio (IFR) The most enduring myth regarding COVID-19 is that this is a highly lethal infection. It is not. The data is unequivocal: • COVID-19 kills very rarely and is mostly limited to the medically fragile • COVID-19 is less deadly than influenza in children • COVID-19 is similar lethality in the middle adult years and treatable

The article reads thus:

"It's a year since the World Health Organization (WHO) officially declared a global pandemic of swine flu, triggering health emergencies across the planet.

But instead of accolades, the WHO and authorities everywhere are facing an avalanche of disturbing questions about the handling of the swine flu, and the influence of vested interests.

To put the key question most crudely: was the world wrongly persuaded to believe it was in the grip of a ghastly and severe pandemic by decision-making bodies unduly influenced by pharmaceutical companies hoping to sell billions of dollars worth of vaccines and anti-viral drugs?

A report just out from the Council of Europe has come to some devastating conclusions. The declaration of a pandemic lead to a "waste of huge sums of public money", a "distortion of priorities" in public health services, the "provocation of unjustified fear" and the "creation of health risks through vaccines and medications" that may not have been sufficiently tested.

Clearly any untimely death is a tragedy, but from early on it looked like H1N1 was a relatively moderate strain of influenza, though it could be unusually harmful for certain groups. And the global death toll is in the thousands not the predicted millions. But governments in many places have been left with contracts for millions of doses of vaccines now going to waste.

A series of investigations have been launched into how authorities handled swine flu, with the damning Council of Europe report one of the first completed. It originated from a motion tabled in the 47 nation Parliamentary Assembly titled: "Fake pandemic – a threat for health."

It identifies three key problems: first, WHO's excessive response and pandemic declaration; second, excessive secrecy surrounding

pandemics, a threat to health" will become a prominent discussion topic during its winter session, held from 28–29 January in Strasbourg, France. During a closed-door session on 26 January, members will hear WHO representatives, the pharmaceutical industry, and experts according to the Web site, but the scope of the inquiry is as yet unclear.

*In an interview with the French communist magazine *L'Humanité* (English translation), Wodarg says he also wants to study the role of scientific organizations like the French Pasteur Institute or the Robert Koch Institute in Germany, which he says should have advised their governments more critically about the decision to purchase vaccines. "In some countries, the institutes did just that," he says. "In Finland or Poland, for example, critical voices were raised to say: 'We don't need that.'*

Link: <https://www.sciencealert.org/news/2010/01/facing-inquiry-who-strikes-back-fake-pandemic-swine-flu-criticism>

8.1.A POINT NO: -4-A #; THE AMERICAN FRONTLINE DOCTORS WHITE PAPER ON COVID-19 EXPERIMENTAL VACCINE CANDIDATES.

8.1.A.1. That in the abovesaid report/paper/compilation the said group of Doctors have in a very scientific, logical and legal way has explained the frauds of vaccine and pharma syndicate and also alerted about death risking consequences of use of Experimental Vaccines.

8.1.A.2. It is one of the best compilations of scientific data and best of its presentation for the betterment of entire mankind.

A copy of the said document is at Link:-

<https://img1.wsimg.com/ohhrivo/99d35f92-n5ch-41eb-ac9c-00370d4aef17/8MDwhitewpaper.pdf>

8.1.A.3. So unless the said issues are countered by the scientific data (which is impossible), the vaccination needs to be immediately stopped. Otherwise every loss of life will be intentional and deliberate.

8.1.A.4. This is not the question of only Indians but the question of entire humanity and we must stand for it.

age 19 to as high as 5.4% for those 70 years of age and above. That is an 19x100x risk difference based upon age! It is quite clear that young people are at a statistically insignificant risk of death from COVID-19. Nearly 80% of all coronavirus-related deaths in the US through November 28, 2020 have occurred in adults 65 years of age and older and only 6% of the deaths had COVID-19 as the only cause mentioned. On average, there were 2.8 additional conditions or causes per death. 20

Safety Concerns Regarding the Experimental COVID-19 Vaccines I. Brand New Technology. No vaccine based on messenger RNA has ever been approved for any disease, or even entered final-stage trials until now, so there's no peer-reviewed published human data to compare how mRNA stacks up against older technologies. How well mRNA 24 vaccines will actually prevent COVID-19 remains unknown. This new technology is less stable than older technologies, for example, requiring deep freezing temperatures up to negative 70 degrees Celsius for Pfizer's vaccine. This differs from other vaccines that are typically kept in ordinary refrigerators. Recently a vaccine candidate had to be bailed out because test subjects had false positive HIV test results – in other words, unexpected drugs must be expected with brand new experimental technology.

2. Failure of Previous Coronavirus Vaccines.

Despite trying for decades, scientists have never been able to create a successful coronavirus vaccine. Whether they think they have, the experimental coronavirus vaccine has failed and animals who got the experimental vaccine died. 26

3. No Independently Published Animal Studies.

Most other previous vaccines have performed and published results on animal studies prior to giving to humans. This is critical because deadly effects are often not seen until this step. Practices that have been given to humans prior to animal trials have frequently resulted in death that

4. Known Complications.

One of the known complications of vaccines is something called immune enhancement. One type of immune enhancement is known as Antibody-Dependent Enhancement (ADE). This is a process where a virus leverages antibodies to aid infection. In short, the anti-COVID antibodies stimulated by a vaccine amplify the infection rather than prevent its damage. This paradoxical reaction has been seen repeatedly in other vaccines and animal development trials especially with coronavirus vaccine trials.³⁸ Other known complications of vaccines include neurological diseases such as transverse myelitis, Bell's Palsy, multiple sclerosis, autism, and Guillain-Barré. For example, in 1976 the government attempted a mass vaccination of the population with a newly created Swine Flu vaccine. The vaccination program was aborted after about 450 people came down with Guillain-Barré. The extremely limited COVID-19 vaccine data already has at least two transverse myelitis cases and four Bell's Palsy cases that may be linked to vaccination.³⁹

This same thing happened in the 1960's with Respiratory Syncytial Virus (RSV) – they also skipped the animal studies and gave the vaccine to 35 children and initially it looked like it worked well. But when those children were exposed to the wild virus, they got much sicker and then two of the kids died, which became a scandal. RSV typically is mild in children – whereas vaccinating children for it led to death.⁴⁰

The original SARS-CoV, a coronavirus 78% similar to the current SARS-CoV-2 causing COVID-19, caused an epidemic in 2003. Scientists attempted to create a vaccine. Initially it appeared promising, but ultimately it was abandoned because although the mice tolerated the vaccine and produced antibodies, when the mice were exposed to the actual virus in the wild, they died due to what we would think of as sudden severe cytokine storm.⁴¹

If these experimental coronavirus vaccines cause an ADE reaction and millions and millions of Americans have taken this vaccine, instead of a 99.99% cure rate for COVID-19 we could face a 20-30% death rate.

In medicine, the guiding principle is "First, do no harm." Widely distributing a COVID-19 experimental vaccine before adequately addressing and clinically evaluating the above concerns is reckless. This is especially true in adults under 30 years old who have an infection survival rate of about 99.98%, and even lower in those without high-risk comorbidities. While "first, do no harm" may not be a guiding principle for politicians or health authorities, it still resides in the forefront of the minds of frontline physicians.

The warp speed progress in vaccine development should be praised. This should not be confused, however, with readiness to distribute a vaccine to hundreds of millions persons globally. EUAs, for vaccines does not obviate the need to make good decisions for patients. Because the R/R (infection fatality ratio) is exceedingly low for younger persons and because the vaccine is experimental with so many known and unknown risks including neurologic disorders, auto-immune disorders, high concern for antibody-dependent enhancement and infertility concerns... America's Frontline Doctors⁴² holds that it is unethical to advocate for the vaccine to persons under 50. The risk and safety evidence based upon trials cannot be justified in younger persons. It is therefore prohibited. If pharmaceutical companies, private businesses, or the government mandate or coerce persons to comply with unethical policies for which there is substantial evidence of likely harm, and indeed a person is harmed, that person's grievances must be adjudicated in light of the facts: defendant's knowingly willful intentions and AFLDS will do everything within its power to assist such plaintiffs. While we sincerely hope that will never be the case, and we are taking all measures to reduce that possibility, should that unfortunate situation come to pass, we expect to assist hundreds of thousands of patients in class action lawsuits.

Vaccination must always be an informed decision between a doctor and his/her patient that takes into consideration a plurality of risk factors including patient age, comorbidities and exposure risks. Every patient is unique both in mind and body. It is in the surrogacy relationship

* Claims that hydroxychloroquine saves people from COVID-19*

vii) The malfeasance of accused officials of World Health Organization (WHO) and others are writ large as can be seen from the very fact that while there were very limited, proven medicines and uncertainty over sufficiency of vaccines, then their vehement opposition to 'ivermectin' which is proven to be an effective drug prevention and treatment of COVID-19, is itself a sufficient reason to hold that said act was for furthering the interests of Vaccine Syndicate and letting people die so that Governments might permit the vaccines under Emergency Use Authorization (EUA), even when there were no sufficient studies regarding the safety and efficacy of vaccines.

viii) The above guidelines of YouTube are against the authentic, scientific data provided by the scientists and experts and the same is accepted by Government of India and has proven to be effective. This implies that the YouTube guidelines are a part of conspiracy of accused.

ix) The conspiracy came into the light recently when the leaked emails of accused Dr. Anthony Fauci revealed his connection with Mark Zuckerberg – who owns Facebook, WhatsApp and Instagram. A detailed investigation and their Narco Analysis Test would bring the whole truth to the surface.

x) Evidences proved that, the media hype around the second wave was a part of their sinister plan as can be seen clearly from the very facts that the three very old pictures of dead bodies in river Ganga in the State of Uttar Pradesh were circulated in MSM and social media.

xi) The conspirators, who controlled the media, targeted and defamed select State Governments in India and spread misinformation to create fear, anxiety, hatred in the minds of common public against the Ruling party in Central Government of India and few Chief Ministers of the States.

xii) In furtherance of said conspiracy the Accused Dr. Fauci of USA has provided unsolicited and ill-advice to India. The same was given publicity by MSM. His interviews were arranged by the:

i) The Hindu and ii) NDTV

Lastly, there are already known severe and unique problems with *so far unapproved coronavirus vaccines*. The reason there are no upper respiratory coronavirus vaccines is because the risk/benefit ratio has never been overcome. The vaccine can cause pathogenic priming, increasing lethal whereas the virus itself is often transient and non-lethal. Dr. Hotez, strong vaccine advocate and scientist, testified at the House Science Committee Hearing that these type of vaccines caused worse outcomes including death in children. One animal study of original SARS vaccine showed hypersensitivity to the SARS components. Caution in proceeding to application of a SARS-CoV vaccine in humans is indicated. Previous coronavirus vaccine projects triggered immune responses so strong that the test animals died, and the vaccine trials were halted.⁵²

VIII. COVID-19 Experimental Vaccines & Other Unknown or New Problems

Frontline physicians have a very healthy respect for what is unknown. With these new experimental vaccines more is unknown than known, so this section is by definition, incomplete. But we already have suggestions of where serious problems will arise, based upon early data and mechanism of action. There is evidence to support that the vaccine could cause permanent auto-immune rejection of the placenta. Many scientists already agree the risk is much too high to release these experimental vaccines to the public at large. On December 1, 2020, the executive head of respiratory research Dr. Michael Yeudan and the lung specialist and former head of the public health department Dr. Wolfgang Wodarg filed an application with the European Medicine Agency responsible for European approval, for the immediate suspension of all SARS-CoV-2 vaccine studies, in particular the BioNTech/Pfizer study on BNT162b. One of the biggest 61 62 reasons they cited was the possibility of lifelong infertility as described above and copied here:

oligies industries combined.⁶⁶ While not alleging any negative purposeful intent, it is obvious that a company that does not have to be sure its products are safe will never be as careful as a company that cannot afford such mistakes. When there is a rush, as this unprecedented situation has revealed, all sorts of corners have been cut, including long-term studies and animal studies. And the very foundational question of even needing a vaccine has been pushed to the side, in large part due to the very exciting profit anticipated by the pharmaceutical companies. If things were not so rushed and financially incentivized, doctors and scientists would have noticed that a coronavirus vaccine is likely neither desirable nor safe and effective given its low lethality, history of ADE and prior lethal result of coronavirus vaccines.

XII. AFLDS Recommendations Regarding COVID-19 Experimental Vaccines

Prohibited for the young, Discouraged for the healthy middle-aged and Optional for the co-morbid and elderly. There is no evidence that vaccines should be racially prioritized.

a. 0-20: prohibited (exceedingly low risk from COVID, unknown risk of auto-immune disease, unknown risk of pathogenic priming, risk of lifelong infertility)

b. 20-50: healthy: strongly discouraged (exceedingly low risk from COVID, unknown risk of auto-immune disease, unknown risk of pathogenic priming, risk of lifelong infertility)

c. 50-69 & healthy: strongly discouraged (low risk from COVID, unknown risk of auto-immune disease, unknown risk of pathogenic priming, unknown effect on placenta and spermatogenesis)

d. 50-69 & co-morbid: discouraged (experimental vaccine is higher risk than early or prophylactic treatment with established medications)

e. >70 & healthy: personal risk assessment (experimental vaccine is higher risk than early or prophylactic treatment with established medications)

v) During this period the most effective, safe, affordable and easily available allopathic drug which has proved to be an effective early treatment drug is 'Ivermectin'. The relevant scientific data and practical results including the testimony in both in US Senate of Dr. Pierre Kory of FLCCC and experiences shared by several other doctors is at Annexure-R-2.

vi) The said drug was helpful for all the mankind and for the welfare of the common man. But the same was disadvantageous to the vested interests of vaccine companies. Therefore the accused managed to underplay, hide and defame the said results with the help of new narratives-conspiracy theories.

The best examples can be seen from the guidelines of YouTube called 'COVID-19 medical misinformation policy' which has following specific points:

"COVID-19 medical misinformation policy"

What this policy means for you

If you're posting content

Don't post content on YouTube if it includes any of the following:

Treatment misinformation:

- > Content that recommends use of Ivermectin or Hydroxychloroquine for the treatment of COVID-19
- > Claims that Ivermectin or Hydroxychloroquine are effective treatments for COVID-19

Prevention misinformation: Content that promotes prevention methods that contradict local health authorities or WHO.

- > Content that recommends use of Ivermectin or Hydroxychloroquine for the prevention of COVID-19
- > Claims that COVID-19 vaccines do not reduce risk of contracting COVID-19

Last week, Twitter labelled as "manipulated media" a tweet by Patra on the alleged "toolkit". Twitter says it "may label Tweets that include media (videos, audio, and images) that have been deceptively altered or fabricated".

Biswal told the Delhi Police is inquiring into a complaint in the toolkit matter.

"It appears that Twitter has some information which is not known to us and on the basis of which they have classified (Patra's tweet) as such. This information is relevant to the inquiry. The Special Cell, which is conducting the inquiry, wants to find out the truth. Twitter, which has claimed to know the underlying truth, should clarify," he said.

The government had earlier asked Twitter to remove the "manipulated media" tag as the matter is pending before law enforcement agency, and made it clear that the social media platform cannot pass judgment when the issue is under investigation.

BJP leaders, including Patra, have posted numerous tweets to attack the Congress over the prepared "toolkit".

Read more at:

[Link: https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/two-cs-leaders-to-delhi-police-s-motives-in-jan-patra-in-covid-toolkit-case/articleshow/82837577.cms?utm_source=contentfire&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=spe](https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/two-cs-leaders-to-delhi-police-s-motives-in-jan-patra-in-covid-toolkit-case/articleshow/82837577.cms?utm_source=contentfire&utm_medium=referral&utm_campaign=spe)

xv) Recent interim report by the Supreme Court audit team is said to have pointed out that, Delhi Government exaggerated the City's oxygen needs by

If it is true, then there is also a need for Narco Analysis & Lie Detector Test of San Arvind Kejriwal & concerned accused officials of Delhi Government to find out the connection between Vaccine Syndicates.

xvii) The accused came in direct opposition to State Government of Goa, India after 9th May, 2021 when State Government of Goa declared that in order to prevent Covid-19 they will use Ivermectin for prophylactic purpose. In Goa also BJP party is in power.

xviii) On 9th May, 2021, the State Government of Goa announced the use of Ivermectin for treatment of Covid-19.

On the very next day i.e. on 10th May, 2021 accused Dr. Soumya Swaminathan tweeted as under;

*"Safety and efficacy are important when using any drug for a new indication. **WHO recommends against the use of Ivermectin for COVID19 except within clinical trials.** <https://www.who.int/news-room/detail/10-may-2021>*

xix) Indian Bar Association has issued a Legal notice dated 25.05.2021. The accused Dr. Soumya Swaminathan, having perceived adverse atmosphere, deleted the said tweet as she had no scientific and legally admissible data to prove her stand.

xix) Each time and particularly from following specific instances, it is sufficiently proved that the accused more particularly Dr. Soumya Swaminathan does not possess any authentic and scientific evidences;

i) When the earlier Notice was served on her on 25.05.2021, she has neither replied to the notice nor has she approached any court of law against us. On the contrary, the chose to delete the controversial tweet advising against the use of Ivermectin for COVID-19;

ii) When the Health Secretary of the State Government of Goa relying on affidavit of Under Secretary of Union of India made their submission as such before Hon'ble High Court, with

March 29th 2021. Therefore, there appears to be a significant discrepancy between deaths reported in the newspapers and the official government figure.

The below link has a committed date 2300 deaths as on 22nd June, newspaper reports reporting deaths alone after administration of vaccine. This list is updated regularly.

Link:- https://drive.google.com/file/d/1uikclab_KD9Ux7HINzrlwaf1NJR0D_1P/view?usp=sharing

xx) Alarmed by the rise in deaths and serious adverse events following immunization, Tamilnadu Medical Practitioner's Association wrote a letter dated 27.04.2021 in this regard highlighting the concerns. The true copy of the letter written by Tamilnadu Medical Practitioner's Association dated 27.04.2021 is at Annexure R-4

The letter is reproduced asunder;

"Dear friends,

All of you must be concerned about the reported deaths after taking the Covid vaccine. Through the Adverse Effects Following Immunization (AEFI) committee, I confront public and the profession by saying they're unrelated to the vaccine, we have to take it with a grain of salt.

134 cases died and 303 cases hospitalised in India following Covid vaccination were analysed:

Died (124)	Hospitalised (365)
Within 3 days	93
4 th to 7 th day	18
8 th to 28 th day	11
After 28 days	02

If they are due to reasons other than vaccination, they should be evenly distributed during every week following vaccination. But 75% death occurred and 90% were

reported only 180 deaths with 190 million doses. This shows that in India AEFIs are grossly not reported/ not recorded by GOI.

xxi) Please read the article titled as 'Death By Vaccine – The Greatest Scandal of 21st Century'.

Link:- <https://greatconspiracy.com/death-by-vaccine-scandal/amp/> Twitter Impression track> 09

xxii) The Pharma Syndicate and more particularly the vaccine manufacturer's GAVI etc. were never interested to serve humanity. They are not doing the business with honest and ethical spirit. Their only agenda was to hijack the common sense of the people and make money which will be at the cost of lives of people. They are guilty of genocide i.e. mass murders with cool mind and taking help of science media and corrupt bureaucrats, political leaders etc.

xxiii) None of the vaccine manufacturers are found to be honest to humanity and to their respective nations. Their additional dishonesty can be seen from the very fact that they neither informed the world as to what is their formula to treat the people nor agreed for patent waiver.

On the contrary they tried to make their business prosper at the cost of deaths of common people and taking bread and butter of majority of peoples across the world.

xxiv) DUTY AND OBLIGATIONS OF STATE MACHINERY TO PROSECUTE ACCUSED

That it is obligation of the State to prosecute the offenders of humanity.

Neeharika Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Vs. State 2021 SCC OnLine SC 3151

So, without wasting a moment, it is just and necessary that all the criminals, who are offenders against entire humanity should be booked.

xxv) NEEDS TO ISSUE ARREST WARRANTS THOUGH INTERPOL -

That, most of the accused such as Bill Gates, Dr. Soumya Swaminathan, Dr. Tedros et al are residing outside India.

actually much lower if the said medicine is used for early treatment as well as prophylaxis, neither of the accused chose to produce any proof to counter the said report. As a result, Hon'ble High Court has refused to accept the advisory of WHO.

xxvi) When All India Institute of Medical Science (AIIMS) had published a statement on 24.05.2021 that there is no evidence to predict the third wave and its effect on children, she did not give any "Evidence" in support of her statement dated 25.05.2021 which was contrary to the said statement of AIIMS.

After she was served with legal notice on 25.05.2021, by Indian Bar Association, she feared of being exposed and being summoned in Court of Law and therefore she took a U turn and stated that there is no sufficient evidence to suggest that children would be affected in the third wave.

Same stand is taken by the co-accused Tedros in his tweet dated 10th June 2021.

xxvii) The agenda of misinformation by accused is also exposed in the statement published in Press Bureau of India on June 8, 2021

"It is a piece of misinformation that subsequent waves of the COVID-19 pandemic are going to cause severe illness in children. There is no data - either from India or globally - to show that children will be seriously infected in subsequent waves."

xxviii) Dr. Sunjeev Ray the Chief of Research Team of Covaxin in his interview dated 12th June 2021, given to **Nashikraat Times** express his views on the basis of scientific evidence and accused such person (Dr. Soumya Swaminathan & Ors.) that they are having vested interest behind such agenda. [Annexure-R-3]

Link:- https://paper.nashikraatimes.com/imagesview_17204_24894_d_16_12_06_2021_6_c_1.xhtml

I feel this may be due to thrombogenic property of the vaccine, which contains attenuated or dead virus. This can lead to coronary or cerebrovascular events, especially if there has been some pre-existing disease in those vessels.

Applying this logic, to all those who called me for the advice before vaccination, I started anti-coagulant and anti-platelet agent (triarasaban 10mg and aspirin 75mg) two days before the vaccination and continued it for 8 days after, with no major adverse effects reported in 123 patients.

This may not be strictly randomised, controlled study, but we are desperate in preventing post-vaccine deaths and should be able to assure our patients about their safety. I invite comments from our colleagues, whether we should pursue this 'theory' in the next step (leading our recommendation to the ICMR and AEFI committee for their comments and future action). Let Tamil Nadu doctors take the lead in this terrible situation."

xxix) Reporting on the deaths and serious adverse events following immunization. **The Wire Science** in an article (link: <https://science.thewire.in/health/617-serious-adverse-events-after-vaccination-reported-in-india-until-march-29/>) titled "617 Serious Adverse Events After Vaccination Reported in India until March 29" dated 09.04.2021, reported the following:

"As of March 29, at least 617 serious adverse events following big immunisation (AEFI) had been reported from around the country, according to a presentation made before the National AEFI Committee two days later. Of these 617, at least 180 people (29.2%) died, and of these, complete documents were available only for 35 people (19.4%).

The Government of India has been drawing flak for some time over its handling of COVID vaccines. Now comes another issue.

They are guilty of mass murders and they will subject to death penalty. In such cases, they don't deserve the bail facility as per Indian law.

Any mercy with these people will be injustice to the entire humanity.

If any public servant avoids the arrest, then such officer also needs to be made accused as per Section 201,218 etc. of Indian Penal Code.

xxxi) NEEDS FOR ATTACHMENT OF THE PROPERTIES OF ACCUSED:-

The conspiracies of accused are being exposed everywhere in the world.

Majority of the people are likely to initiate proceedings against them. American Republican senators here brought the bill to 'Fire Dr. Anthony Fauci'

If we roughly calculate the interim compensation to be recovered for India, then it will at least be Rupees 70 to 80 Lacs Crores around 1076.318 Trillion US Dollars.

The accused will not be able to compensate each victim across the world even after selling their entire properties.

Therefore, it is just and necessary that in order to secure the prospective rights of victims who are litigant to this complaint he secured by attaching all their movable and immovable properties including their bank accounts.

Indian law specifically mandate for such action.

This is also necessary for stopping further crimes by the accused by using their money power.

xxxi) We request a thorough investigation through a Special Investigation Team (SIT) having expert officers from RAW, CBI, IB, ED, with Doctors, Scientists those are unconnected with accused and their NGOs, Trusts such as Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation etc.

xxxi) Proper protection to witnesses needs to be ordered and a systematic planning to make few accused as an approver to expose accused forthwith is also necessary.

xxxi) Close watch on media needs to be ordered.

xxxi) The conspiracy regarding other safe drug Hydroxychloroquine is exposed by American Frontline Doctors (AFLD) in their White Paper: Covid-19- Experimental Vaccine candidates?

Link:- <https://tinyurl.com/bbbbyggs> 99d3502-a5eb-41ef-9d82-a070fa5e1778MDW/whitepaper.pdf

xxv) Experts Report on non-requirement of vaccines in the person who developed antibodies due to their body contact with Covid-19 ex-furie proved the false narratives of Vaccine Syndicate, in collaboration with WHO Director-General Dr. Tedros, Chief Medical Advisor to the President of USA Dr. Anthony Fauci etc.

xxvi) That, the authentic and huge data of cure from Covid-19 with the help of scientifically proved therapies of Naturopathy and Ayurvedic as claimed by Dr. Biswaroop Roy Chowdhury and Baba Ramdev was suppressed, neglected, defamed with the help of false narratives without any scientific reason to counter it. The officials of WHO and some government officials, media houses joined the conspiracy and they are liable for severe punishment as that of main accused.

xxvii) All the persons advocating the mass vaccinations by suppressing the above-mentioned scientific data and running narratives to help the vaccine Syndicate needs to be interrogated and the guilty needs to be punished.

xxviii) After publishing of above report, the accused came with new narrative that one dose of vaccine Covishield is sufficient for such person.

Link:- <https://www.indiatoday.in/coronavirus/story/single-dose-of-vaccine-is-sufficient-covid-recovered-patients-study-1314668-2021-06-11>

xxix) The other managements of conspiracies in media, doctors and bureaucracy to amend the policies/roles to not to report the death caused due to side effects of vaccines and also not to report the in effectiveness of the vaccines as there were severe deaths even after taking two doses of vaccines is also clear from the following data:

xxx) CONCEALMENT AND SUPPRESSION OF DEATH BY VACCINES:- There have been thousands of cases of deaths and serious adverse events following vaccination in India. According to the following table

According to the slides presented on March 31, prepared by the Immunization Technical Support Unit at the health ministry and which **TheWire Science** in an article (link: <https://science.thewire.in/health/617-serious-adverse-events-after-vaccination-reported-in-india-until-march-29/>) titled "617 Serious Adverse Events After Vaccination Reported in India until March 29" dated 09.04.2021, reported the following:

However, according to the presentation, complete documents were available for only 35 people. These documents refer to case reporting forms and case investigation forms that the corresponding healthcare workers must file at the district level for each case. Article:

THE VAERS Report

xxxi) 4863 (as on 24th May 2021) persons died and 195000 persons had adverse events after vaccination in USA (Dec 2020 to May 2021)

xxxii) The US government has set up The Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) for reporting of all deaths happening post vaccination. This system reported 4863 deaths and 195000 serious adverse events were reported out of 257 million doses of vaccination in the USA. The link to VAERS is as under:- <https://www.cdc.gov/acip/2019-ncov-vaccines/safety/vaccine-adverse-events.html>

xxxi) Despite such reporting mechanism, the reporting of serious adverse events remainignly under reported in the USA. In a separate 2011 study titled "Electronic Support for Public Health-Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System" commissioned by Department of Health and Human Services (USA) and performed by Harvard Consultants, concluded that "fewer than 1 % of vaccine adverse events are reported". The link of this report can be found at <https://digitallinc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1810is017045-anuary-final-report-2011.pdf>

xxxi) Regarding initial conspiracy by Dr. Anthony Fauci and others, in addition to other proofs and data I, am also relying on the "Dr. Fauci / Covid-19 Dossier" by Dr. David E. Martin.

Please see Annexure few relevant paras ends as under:

"18 U.S.C. §2339 C et seq. – Funding and Conspiring to Commit Acts of Terror

Indirectly, unlawfully and wilfully provides or collects funds with the intention that such funds be used, or with the knowledge that such funds are to be used, in full or in part, in order to carry out:

(A) An act which constitutes an offense within the scope of a treaty specified in subsection (c)(7), as implemented by the United States; or

(B) Any other act intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian, or to any other person not taking an active part in the hostilities in the situation of armed conflict, when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population; or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act....

By no later than April 11, 2005, Dr. Anthony Fauci was publicly acknowledging the association of SARS with bioterror potential. Leveraging the fear of the analysis of bioterror of 2001, he publicly claimed the economic boom that domestic terror had directed towards his budget. He specifically stated that NIAID was actively funding research on a "SARS Chip" DNA microarray to rapidly detect SARS (something that was not made available during the current "pandemic") and two candidate vaccines focused on the SARS CoV spike protein. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3129336/> Led by three Chinese researchers under his employment – Zhi-yong Yang, Wing-pui Kong, and Yue Huang – Fauci had at least one DNA vaccine in animal trials by 2004? <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2095382/> This team, part of the Vaccine Research

Dr. Fauci's decision to unilaterally promote vaccines as a primary intervention for several designated "infectious diseases" precluded proven therapies from being applied to the sick and dying.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1222869/>

The CDC and NIAID led by Anthony Fauci entered into trade among States (including, but not limited to working with EcoHealth Alliance Inc. and with foreign nations (specifically, the Wuhan Institute of Virology and the Chinese Academy of Sciences) through the 2014 et seq. National Institutes of Health Grant R01AI110964 to exploit their patent rights. This research was known to involve surface proteins in coronaviruses that had the capacity to directly infect human respiratory systems. In flagrant violation of the NIH moratorium on gain of function research, NIAID and Ralph Baric persisted in working with chimeric coronavirus components specifically to amplify the pathogenicity of the biologic material.

By October 2013 the Wuhan Institute of Virology *1* coronavirus S1 spike protein was described in NIAID's funded work in China. This work involved NIAID, USAID, and Peter Duszak, the head of EcoHealth Alliance. This work, funded under R01AI079231, was pivotal in isolating and manipulating viral fragments retrieved from sites across China which contained high risk for severe human response.²⁴(Ge, XY., Li, JL., Yang, XL. et al. Isolation and characterization of a bat SARS-like coronavirus that uses the ACE2 receptor. *Nature* 2013; 535-538 (2013).)

By March 2015, both the virulence of the S1 spike protein and the ACE II receptor was known to present a considerable risk to human health. NIAID, EcoHealth Alliance and numerous researchers lamented the fact that the public was not sufficiently concerned about coronaviruses to adequately fund their desired research.²⁵(Forum on Medical and Public Health Preparedness for Catastrophic Events: Forum on Drug Discovery, Development, and Translation; Forum on

pathogen for public health purposes along with the means to share limited medical countermeasures across countries.

Progress indicator(s) by September 2018

* Donors and countries commit and identify timelines for financing and development of a universal influenza vaccine, broad spectrum antivirals, and targeted therapeutics. WHO and its Member States develop options for standard procedures and timelines for sharing of sequence data, specimens, and medical countermeasures for pathogens other than influenza.

* Donors, countries and multilateral institutions develop a multi-year plan and approach for strengthening R&D research capacity, in advance of and during an epidemic.

* WHO, the United Nations Children's Fund, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, academic and other partners identify strategies for increasing capacity and integration of social science approaches and researchers across the entire preparedness-response continuum.²⁶(http://apps.who.int/gb/ebwhist/en/meeting/CPMB_annualreview_2019.pdf (page 8))

As if to confirm the utility of the September 2019 demand for "financing and development" of vaccine and the forthcoming SARS-CoV-2 alleged outbreak in December of 2019, Dr. Fauci began gloating that his fortunes for additional funding were likely changing for the better. In a February 2020 interview in STAT, he was quoted as follows:

"The emergence of the new virus is going to change that figure, likely considerably," Fauci said. "I don't know how much it's going to be. But I think it's going to generate more sustained interest in coronaviruses because it's very clear that coronaviruses can do really interesting things."²⁷(<https://www.statnews.com/2020/02/10/fauci-finding-and-flaunting-interest-his-coronavirus-research/>)

18 U.S.C. § 2331 § 802 - Acts of Domestic Terrorism resulting in

to Infectious Diseases: Enabling Sustainable Capabilities Through Ongoing Public- and Private-Sector Partnerships: Workshop Summary. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2016
Feb 12, 6. Developing MCMS for Coronaviruses. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK339040/>

Dr. Peter Duszak of EcoHealth Alliance offered the following assessment:

"Duszak reiterated that, until an infectious disease crisis is very real, present, and at an emergency threshold, it is often largely ignored. To sustain the funding base beyond the crisis, he said, we need to increase public understanding of the need for MCMS such as a pan-influenza or pan-coronavirus vaccine. A key driver is the media, and the economics follow the hype. We need to use that type to our advantage to get to the real issues. Investors will respond if they see profit at the end of the process. Duszak stated."²⁸ (ibid.)

Economics will follow the hype.

The CDC and NIAID entered into trade among States (including, but not limited to working with University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill and with foreign nations (specifically, the Wuhan Institute of Virology and the Chinese Academy of Sciences represented by Zheng-Ji Shi through U19AI109261 (Ralph S. Baric), U19AI107310 (Ralph S. Baric), and National Natural Science Foundation of China Award 81290343 (Zheng-Ji Shi) et al. 2015-2016. These projects took place during a time when the work being performed was prohibited by the United States National Institutes of Health.

The public was clearly advised of the dangers being presented by NIAID-funded research in 2013 and 2016 when the Wuhan Institute of Virology material was being manipulated at UNC in Ralph Baric's lab.

Section 802 of the USA PATRIOT Act (Pub. L. No. 107-56) expanded the definition of terrorism to cover "domestic," as opposed to international, terrorism. A person engages in domestic terrorism if they do an act "dangerous to human life" that is a violation of the criminal laws of a state or the United States, if the act appears to be intended to: (i) intimidate or coerce a civilian population; (ii) influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion;

Dr. Anthony Fauci has intimidated and coerced a civilian population and sought to influence the policy of a government by intimidation and coercion.

With no corroboration, Dr. Anthony Fauci promoted <https://www.cnn.com/2016/02/16/health/coronavirus-mitigation-says-two-million-loses/> Professor Neil Ferguson's computer simulation derived claims that,

"The world is facing the most serious public health crisis in generations. Here we provide concrete estimates of the scale of the threat countries face now."

"We use the latest estimates of severity to show that policy strategies which aim to mitigate the epidemic might halve deaths and reduce peak healthcare demand by two-thirds, but that this will not be enough to prevent health systems being overwhelmed. More intensive, and socially disruptive interventions will therefore be required to suppress transmission to low levels. It is likely such measures – most notably, large scale social distancing – will need to be in place for many months, perhaps until a vaccine becomes available."

<https://www Imperial.ac.uk/nruw/196734/covid-19-imperial-researchers-model-likely-outcome/>

Reporting to the President that as many as 2.2 million deaths may result from a pathogen that had not yet been isolated and could not be measured with any accuracy, Dr. Fauci intimidated and coerced the population and the government into reckless, untested, and harmful acts creating irreparable harm to lives and livelihoods.
<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378109720301121>

express provision is made by this Code for the punishment of such abetment, be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to seven years, and shall also be liable to fine; if act causing harm be done in consequence – and if any act for which the abettor is liable in consequence of the abetment, and which causes hurt to any person, is done, the abettor shall be liable to imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to fourteen years, and shall also be liable to fine

14.1.3. Section 392 of IPC:-

392. Punishment for murder.—Whoever commits murder shall be punished with death, or [imprisonment for life], and shall also be liable to fine.

14.1.4. Section 394 of IPC:-

394. Punishment for culpable homicide not amounting to murder.—

Whoever commits culpable homicide not amounting to murder shall be punished with [imprisonment for life], or imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, and shall also be liable to fine, if the act by which the death is caused is done with the intention of causing death, or of causing such bodily injury as is likely to cause death, or with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to ten years, or with fine, or with both, if the act is done with the knowledge that it is likely to cause death, but without any intention to cause death, or to cause such bodily injury as is likely to cause death.

14.1.5. Section 52 of IPC:-

52. "Good faith".—Nothing is said to be done or believed in "good faith" which is done or believed without due care and attention.

14.1.6. Section 188 of IPC:-

188. Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant.—

Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to obtain

Both Ebright and Wain-Hobson are long-standing critics of gain-of-function research.

In their paper, the study authors also concede that funders may think twice about allowing such experiments in the future. "Scientific review panels may deem similar studies building chimeric viruses based on circulating strains too risky to pursue," they write, adding that discussion is needed as to whether these types of chimeric virus studies warrant further investigation versus the inherent risks involved.

But Baric and others say the research did have benefits. The study findings "move this virus from a candidate emerging pathogen to a clear and present danger," says Peter Duszak, who co-authored the 2013 paper. Duszak is president of the EcoHealth Alliance, an international network of scientists headquartered in New York City, that samples viruses from animals and people to emerging-diseases hotspots across the globe.

Studies testing hybrid viruses in human cell culture and animal models are limited in what they can say about the threat posed by a wild virus, Duszak agrees. But he argues that they can help indicate which pathogens should be prioritized for further research attention. "Climate-Change.nature.com/news/engaged-but-virus-study-debate-over-stabs-research%20118767"

Knowing that the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (through CDC, NIH, NISID), and their funded laboratories and commercial partners had patents on each proposed element of medical countermeasures and their funding, Dr. Fauci, Dr. Guo (China CDC), and Dr. Elias (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation) conceived to create acts of terror on the global population – including the citizens of the United States – when, in September 2019, they published the following mandate:

"Countries, donors and multilateral institutions must be prepared for the worst. A rapidly spreading pandemic due to a lethal respiratory pathogen (whether naturally emergent or accidentally or deliberately released) poses additional preparedness requirements. Donors and multilateral institutions must ensure adequate investment in

<https://www.hhs.gov/press-releases/2019/09/11/hhs-announces> had any evidence of success in estimating previous outbreaks from coronaviruses, but, without consultation or peer-review, Dr. Fauci adopted their terrifying estimates as the basis for interventions that are explicitly against medical advice.

+ The imposition of social distancing was based on computer simulation and environmental models with NO disease transmission evidence whatsoever.

+ The imposition of face mask wearing was directly against controlled clinical trial evidence and against the written policy in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

+ Face masks should not be worn by healthy individuals to protect themselves from acquiring respiratory infection because there is no evidence to suggest that face masks worn by healthy individuals are effective in preventing people from becoming ill.²⁹ (https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/272593?gub_id=102RN&c1=1)
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32547074/>

+ In both the Imperial College and the IHME simulations, quarantines were modeled for the sick, not the healthy.

Insisting on vaccines while blocking the emergency use of proven pharmaceutical interventions may have contributed to the death of many patients and otherwise healthy individuals.
<https://www.reuters.com/investigates/special-report/why-coronavirus-usa-caused/>

Using the power of NIAID during the alleged pandemic, Dr. Antonio Fauci actively suppressed proven medical countermeasures used by, and validated in scientific proceedings, that offered alternatives to the

lawfully employed, he punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees, or with both, and such disobedience causes or tends to cause danger to human life, health or safety, or causes or tends to cause a riot or affray, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both. Explanation – It is not necessary that the offender should intend to produce harm, or contemplate his disobedience as likely to produce harm. It is sufficient that he knows of the order which he disobeys, and that his disobedience produces, or is likely to produce, harm.

14.1.7. Section 192 of IPC:-

192. Fabricating false evidence.—Whoever creates any circumstance to exist or induces any false entry in any book or record, or electronic record or makes any document or electronic record containing a false statement, intending that such circumstance, false entry or false statement may appear in evidence in a judicial proceeding, or in a proceeding taken by law before a public servant as such, or before an arbitrator, and that such circumstance, false entry or false statement, so appearing in evidence, may cause any person, who in such proceeding is to form an opinion upon the evidence, to entertain an erroneous opinion touching any point material to the result of such proceeding, is said "to fabricate false evidence".

14.1.8. Section 193 of IPC:-

193. Punishment for false evidence.—Whoever intentionally gives false evidence in any stage of a judicial proceeding, or fabricates false evidence for the purpose of being used in any stage of a judicial proceeding, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, and shall also be liable to fine, and whenever intentionally gives or fabricates false evidence in any other case, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to three years, and shall also be liable to fine.

14.1.2. Section 115 of IPC:-

109. Punishment of abetment if the act abetted is committed in consequence and where no express provision is made for its punishment.—Whoever abets any offence shall, if the act abetted is committed in consequence of the abetment, and no express provision is made by this Code for the punishment of such abetment, be punished with the punishment provided for the offence. Explanation – An act or offence is said to be committed in consequence of abetment, when it is committed in consequence of the instigation, or in pursuance of the conspiracy, or with the aid which constitutes the abetment.

188. Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant.—

Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to obtain

to the virus that is said to be causing Covid-19¹. This protocol is also available on WHO website².

A major issue with this publication is that the authors artificially simulated the novel Coronavirus that closely matched the viral genome sequence (genetic formula) given by the Chinese authorities. The authors developed clinical samples by using related viruses (such as the viruses responsible for SARS, MERS and similar respiratory diseases) from batbaths. The RNA extracted from such artificially created samples was used to design the RT-PCR test. The authors state:

"In the present case of 2019-nCoV, virus isolates or samples from infected patients have so far not become available to the international public health community. We report here on the establishment and validation of a diagnostic workflow for 2019-nCoV screening and specific confirmation, designed in absence of available virus isolates or original patient specimens. Design and validation were enabled by the close genetic relationship to the 2003 SARS-CoV, and aided by the use of synthetic nucleic acid technology."³

A diagnostic test kit that was designed without the availability of the live pathogen to be detected cannot be an accurate test. This is further evidenced in this part of the treatise.

¹[Jan2020](https://www.covid19treatance.org/comment/1028071580)
²[Jan2020](https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/coronavirus/protocol-v2.pdf?sfvrsn=9e6fb1fc_2)

³[Sep 2020](https://doi.org/10.4102/IJHMS.IJHMS-92_20)

15.7. The RT-PCR test is done by taking a swab sample from the individual's nose or throat. In the laboratory, this sample is used to extract the viral RNA (ribonucleic acid). The RNA then undergoes the RT-PCR technique which creates strands of viral DNA (deoxyribonucleic acid). The DNA strand is run through several cycles of PCR for it to replicate itself. The cycle threshold value or Ct value is the number of cycles that it takes for the DNA to reach a detectable level.

15.8. Idea of "asymptomatic transmission" was influenced by a case report in Germany, in which an infection was attributed to contact with an asymptomatic person. The report was published in March 2020 in the *New England Journal of*

ICMR gives an inflated figure of the number of Covid-19 cases including asymptomatic cases:

15.16. Website of ICMR¹ shows that they have not published any research papers on the efficiency of RT-PCR tests nor does their website offers any scientific reasons for their decision to select cycle threshold value (Ct) value less than 35:

¹<https://www.icmr.gov.in/papers.html>

15.17. That asymptomatic people do not infect is corroborated by a large study done in Wuhan where the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak originated. Published in *Nature Communications* in November 2020, the study is titled "*Post-lockdown SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid screening in nearly ten million residents of Wuhan, China*".²

Researchers in Wuhan did a city-wide screening between May 14 and June 1 using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays to detect viral RNA fragments in residents. Among eligible residents, which was those aged six years or older, 92.9 percent participated, which amounted to 9,899,828 people. With this intensive screening program, there were positive test results for 300 individuals who were asymptomatic. Among these, 63 percent also tested positive for antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, offering additional evidence that they had indeed been infected. Nevertheless, contact tracing of 1,174 close contacts of asymptomatic individuals with evidence of infection revealed none who also tested positive.

The researchers also tried to culture virus from asymptomatic individuals who tested positive; but the results indicated that there was "no 'viable virus' in positive cases detected in this study".

Consequently, despite testing positive for viral RNA, none of these individuals appeared capable of transmitting the virus to others. As the authors stated, "there was no evidence of transmission from asymptomatic positive persons to traced close contacts".

¹[Nov 2020](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-19802-w)

15.18. An editorial in *The British Medical Journal* in December, 2020 titled *"The case for a new definition of COVID-19"*.

This means that RT-PCR test is an unapproved medical product. It can be inferred that this method has not completed successful rigorous testing.

¹<https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-use/2019-novel-coronavirus-use-in-health-care-settings-medical-devices-for-emergency-use-authorizations-new-medical-devices-during-covid-19-pandemic>

15.23. The inventor of the RT-PCR test *Kurt Mullis* said in a video filmed sometime in 1990s that the test can find almost anything in anybody³. He said that there is lot of scope for misinterpretation. He further adds in the video that the measurement done by the test is not exact.

¹[1990s](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7oZ2R4XhQO)

²[1990s](https://www.hcsc.org/video/b125e7957a/CF)

15.24. Manufacturers of RT-PCR test state that the test is for research use only and not intended for diagnostic use. For example, *Creative Diagnostics*, an American biotechnology company producing diagnostic equipment states that RT-PCR test cannot be used as the only evidence for clinical diagnosis.

¹[\[Annexure R-17\]](https://www.creativediagnostics.com/pdf/CDC%20RT-PCR.pdf)

15.25. To summarize RT-PCR tests are predominantly used worldwide and in India to test for Covid-19. However, the test inventor, test manufacturers and regulators such as FDA have said that the test is not intended to be used as the only tool for diagnosis. Scientific studies have shown that the high cycle threshold value (Ct) of 35 that is guided by ICMR, results in high percentage of false positives. Studies have also shown that positively tested asymptomatic people have a higher Ct values compared to Ct values of positively tested symptomatic people. Furthermore, the modelling studies used to show that pre-asymptomatic people are highly infectious during incubation period are flawed. Thus when an asymptomatic or pre-symptomatic person tests positive and the person shows no symptom of illness then, it is fallacious to assume that such a person is transmitting the virus.

¹[\[Annexure R-9\]](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1161468)

²[\[Annexure R-10\]](https://doi.org/10.4102/IJHMS.IJHMS-92_20)

15.9. A culture is a specially prepared nutrient medium to grow microorganism such as viruses. In a paper published by Indian scientists in Sep 2020 titled "*COVID diagnostics: Do we have sufficient armamentarium for the present and the unforeseen?*", in the *Indian Journal of Medical Specialties*, the scientists state that testing by means of viral culture is the gold standard for SARS-CoV-2.

¹[Sep 2020](https://doi.org/10.4102/IJHMS.IJHMS-92_20)

15.10. Vero cells are a lineage of cells used in culture. A study titled "*Predicting Infectious Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 From Diagnostic Samples*" published in *Oxford Academic – Clinical Infectious Diseases* states that RT-PCR detects RNA (Ribonucleic Acid), not infectious virus; thus, its ability to determine duration of infectivity of patients is limited. This study took 90 SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR confirmed positive samples and determined their ability to infect Vero cell lines. 26 samples (28.9%) demonstrated viral growth. There was no growth in samples with Ct > 24 or STT > 8 days. The study concludes that SARS-CoV-2 Vero cell infectivity was only observed for RT-PCR Ct < 24 and STT < 8 days. Infectivity of patients with Ct > 24 and duration of symptoms > 8 days may be low.

Thus, as per this study patients could not be contagious with Ct > 24 as the virus is not detected in culture above this value.

¹[\[Annexure R-10\]](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz538)

²[Sep 2020](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz538)

15.11. Furthermore, an article was published in *Oxford Academic – Clinical Infectious Diseases* on the correlation between 3790 RT-PCR positive samples and positive cell cultures including 1941 SARS-CoV-2 isolates. In this study the researchers compared the RT-PCR test against the gold standard test i.e., viral culture. The researchers found that at a cycle threshold (Ct) of 25, the RT-PCR test was 70 percent reliable, a figure that dropped to 20 percent at 30 cycles, and just three percent at 35 cycles. That meant 97 percent were false positives at 35 cycles.

available for routine use. As things stand, a person who tests positive with any kind of test may or may not have an active infection with live virus, and may or may not be infectious."

¹[Dec 2020](https://doi.org/10.11586/nni/mz4851)

15.19. There are practical difficulties to determine if pre-symptomatic people are contagious. It is not possible to go back in time and test whether a person who is showing symptoms now was spreading the virus during incubation period. Instead modeling studies have been done, which conclude that a significant percentage of transmission is due to pre-symptomatic people.

15.24. An example of modeling studies is a CDC sponsored study titled "*SARS-CoV-2 Transmission from People Without COVID-19 Symptoms*" published in *Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA)* in January 2021. This is an example of a study used by the authorities to support the claim the asymptomatic and pre-symptomatic people are responsible for more than half of all transmissions. This study is a modeling study. But outputs in modeling studies are based on some mathematical formulas which need some input assumptions. Thus, the output of modeling studies are dependent on input assumptions. Two key assumptions in this modeling study are:

- before a person develops symptoms there is a highly infectious incubation period (incubation period is the time from infection to onset of symptoms)
- asymptomatic people are 75% as infectious as symptomatic people

The flaws in these assumptions are as follows;

- The basis for the first assumption is *Nature Medicine* modelling study titled "*Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19*" published in April 2020. But this study itself has flaws and limitations. The researchers have themselves pointed out that they did not have data on viral shedding before symptom onset. They only had "viral load" data from patients who were already in the hospital and after those patients' symptoms had already developed. The researchers admitted to recall bias that is they themselves did not know when the patients' symptoms started, they had to rely on the patient's memory for

transmission" is an artifact of invalid and unreliable PCR test procedures and interpretations, leading to high false-positive rates. Evidence indicates that PCR-positive, asymptomatic people are healthy false-positives, not carriers. As far as the scientific literature goes, the evidence is clear: truly asymptomatic transmission is very rare. This position is supported by a large study from the city in China where the SARS-CoV-2 outbreak originated. Published in *Nature Communications* on November 20, the study is titled "*Postlockdown SARS-CoV-2 nucleic acid screening in nearly ten million residents of Wuhan, China*".³ Researchers in Wuhan did a city-wide screening between May 14 and June 1 using reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) assays to detect viral RNA fragments in residents.

16.2. Among eligible residents, which was those aged six years or older, 92.9 percent participated, which amounted to 9,899,828 people. With this intensive screening program, there were positive test results for 300 individuals who were asymptomatic. Among these, 63 percent also tested positive for antibodies to SARS-CoV-2, offering additional evidence that they had indeed been infected. Nevertheless, contact tracing of 1,174 close contacts of asymptomatic individuals with evidence of infection revealed none who also tested positive. The researchers also tried to culture virus from asymptomatic individuals who tested positive, but the results indicated that there was "no 'viable virus' in positive cases detected in this study". Consequently, despite testing positive for viral RNA, none of these individuals appeared capable of transmitting the virus to others. As the authors stated, "**There was no evidence of transmission from asymptomatic positive persons to traced close contacts.**"

16.3. In contrast, the papers cited by the Centre for Disease Control to justify claims of asymptomatic transmission are based on hypothetical models, not empirical studies they present assumptions and estimates rather than evidence. Preventing asymptomatic infection is not a viable rationale for promoting vaccination of the general population.

17. POINT NO:- 13 #:- SCIENTIFIC FRAUDS REGARDING MASK:-

17.1. That, as per the recent information received by Mr. Anil Chaudhary on 19.05.2021, from Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, it is clarified that the protocols and rules which needs to be followed regarding wearing of Mask, are available on

15.12. Dr. KK Aggarwal, late President of Heart Care Foundation of India, late President of Confederation of Medical Association of Asia and Oceania, and past president of the Indian Medical Association, said that if the Ct value is above 24, it is likely that the person's viral load is really less and that he won't pass on the infection to anyone else, and if the value is less than 24 then it is highly likely that they are infectious¹.

¹[Sep 2020](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cwplq1DwvA)

15.13. *Journal of Infection* published a research titled "*The performance of the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test as a tool for detecting SARS-CoV-2 infection in the population*" in May 2021. The researchers analyzed real-world data from a large laboratory in the city of Münster, Germany. In all 4164 RT-PCR positive cases were analyzed. The researchers assessed the influence of symptoms on the distribution of cycle threshold Ct values. The researchers state in their conclusion:

"In light of our findings that more than half of individuals with positive PCR test results are unlikely to have been infectious, RT-PCR test positivity should not be taken as an accurate measure of infectious SARS-CoV-2 incidence. Asymptomatic individuals with positive RT-PCR test results have higher Ct values and a lower probability of being infectious than symptomatic individuals with positive results."

¹[May 2021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2021.03.022)

15.14. As per news articles in June 2021 such as in *The Indian Express*, ICMR said that all patients tested positive by RT-PCR method with a cycle threshold (Ct) value less than 35 may be considered as positive while those with a Ct value above 35 may be considered as negative. This is corroborated by RTI reply from ICMR wherein they have said that Ct value below 35 is considered as positive¹.

¹[Jun 2021](https://indianexpress.com/article/science/explained-the-cv-value-is-a-risk-factor-7291682/)

15.15. *Journal of Infection* published a research titled "*Explained: the Cv value is a risk factor*" in June 2021.

a. proportion of pre-symptomatic transmission that is "artificially inflated".
b. The basis for the second assumption of asymptomatic people being 75% as infectious as symptomatic people are three studies showing that asymptomatic people are carriers of the virus. But all these studies have relied upon the RT-PCR method of testing, one study even stating that the cycle threshold Ct value was taken less than 40%. And as is known earlier in this part of the review the RT-PCR tests with Ct values greater than 25 are unreliable and show high percentage of false positives.

¹[Jan 2021](https://doi.org/10.1010/janantivirology.2020.35657)

²[Apr 2020](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordmed/med-9780192895055.003.0005)

³[Aug 2020](https://doi.org/10.1093/antimicro/med.2020.386)

Thus both these assumptions are shown to be inaccurate, hence this modelling study to determine if pre-symptomatic people are infectious is flawed.

15.21. The RT-PCR method of testing for SARS-CoV-2 has still not been approved or cleared by the United States FDA¹. It has only been authorized for emergency use. Even in May 2021, a full one year after the outbreak of Covid-19, the FDA continues to authorize this test for emergency use only.² Also ICMR has stated that the test is approved for emergency use in the order of Ministry of Health and Family Welfare³ dated 21st Mar 2020, and this emergency use authorization status has not changed since.

¹[Jan 2021](https://doi.org/10.1010/janantivirology.2020.35657)

²[May 2021](https://www.fda.gov/medicines/med-drugs-therapies/medications-approvals/medications-approvals-emergency-use/2020-emergency-use-authorization-covid-19)

15.22. The relevant guidelines on 1st link which were downloaded earlier are as under;

¹[Apr 2020](https://www.fda.gov/medicines/med-drugs-therapies/medications-approvals/medications-approvals-emergency-use/2020-emergency-use-authorization-covid-19)

²[May 2021](https://www.fda.gov/medicines/med-drugs-therapies/medications-approvals/medications-approvals-emergency-use/2020-emergency-use-authorization-covid-19)

³[Jun 2021](https://www.fda.gov/medicines/med-drugs-therapies/medications-approvals/medications-approvals-emergency-use/2020-emergency-use-authorization-covid-19)

"During a public health emergency, the FDA can use its Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) authority to allow the use of unapproved medical products, or unapproved uses of approved medical products."

17.2. The relevant guidelines on 1st link which were downloaded earlier are as under;

¹[Apr. 2020](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control/masks/mask-use.html)

²[May 2021](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control/masks/mask-use.html)

³[Jun 2021](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/hcp/infection-control/masks/mask-use.html)

Further, there is no scientific evidence to show health benefit of using masks for non-risk persons in the community. In fact erroneous use of masks or continuous use of a disposable mask for longer than 6 hours or reported use of same mask may actually increase risk of getting an infection. It also incurs unnecessary cost.¹

A copy of the information received under RTI is annexed herewith at [\[Annexure R-18\]](#).

17.3. That, as per written communication dated 27th May, 2021 with Mr. Shrivardhanikar, it is clearly informed by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) that "as per guidelines/SOP the use of Mask is mandatory".

A copy of said letter is annexed herewith at [\[Annexure R-19\]](#).

17.4. That, despite the above said guidelines the healthy common people are being compelled to wear mask by the various authorities.

17.5. The taller time, advertisement, slogan and public addresses of all the authorities constantly keep on asking for the mask and the people not wearing the mask are made to pay fines.

In Mumbai more than Rs. 55 crores are collected from the citizen.

Link: <https://www.indiaclimatedialogue.net/story/re-ts-55-crore-collected-in-mumbai-against-not-wearing-masks-in-public-1809409-2021-05-24>

17.6. That, a review of research papers published in prestigious journals reveals that face masks or coverings are ineffective to control Covid-19. There is growing scientific evidence that face masks have harmful health effects for adults. Face masks have

vulnerability should be protected and the personal integrity of such individuals respected.

Article 10 – Equality, justice and equity

The fundamental equality of all human beings in dignity and rights is to be respected so that they are treated justly and equitably.

Article 11 – Non-discrimination and non-stigmatization

No individual or group should be discriminated against or stigmatized on any grounds, in violation of human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Article 16 – Protecting future generations

The impact of life sciences on future generations, including on their genetic constitution, should be given due regard.

Application of the principles

Article 18 – Decision-making and addressing biethical issues

1. Professionalism, honesty, integrity and transparency in decision-making should be promoted, in particular declarations of all conflicts of interest and appropriate sharing of knowledge. Every endeavour should be made to use the best available scientific knowledge and methodology in addressing and periodically reviewing biethical issues.

2. Persons and professionals concerned and society as a whole should be engaged in dialogue on a regular basis.

3. Opportunities for informed pluralistic public debate, seeking the expression of all relevant opinions, should be promoted.

18.11. But here the people are forced to vaccinate by suppressing the actual side effects and other relevant data.

18.10. There are some crucial provisions of International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) affected due to the violations of rights of citizens of those

Passive Euthanasia has also recognised passive euthanasia, but no law has been enacted.

202.8. An inquiry into Common Law jurisdictions reveals that all adults with capacity to consent have the right of self-determination and autonomy. The said rights pave the way for the right to refuse medical treatment which has received universal recognition. A competent person who has come of age has the right to refuse specific treatment or all treatments or opt for alternative treatments, even if such decision entails a risk of death. The "Emergency Principle" or the "Principle of Necessity" has to be given effect to only when it is not practicable to obtain the patient's consent for treatment and his/her life is in danger. But where a patient has already made a valid Advance Directive which is free from reasonable doubts and specifying that he/she does not wish to be treated, then such directive has to be given effect to.

202.9. Right to life and liberty as envisaged under Article 21 of the Constitution is meaningless unless it encompasses within its sphere individual dignity. With the passage of time, this Court has expanded the spectrum of Article 21 to include within it the right to live with dignity as component of right to life and liberty.

202.12. Though the sanctity of life has to be kept on the high pedestal yet in cases of terminally ill persons or PVS patients where there is no hope for revival, priority shall be given to the Advance Directive and the right of self-determination.

202.13. In the absence of Advance Directive, the procedure provided for the said category heretofore shall be applicable.

202.14. When passive euthanasia as a situational palliative measure becomes applicable, the best interest of the patient shall override the State interest.

306. In addition to personal autonomy, other facets of human dignity, namely, "self-expression" and "right to determine" also support the argument that it is the choice of the patient to receive or not to receive

"2. The petition proceeds on the footing that the Standard Operating Procedures / Guidelines prescribed by the State Government as well as the Government of India compel a person suffering from Covid-19 to take treatment only by use of Allopathic drugs.

3. At least from the Standard Operating Procedures, which are placed on record, we do not find anything therein which shows that the Government can compel a patient to take only Allopathic drugs. We cannot go into the question whether Covid-19 can be successfully treated either by Ayurvedic drugs or by Allopathic drugs. It is for the experts in the field of medicine to decide that question."

18.14. Needless to mention here that, a PIL is filed in the Supreme Court of India on 13th May, 2021 hearing Writ Petition No. 100607 of 2021 between the parties Dr. Jacob Pultved Vs. Union of India and Ors.

18.15. However, it seems that some of the entities, authorities and employees, either due to ignorance of law or driven by ulterior purposes or for the reasons best known to them, are forcing people to get vaccinated, which is direct violation of fundamental rights guaranteed under our Constitution of India and also by International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights (ICCPR).

Person or authority forcing for vaccination will be liable for action under contempt and also face prosecution under section 188, 166 et al of Indian Penal Code.

Any Authority or person or a Company that does not follow the above guidelines and prevailing laws, will be liable for action under Contempt of Courts Act and also under various provisions of IPC such as 188, 166 and others of IPC.

18.16. In Prominent Hotels Case 2015 SCC Online Del 11910, it is ruled as under,

"22. In East India Commercial Co. Ltd v. Collector of Customs, Calcutta, AIR 1962 SC 1893, Subba Rao, J. speaking for the majority observed reads as under:

"31.This raises the question whether an administrative authority can issue such an order. Judicial Committee of the Law Commission has observed:

The relevant Articles of aforesaid covenant applicable for the present situation of corona pandemic are as under:

Article 6 (1)

Article 6 (1) Every human being has the inherent right to life. This right shall be protected by law. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his life.

Article 7

"Article 7 No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation."

Article 6 (3)

Article 6 (3) When deprivation of life constitutes the crime of genocide, it is understood that nothing in this article shall authorize any State Party to the present Covenant to derogate in any way from any obligation assumed under the provisions of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

18.11. In Common Cause Vs. Union of India (2018) 5 SCC 1, it is ruled as under;

"169. In the context of health and medical care decisions, a person's exercise of self-determination and autonomy involves the exercise of his right to decide whether and to what extent he/she is willing to submit himself/herself to medical procedures and treatments, choosing amongst the available alternative treatments or, for that matter, opting for no treatment at all which, as per his or her own understanding, is in consonance with his or her own individual aspirations and values.

1. Conclusions in section

2. In view of the aforesaid analysis, we record our conclusions in section:

202.1. A careful and precise perusal of the judgement in Gian Kaur

individual possessed of a free and competent mental state is entitled to decide whether or not to accept medical treatment. The right of such an individual to refuse medical treatment is unconditional. Neither the law nor the Constitution compel an individual who is competent and able to take decisions, to disclose the reasons for refusing medical treatment nor is such a refusal subject to the supervisory control of an outside entity."

18.12. In the case between the Parents Teachers Association, Government Higher Secondary School, Kokkut, Kerala and the State of Kerala WP (C) 36065 of 2017, the Hon'ble High Court of Kerala had passed the order dated is under;

If at all any parent has an objection, it has to be necessarily brought before the authority, and there need not be any vaccination administered to such children whose parents object to the Vaccination".

1.11. Also, in the case (W.P.(C) 343/2019 & CM Nos.1604-1605/2019) between Master Haridatt Kumar (Minor through Petitioners Anubhav Kumar and Mr. Abhinav Mukundji Versus Union of India, & W.P.(C) 350/2019 & CM Nos. 1642-1644/2019 between Baby Veda Kalan & Others Versus Director of Education & Others.

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi had observed that:

"The assumption that children could be vaccinated forcibly or without consent is unsustainable. This Court is of the view that all efforts are required to be made to obtain the decision of the parents before proceeding with the MR campaign. In this regard, it would be appropriate to ensure that the consent forms/ slips are sent to each and every student. Since the time period for implementing the campaign is short, the response period should be reduced and parents/guardians of students must be requested to respond immediately and, in any case, in no more than three working days. If the consent forms/ slips are not returned by the concerned parent, the class teacher must ensure that

the power to punish for contempt of itself. Under Art. 226, it has a plenary power to issue orders or writs for the enforcement of the fundamental rights and for any other purpose to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases any Government within its territorial jurisdiction. Under Art. 227 it has jurisdiction over all Courts and tribunals throughout the territories in relation to which it exercises jurisdiction. It would be anomalous to suggest that a tribunal over which the High Court has superintendence can ignore the law declared by that Court and start proceedings in direct violation of it. If a tribunal can do so, all the subordinate Courts can equally do so, for there is no specific provision, just like in the case of Supreme Court, making the law declared by the High Court binding on subordinate Courts. It is implicit in the power of supervision conferred on a superior tribunal that all the tribunals subject to its supervision should conform to the law laid down by it. Such obedience would also be conducive to their smooth working; otherwise there would be confusion in the administration of law and respect for law would invariably suffer. We, therefore, hold that the law declared by the highest Court in the State is binding on authorities, or tribunals under its superintendence, and that they cannot ignore it either in initiating a proceeding or deciding on the rights involved in such a proceeding. If that be so, the notice issued by the authority signifying the launching of proceedings, contrary to the law laid down by the High Court would be invalid and the proceedings themselves would be without jurisdiction."

(Emphasis supplied)

22.3. The above legal position was reiterated in Mukherjee vs. State of Jammu and Kashmir, (1971) 1 SCC 759, in which Goyal, J. observed (at page 2209):

"6. The law as declared by this Court was binding on the respondent-State and its officers and they were bound to follow

death for reducing the period of suffering constitutes a right to live with dignity.

202.2. The Constitution Bench in Gian Kaur [Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab], (1996) 2 SCC 648; 1996 SCC (Cri) 374 has not approved the decision in Aircelde [Aircelde N.I.S. Trust v. Bland], 1993 4 CTC 789 - (1993) 2 WLR 316; (1993) 1 All ER 821 (CA & HL).

202.3. It is not the ratio of Gian Kaur [Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab], (1996) 2 SCC 648; 1996 SCC (Cri) 374 that passive euthanasia can be introduced only by legislation.

202.4. The two-Judge Bench in Aruna Ramachandran Shambhu v. Union of India, (2011) 4 SCC 454 - (2011) 2 SCC (Cri) 280 - (2011) 2 SCC (Cr) 294 has agreed holding that this Court in Gian Kaur [Gian Kaur v. State of Punjab], (1996) 2 SCC 648; 1996 SCC (Cri) 374 has approved the decision in Aircelde case [Aircelde N.I.S. Trust v. Bland], 1993 4 CTC 789 - (1993) 2 WLR 316; (1993) 1 All ER 821 (CA & HL); and that euthanasia could be made lawful only by legislation.

202.5. There is an inherent difference between active euthanasia and passive euthanasia as the former entails a positive affirmative act, while the latter relates to withdrawal of life-support measures or withholding of medical treatment meant for artificially prolonging life.

202.6. In active euthanasia, a specific overt act is done to end the patient's life whereas in passive euthanasia, something is not done which is necessary for preserving a patient's life. It is due to this difference that most of the countries across the world have legalized passive euthanasia either by legislation or by judicial interpretation with certain conditions and safeguards.

available telephonically despite efforts by the concerned teacher, their consent can be presumed provided respondents nos. 1 and 2 ensure that full information regarding the commission is provided to all parents."

"The contention that illustration of the side effects and contraindications in the advertisement would discourage parents or guardians from consenting to the MR campaign and, therefore, the same should be avoided, is summarised. The entire object of issuing advertisements is to ensure that necessary information is available to all parents/guardians in order that they can take an informed decision. The respondents are not only required to indicate the benefits of the MR vaccine but also indicate the side effects or contraindications so that the parents/guardians can take an informed decision whether the vaccine is to be administered to their wards' children."

The Hon'ble High Court of Delhi thus passed the following orders:

"MR vaccines will not be administered to those students whose parents / guardians have declined to give their consent. The said vaccination will be administered only to those students whose parents have given their consent either by returning the consent forms or by concurring the same directly to the class teacher/nodal teacher, and also to students whose parents/guardians cannot be contacted despite best efforts by the class teacher/nodal teacher and who have otherwise not indicated to the contrary".

6. Further on the issue of informed consent, the Hon'ble High Court had clearly directed that:

"Directorate of Family Welfare shall issue quarter page advertisements in various newspapers as indicated by the respondents.... The advertisements shall also indicate that the vaccination shall be administered with Auto-Disable Syringes to the eligible children by Auxiliary Nurse Midwife. The advertisement shall also clearly indicate the side effects and contraindications as may be finalized by the Department of Preventive Medicine, AIIS India Institute of Medical Sciences".

22.4. In Burdakar Mitali Et-Commissioner of Environment v. Bhonjan Das, (1973) 1 SCC 446, the appellant therein, a member of Judicial Service of State of Orissa refused to follow the decision of the High Court. The High Court issued a notice of contempt to the appellant and thereafter held him guilty of contempt which was challenged before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court held as under:-

**15. The conduct of the appellant in not following previous decisions of the High Court is calculated to create confusion in the administration of law. It will undermine respect for law laid down by the High Court and impair the constitutional authority of the High Court. His conduct is therefore comprehended by the principles underlying the law of Contempt. The analogy of the inferior court's disobedience to the specific order of a superior court also suggests that his conduct falls within the purview of the law of Contempt. Just as the disobedience to a specific order of the Court undermines the authority and dignity of the court in a particular case, similarly the deliberate and malefic conduct of not following the law laid down in the previous decision undermines the constitutional authority and respect of the High Court. Indeed, while the former conduct has repercussions on an individual case and on a limited number of persons, the latter conduct has a much wider and more disastrous impact. It is calculated not only to undermine the constitutional authority and respect of the High Court, generally, but is also likely to subvert the Rule of Law and engender harassing uncertainty and confusion in the administration of law."*

(Emphasis supplied)

22.5. In Montinder Singh Bitu v. Union of India, (2012) 1 SCC 233 the Supreme Court held as under:-

"26. ... Disobedience of orders of the court strikes at the very root of the rule of law on which the judicial system rests. The

with which they are sacredly entrusted, the dignity and authority of the courts have to be respected and protected at all costs...
29. **Lethargy, ignorance, official delays and absence of motivation** can hardly be offered as any defence in an action for contempt. Inordinate delay in complying with the orders of the courts has also received judicial criticism. ... Inaction or even dormant behaviour by the officers in the highest echelons in the hierarchy of the Government in complying with the directions/orders of this Court certainly amounts to disobedience. ... Even a lackadaisical attitude, which itself may not be deliberate or wilful, have not been held to be a sufficient ground of defence in a contempt proceeding. Obviously, the purpose is to ensure compliance with the orders of the court at the earliest and within stipulated period."

(Emphasis supplied)

22.9. In *Priya Gupta v. Addl. Secy. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare*, (2013) 11 SCC 404, the Supreme Court held as under:-

"12. The government departments are no exception to the consequences of wilful disobedience of the orders of the Court. Violation of the orders of the Court would be its disobedience and would invite action in accordance with law. The orders passed by this Court are the law of the land in terms of Article 141 of the Constitution of India. No court or tribunal and for that matter any other authority can ignore the law stated by this Court. Such obedience would also be conducive to their smooth working, otherwise there would be confusion in the administration of law and the respect for law would irretrievably suffer. There can be no hesitation in holding that the law declared by the higher court in the State is binding on authorities and tribunals under its superintendence and they cannot ignore it. This Court also expressed the view that it had become necessary to reiterate that disrespect to the constitutional ethos and breach of discipline have a grave impact on the credibility of judicial institution and encourages chance litigation. It must be preposterous, if not far-fetched, in view of the functional position of the Supreme Court depicted above, non-compliance of its orders, would dislodge the cornerstone maintaining the equilibrium and equanimity in the country's governance. There would be a breakdown of constitutional functioning. It would be a mayhem of sorts.

185.2. **Disobedience of orders of a Court strikes at the very root of the rule of law on which the judicial system rests. Judicial orders are bound to be obeyed at all costs. However grave the effect may be, is no answer for non-compliance with a judicial order. Judicial orders cannot be permitted to be circumvented. In exercise of the contempt jurisdiction, courts have the power to enforce compliance with judicial orders, and also, the power to punish for contempt."**

22.11. In *State of Gujarat v. Secretary, Labour Social Welfare and Tribunal Development Deptt. Sachivalaya*, 1982 Cril.J 225; the Division Bench of the Gujarat High Court summarized the principles as under:-

"11. From the above four decisions, the following propositions emerge:
(1) It is immaterial that in a previous litigation the particular petition before the Court was or was not a party, but if a law on a particular point has been laid down by the High Court, it must be followed by all authorities and tribunals in the State;
(2) The law laid down by the High Court must be followed by all authorities and subordinate tribunals when it has been declared by the Highest Court in the State and they cannot ignore it either in initiating proceedings or deciding on the rights involved in such a proceeding;
(3) If in spite of the earlier exposition of law by the High Court having been pointed out and attention being pointedly drawn to that legal position, in utter disregard of that position,

As of today 8/5/21, India had 2.76 Cr cases and 3.19 Lakh deaths, a recovery rate of 98.85%.

Link: <http://www.google.com/search?q=covid+deaths+in+india>

As of 8/5/21, World had 16.8 Cr cases and 35.2 Lakh deaths, a recovery rate of 97.91%.

Link: <http://www.google.com/search?q=covid+deaths+in+world&rlz>

Source - [TB Statistics India.pdf](#)

Total deaths for Respiratory infection as per Census India Govt in Table 5 - 2010-2013 - 0.03%, i.e. Approx 4.2 lakh deaths per year. (Typical infections of respiratory tract include tonsillitis, pharyngitis, laryngitis, sinusitis, otitis media, certain influenza types, and the common cold.)

Around 8.7 lakh people die of infectious diseases every year in India and TB is one of the major disease. The R value (which gives the infection rate of any disease) of TB is 14 and for SarsCov 2 is 2.2, which means that an infected TB person can infect 14 people. So with this conditions prevalent in our country for years TB or any infectious diseases was never called as an Pandemic.

19.2. AIIMS - All India Institute for Medical Sciences in their Covid-19 information booklet has given this pasted below:

<https://covid.aiims.edu/covid-19-informationbooklet/>

Why then is there a need to impose such a drastic measure of which we know not the long term repercussions, instead of rather focusing on more efficiently treating the body when it is infected, or improving the immunity and overall health of the so called 'immune compromised' individuals?

19B. WHY VACCINE MANUFACTURERS ARE EXEMPTED FROM LEGAL LIABILITY

19-B.1. COVID-19 vaccine manufacturers have been exempted from legal liability for vaccine-induced harm. It is therefore in the interests of all those authorising, enforcing and administering COVID-19 vaccinations to understand the evidence

of the judicial system. If the Courts command others to act in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution and to abide by the rule of law, it is not possible to countenance violation of the constitutional principle by those who are required to lay down the law. (Ref. *East India Commercial Co. Ltd. v. Collector of Customs* [AIR 1962 SC 1892] and *Official Liquidator v. Dayanand* [(2008) 10 SCC 1 : (2009) 1 SCC (L&S), 941]) (SCC p. 57, para 90-91)

13. These very principles have to be strictly adhered to by the executive and instrumentalities of the State. It is expected that none of these institutions should fall out of line with the requirements of the standard of discipline in order to maintain the dignity of institution and ensure proper administration of justice.

14. It is true that Section 12 of the Act contemplates disobedience of the orders of the court to be wilful and further that such violation has to be of a specific order or direction of the court. To contend that there cannot be an initiation of contempt proceedings where directions are of a general nature as it would not only be impracticable, but even impossible to regulate such orders of the court, is an argument which does not impress the court. As already noticed, the Constitution has placed upon the judiciary, the responsibility to interpret the law and ensure proper administration of justice. In carrying out these constitutional functions, the courts have to ensure that dignity of the court, process of court and respect for administration of justice is maintained. Violations which are likely to erode upon the faith of the public in administration of justice and the court system must be punished, to prevent repetition of such behaviour and the adverse impact on public faith. With the development of law, the courts have issued directions and even split out in their judgments, certain guidelines, which are to be operative till proper legislations are enacted. The directions of the court which are to provide transparency in action and adherence to basic law and fair play must be enforced

amount to civil contempt as defined in section 2(b) of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971."

(Emphasis supplied)

18.17. Section 188 in the Indian Penal Code reads thus:

188. Disobedience to order duly promulgated by public servant—Whoever, knowing that, by an order promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, he is directed to abstain from a certain act, or to take certain order with certain property in his possession or under his management, disobeys such direction, shall, if such disobedience causes or tends to cause obstruction, annoyance or injury, or risk of obstruction, annoyance or injury, to any person lawfully employed, be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one month or with fine which may extend to two hundred rupees, or with both; and if such disobedience causes or tends to cause danger to human life, health or safety, or causes or tends to cause a riot or affray, shall be punished with imprisonment of either description for a term which may extend to six months, or with fine which may extend to one thousand rupees, or with both. Explanation.—It is not necessary that the offender should intend to produce harm, or contemplate his disobedience as likely to produce harm. It is sufficient that he knows of the order which he disobeys, and that his disobedience produces, or is likely to produce, harm. Illustration.—An order is promulgated by a public servant lawfully empowered to promulgate such order, directing that a religious procession shall not pass down a certain street. A knowingly disobeys the order, and thereby causes danger of riot. A has committed the offence defined in this section."

18.18. Section 166 in the Indian Penal Code reads thus:

166. Riot.—Whoever, without lawful authority, commits the offence

In short, the available evidence and science indicate that COVID-19 vaccines are unnecessary, ineffective and unsafe.

19-B.2. **NECESSITY:** Immunocompetent individuals are protected against SARS-CoV-2 by cellular immunity. Vaccinating low-risk groups is therefore unnecessary. For immunocompromised individuals who do fall ill with COVID-19 there is a range of medical treatments that have been proven safe and effective. Vaccinating the vulnerable is therefore equally unnecessary. **Both Immunocompetent and Vulnerable groups are better protected against variants of SARS-CoV-2 by naturally acquired immunity and by medication than by vaccination.**

19-B.3. **EFFICACY:** Covid-19 vaccines lack a viable mechanism of action against SARS-CoV-2 infection of the airways. Induction of antibodies cannot prevent infection by an agent such as SARS-CoV-2 that invades through the respiratory tract. Moreover, **none of the vaccine trials have provided any evidence that vaccination prevents transmission of the infection by vaccinated individuals urging vaccination to "protect others" therefore has no basis in fact.**

19-B.4. **SAFETY:** The vaccines are dangerous to both healthy individuals and those with pre-existing chronic disease, for reasons such as the following: **risk of lethal and non-lethal disruptions of blood clotting including bleeding disorders, thrombosis in the brain, brain stroke and heart attack, nervous system disorders, facial paralysis, tremors, walking problems, autoimmune and allergic reactions; antibody-dependent enhancement of disease; and vaccine injuries due to rushed manufacturing and unregulated production standards of Covid-19 vaccines.**

Due to the above dangerous side effects of vaccines which are still under trial and are not approved scientifically and their ban in 11 countries, it is in the interest of better health of the public that those who are found to have antibodies should not be vaccinated. This is also necessary to save their lives and also the taxpayer's money.

There are many cases where the person getting two shots of the vaccines died, the best recent example being of Dr. K.K. Agarwal, who was the former National President of the Indian Medical Association (IMA), who was admitted to AIIMS for treatment.

cannot be an artificial distinction drawn in between such class of cases. Whichever class they may belong to, a contemnor cannot build an argument to the effect that the disobedience is of a general direction and not of a specific order issued inter se parties. Such distinction, if permitted, shall be opposed to the basic rule of law.

15. ... the essence of contempt jurisdiction is to ensure obedience of orders of the Court and, thus, to maintain the rule of law. History tells us how a State is protected by its courts and an independent judiciary is the cardinal pillar of the progress of a stable Government. If over-enthusiastic executive attempts to belittle the importance of the court and its judgments and orders, and also lowers down its prestige and confidence before the people, then greater is the necessity for taking recourse to such power in the interest and safety of the public at large. The power to punish for contempt is inherent in the very nature and purpose of the court of justice. In our country, such power is codified..."

(Emphasis supplied)

22.10. In *Sabru Ray Sahay v. Union of India* (2014) 8 SCC 470, the Supreme Court held that the decisions rendered by the Supreme Court have to be complied with by all concerned. Relevant portion of the said Judgment is as under:-

"17. There is no escape from acceptance, or obedience, or compliance of an order passed by the Supreme Court, which is the final and the highest Court in the country. Where would we find ourselves, if the Parliament or a State Legislative Assembly, that a statutory provision stands down as unconstitutional, is valid? Or, if a decision rendered by the Supreme Court, in exercise of its original jurisdiction, is not accepted for compliance, by either the Government of India, and/or one or the other State Governments) concerned? What, if, the concerned government or instrumentality, chooses not to give effect to a Court order, declaring the fundamental right of a citizen? Or, if, a determination rendered by a Court to give effect to a legal right,

intending to cause, or knowing it to be likely that he will, by such disobedience, cause injury to any person, shall be punished with simple imprisonment for a term which may extend to one year, or with fine, or with both: Illustration A, being an officer directed by law to take property in execution, in order to satisfy a decree pronounced in Z's favor by a Court of Justice, knowingly disobeys that direction of law, with the knowledge that he is likely, thereby to cause injury to Z. A has committed the offence defined in this section."

Thus, it is amply clear that no person, Authority or a Company can force a person for vaccination.

18.19. The data regarding effective and harmless remedies through medicines like Ivermectin, Ayurvedic and Naturopathy as claimed by Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance (FLCCC Alliance), British Ivermectin Recommendation Development Panel (BIRD), Biswaroop Roy Chowdhury, Baba Ramdev etc, was suppressed, twisted and dishonesty concealed with the help of narratives without having scientific data but on the basis of Conspiracy theories.

18.20. The unwillingness and comparative expenses incurred by WHO and other Government authorities to scientifically verify the data regarding effectiveness of other claims as compared to vaccines is a sufficient proof of the ulterior purposes and need thorough investigation.

18.21. The finding by Vaccine Syndicate to WHO is also a sufficient ground for proving their partiality and doubt their honesty. The similar issue of conflict of interest is also dealt by the Parliamentary Committee.

18.22. Hence, no reliance can be placed on the advisory of the WHO for deciding the fate of the entire mankind across the world.

19. # POINT NO: 15 # IS IT A REAL PANDEMIC?

19.1. Only a small fraction of human population have actually succumbed to severe or fatal consequences from COVID. The majority of human beings that have contracted COVID have been able to fight it off, and subsequently build natural immunity to fight it again. According to the WHO, the number of new cases soon after. Read News Article - At least 60 Delhi doctors have died in 2nd Covid wave & families are left to pick up pieces – Link: <https://ibtimes.in/health/at-least-60-delhi-doctors-have-died-in-2nd-covid-wave-families-are-left-to-pick-up-pieces/661323>

Needless to say that the Infection Fatality Rate (IFR) of Corona is lesser than 0.25% and if we consider the deaths and side effects of the Covid-19 vaccine, which is still under Phase-III trials, then it is clear that the vaccines are not so effective as projected. In fact given that there is a risk of serious threat to life and dangerous side effects, it would be a grave mistake to advocate the vaccines, as it will be a Crime against Humanity.

Dr. Peter McCullough, one of the world's most published cardiologists, called out the dangers of the COVID-19 vaccine. In particular, he warned about the Spike Protein that is produced after a person gets the shot. He spoke in a lengthy interview about the vaccine - "*This is by far and away the most lethal, toxic, biologic agent ever injected into a human body in American history, and it is going strong, with no mention of safety by our public officials, with wild enthusiasm by our hospitals and hospital administrators, with doctors supporting it.*"

19-C. **MEDICAL EXPERIMENTATION VIA VACCINES ILLEGAL UNDER INTERNATIONAL & NATIONAL LAW**

19-C.1. The relevant articles of Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights, 2005 (UDBRH) are as under:

Article 3 – Human dignity and human rights

I. Human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms are to be fully respected.

in applying and advancing scientific knowledge, medical practice and associated technologies, direct and indirect benefits to patients, research participants and other affected individuals should be maximized and any possible harm to such individuals should be minimized.

Article 6 – Consent

1. Any preventive, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior, free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate, be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without disadvantage or prejudice.

2. Scientific research should only be carried out with the prior, free, express and informed consent of the person concerned. The information should be adequately provided in a comprehensible form and should include modalities for withdrawal of consent. Consent may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without any disadvantage or prejudice. Exceptions to this principle should be made only in accordance with ethical and legal standards adopted by State, consistent with the principles and provisions set out in this Declaration, in particular in article 27, and international human rights law.

3. In appropriate cases of research carried out on a group of persons or a community, additional agreement of the legal representatives of the group or community concerned may be sought. In no case should a collective community agreement or the consent of a community leader or other authority substitute for an individual's informed consent.

Article 7 – Persons without the capacity to consent

In accordance with domestic law, special protection is to be given to persons who do not have the capacity to consent:

(a) authorization for research and medical practice should be of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an understanding and enlightened decision.

The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocureable by other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.

The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and injury.

No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physician also serves as subject.

The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.

During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems to him to be impossible.

During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior skill and careful judgment required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

All hereby, should take notice that the Nuremberg 2.0 trials have begun in Germany, to find guilty all those across the world who have participated in the present 'Crimes against Humanity' under the Covid-19 Program, and to pronounce upon them punishment befitting their

the body. They also reduce immune system activity. Because corticosteroids cause swelling, itching, redness, and allergic reactions, doctors often prescribe them to help treat diseases like asthma.

As can be seen from the above there are many diseases for which vaccine should not be taken given. Immunocompromised can be due to many causes, such as chronic medical conditions, such as heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, HIV, and cancer. autoimmune diseases, such as lupus, multiple sclerosis, and rheumatoid arthritis; medications or treatments, such as radiation therapy or transplants, such as bone marrow or solid organ. This can be found at:

<https://www.healthline.com/health/immunocompetence/low-tolerance-if-you-have-a-weakened-immune-system>

possible in the decision-making process of consent, as well as that of withdrawing consent.

This research should only be carried out for his or her direct health benefit, subject to the authorization and the protective conditions prescribed by law, and if there is no research alternative of comparable effectiveness with research participants able to consent. Research which does not have potential direct health benefit should only be undertaken by way of exception, with the utmost restraint, exposing the person only to a minimal risk and maximal burden and, if the research is expected to contribute to the health benefit of other persons in the same category, subject to the conditions prescribed by law and compatible with the protection of the individual's human rights. Refusal of such persons to take part in research should be respected.

Article 8 – Respect for human vulnerability and personal integrity

In applying and advancing scientific knowledge, medical practice and associated technologies, human vulnerability should be taken into account. Individuals and groups of special vulnerability should be protected and the personal integrity of such individuals respected.

Article 10 – Equality, justice and equity

The fundamental equality of all human beings in dignity and rights is to be respected so that they are treated justly and equitably.

Article 11 – Non-discrimination and non-stigmatization

No individual or group should be discriminated against or stigmatized on any grounds, in violation of human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms.

Article 16 – Protecting future generations

Protection of bodily integrity against invasion by other. The fundamental principles of autonomy were first expressed in Nuremberg Code of 1947.

World Medical Association in Declaration of Helsinki (1964) emphasized upon the importance of informed consent for medical research by adequately informing the subject of the aims, methods, anticipated benefits, potential hazard, and discomfort which the study may entail [6]. All medical procedures, including examinations, diagnostic procedures and medical research on patients in the absence of consent constitute assault (IPC 351) for which he is liable in damages. This is true except in cases of emergency where the patient is unconscious and where it is necessary to operate before consent can be obtained.

Therefore, any coercion of people to take SARS-CoV2 mRNA gene therapies/vaccines, whether directly through government legislation, or indirectly through government, police, and army directions, such as COVID19 Passports or by forced injection or coerced injection, without full consent, free consent and informed consent, is unlawful, immoral and unethical. Any sanctions for not taking the injection/vaccination, along with any measures of coercion and implementation of forced or coerced infection/vaccinations, must cease immediately.

19D. COMPANY'S OWN WARNINGS ON WHO SHOULD NOT GET THE VACCINE-

19D.1. COVAXIN

The fact sheet available on the website of the Covaxin states that certain categories of persons should not be administered the vaccine. The fact sheet can be found at <https://www.bharatbiotech.com/images/covaxin/covaxin-factsheet.pdf>

The relevant part of the fact sheet is asunder:

"What should you mention to your vaccine provider before you get Covaxin? Tell the Vaccinator/Officer supervising your vaccination about all of your medical conditions, including if you:

You should not get the covishield if you:

Had a severe allergic reaction after a previous dose of this vaccine Had a severe allergic reaction to any ingredients of this vaccine"

The insert sheet of Covishield Vaccine gives warnings against the use of Covid-19 vaccine for certain categories of persons. The product sheet can be found at:

https://www.seruminsti.org.com/pdf/covishield_Covaxin_nCoV19_covid19_vaccine_insert.pdf

The relevant part of the product sheet is asunder:

"4.4 Special warnings & Special precautions for use - Hypersensitivity As with all injectable vaccines, appropriate medical treatment and supervision should always be readily available in case of an anaphylactic event following the administration of the vaccine. Concurrent illness As with other vaccines, administration of Covishield should be postponed in individuals suffering from an acute severe fibrile illness. However the presence of a minor infection such as cold and/or low grade fever should not delay vaccination."

Thrombocytopenia and coagulation disorders As with other intramuscular injections Covishield should be given with caution to individuals with thrombocytopenia, any coagulation disorders or to persons on anti-coagulation therapy, because bleeding/bursting may occur following an intramuscular administration in these individuals.

Immunocompromised individuals It is not known whether individuals with impaired immune responsiveness, including individuals receiving immune support therapy, will elicit the same response as immunocompetent individuals to the vaccine regimen.

Immunocompromised individuals may have relatively weaker immune response to the vaccine regimen.

Article 18 – Decision-making and addressing bioethical issues

3. Professionalism, honesty, integrity and transparency in decision-making should be promoted, in particular declarations of all conflicts of interest and appropriate sharing of knowledge. Every endeavour should be made to use the best available scientific knowledge and methodology in addressing and periodically reviewing bioethical issues.

2. Persons and professionals concerned and society as a whole should be engaged in dialogue on a regular basis.

3. Opportunities for informed pluralistic public debate seeking the expression of all relevant opinions, should be promoted.

19-C.2. Crucial provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) applicable to the violations of various citizens of the countries which are party to the Covenant and members of the United Nations Organization. Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966 entry into force 23 March 1976, in accordance with Article 49. The relevant article of aforesaid covenant applicable for the present situation of corona pandemic is as under;

"Article 7 No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. In particular, no one shall be subjected without his free consent to medical or scientific experimentation."

Coercing citizens to get the vaccines directly or indirectly violates the Nuremberg Trials Codes established in 1947, in the wake of horrific scientific abuse by the German Government during World War II, that coercion is Verboten and informed consent essential for participants of medical experiments. All of the Covid-19 vaccines have been commissioned under 'Experimental Use' and are subject to the following of the 10 Nuremberg codes:

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent, should be so situated as to be able to exercise free power of choice in giving his consent.

It is not advisable to take the vaccine in any of these conditions - have any allergies

have fever

have a bleeding disorder or a blood thinner

are immunocompromised

are on a medicine that affects your immune system

Are pregnant

Are breast feeding

Have received another Covid-19 vaccine

WHO SHOULD NOT GET COVAXIN -

You should not get Covaxin if you:

1. Had a severe allergic reaction to any ingredients of the vaccine.
2. Had a severe allergic reaction after a previous dose of the vaccine.
3. Currently have an acute infection or fever.
4. Further in a document released by Bharat Biotech titled "SUMMARY OF PRODUCT CHARACTERISTICS" dated 15 Jan 2021, the effect of the vaccine has been explained for certain categories of work and exercise. The relevant part of the report is as under:
 - 4.1 Interaction with other medicinal products, Chloroquine and Corticosteroids as they may impair the antibody response.
 - 4.2 Effects on ability to drive and use machines

No studies on the effect of COVAXINTM on the ability to drive and use machines have been performed. The link of the report titled "SUMMARY OF PRODUCT CHARACTERISTICS" dated 15 Jan 2021 can be found at https://eudrcae.eftc.gov.in/openaccess/documents/CDSC/1_WEB/COVAXIN_SMPC_2021.pdf

studies do not indicate direct or indirect harmful effects with respect to fertility.

Pregnancy There is a limited experience with the use of ChAdOx1 nCoV-19 Corona Virus Vaccine (Recombinant) in pregnant women. Breastfeeding It is unknown whether Covishield is excreted in human milk.

Thrombocytopenia is a dangerous drop in the number of platelets in the blood. This decrease can increase the risk of bleeding. Thrombocytopenia occurs in people without cancer as well. Coagulation disorders are disruptions in the body's ability to control blood clotting. Coagulation disorders can result in either a hemorrhage (too little clotting that causes an increased risk of bleeding) or thrombosis (too much clotting that causes blood clots to obstruct blood flow). As with other intramuscular injections, COVISHIELD should be given with caution to individuals with thrombocytopenia, any coagulation disorder or to persons on anticoagulation therapy, because bleeding or bruising may occur following an intramuscular administration in these individuals.

Re interactions with other medicinal products, it is important to note that patients who are on regular medications for Diabetes, heart issues, other lifestyle diseases where daily medication is required, no studies have been done,

Re Breast feeding- It is unknown whether Covishield is excreted in human milk. - Since this vaccine is not a live attenuated or inactivated virus technology but an Recombinant DNA technology in which Adeno Virus carry a spike protein DNA molecule of Sarscov 2 which enters into human cells nucleus and instructs the DNA of the human cell to produce mRNA which instructs the ribosomes to produce spike proteins, and then our immune system responds to the protein. This is very alarming as we don't know what reaction it will create in newborn babies when the human milk is consumed. The link to a news article explaining recombinant DNA vaccine of Covishield can be found at:

Further re Duration and level of protection, it has not yet been established. Vaccinating with Covishield may not protect all vaccine recipients. As can be seen from the above there are many diseases for which vaccine should not be taken/given. People can be immunocompromised due to many reasons- diabetes, heart issues, thyroid gland problem, arthritis, crohn's disease, psoriasis, eczema etc and a high percentage of people with various comorbidities are using blood thinners.

Hence the Government & vaccine manufacturers should give more clarity on these issues, & if these implications are correct, then the Government must stop recommending people with comorbidities to get vaccinated.

It is further submitted that being immunocompromised can be due to many causes: 1) chronic medical conditions, such as heart disease, lung disease, diabetes, HIV, and cancer 2) autoimmune diseases, such as lupus, multiple sclerosis, and rheumatoid arthritis 3) medications or treatments, such as radiation therapy 4) transplants, such as bone marrow or solid organ 5) pregnancy 6) a combination of any of the above This explanation can be found at:

<https://www.healthline.com/health/immunocompromised-how-to-know-if-you-have-a-weakened-immune-system>

20. POINT NO:- 16 #-LEGAL POSITION SETTLED BY THE HON'BLE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA & VARIOUS HIGH COURTS IN INDIA REGARDING THE PROOFS REQUIRED TO PROSECUTE THE CONSPIRATORS.

20.1.1. The law regarding extent of proofs required to bring the charge of conspiracy is explained in the judgment of Raman Lal Vs. State of Rajasthan 2000 Cri. L.J. No. 900, wherein it is said as under;

"Conspiracy - I.P.C. Sec. 120 (B) – Supreme court made it clear that an inference of conspiracy has to be drawn on the basis of circumstantial evidence only because it becomes difficult to get

furtherance of "used in the English Law : with the result anything said, done or written by co-conspirator after the conspiracy was formed, will be evidence against the other before he entered the field of conspiracy or after he left it. Anything said, done or written is a relevant fact only."

186. The Hon'ble Apex Court has further quoted with approval in paragraph No.101, the observations made in the case of State (NCT of Delhi Vs. Navjot Sandhu @ Ajman Guru, (2005) 11 SCC 600, wherein it was held that, "The cumulative effect of the proved circumstances should be taken into account in determining the guilt of the accused rather than adopting an isolated approach to each of the circumstances."

21. # POINT NO:- 17 #- LIST OF THE SPECIFIC AREA AND ISSUES REQUIRING THROUGH INVESTIGATION OF ALL THE ACCUSED, THEIR TOXIC CHARITY FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER VARIOUS PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE CONSPIRACY.

21.1. The Investigating Agency should investigate on following points:

- How much funds were & is being given by Bill Gates and its foundation to WHO & other projects in various countries and regarding what purpose?
- How much fund was & is being given by Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunisation (GAVI) and vaccine manufacturing companies and others Pharma Companies to WHO and other Countries and regarding what purpose from said pharma & vaccine manufacturers?
- Who are the people directly and indirectly connected or benefited from the funds, scholarship, stipend, sponsorship?

AND

What is the role played by said persons in research and publishing paper in support of vaccines creating narratives and other conspiracy theories and agenda against effective medicines such as Ivermectin,

22.8. This part also needs investigation about their role in act of commission & omission in the offence of genocide.

23. POINT NO:- 18 #- NEED FOR IMMEDIATE PASSING A SPECIAL ACT CONSTITUTING A SPECIAL COURT/TRIBUNAL HEADED BY FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE OF INDIA SHRI R. M. LODHA TO DECIDE THE SIMILAR CASES OF VACCINE SYNDICATES IN A TIME BOUND MANNER OF 2 MONTHS FROM IT'S FILING ONLY ONE APPEAL TO SPECIAL DEDICATED BENCH OF SUPREME COURT TO DECIDE IT WITHIN 3 WEEKS FROM FILING.

23.1. Since the issue is related with everyone life and livelihood and the regular procedure may be lengthy and time consuming therefore it is just and necessary to constitute a special and dedicated Court/Tribunal like NCLT.

23.2. That, earlier experience of around 8 years delay in the case against Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation despite clear findings by Parliamentary Committee in 72nd Report as explained earlier has created very wrong impression and very adverse impact in the mind of the citizen.

23.3. JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED.

23.4. Constitution Bench in Anita Kashyala's case (2016) 8 SCC 509, has ruled that,

"22... (25) Unduly long delay has the effect of bringing about blatant violation of the rule of law and adverse impact on the common man's access to justice. A person's access to justice is a guaranteed fundamental right under the Constitution and particularly Article 31. Denial of the right undermines public confidence in the justice delivery system and incentivises people to look for short cuts and other fora where they feel that justice will be done quicker. In the long run, this also weakens the justice delivery system and poses a threat to the rule of law."

25. In Tamilnad Mercantile Bank Shareholders Welfare Assn. (2) v. S.C. Sekar (Tamilnad Mercantile Bank Shareholders Welfare Assn. (2) v. S.C. Sekar, (2009) 2 SCC 784 , this Court declared that an aggrieved person cannot be left without the

act of the others – A Co-conspirator who joins subsequently and commits overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy must also be held liable – Proceeding against accused should be continued and cannot be dropped even if the accused is holding a very high position of a Judge of the constitutional court. In such cases no permission is required before prosecuting such accused."

20.2. Hon'ble Bombay High Court in the case of CBI Vs. Bhupender Champaikhal Dalal 2019 SCC OnLineBom 140, it is ruled as under:

CHARGE FOR THE OFFENCE OF CRIMINAL BREACH OF TRUST:-

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Ram NarainPoply Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, AIR 2003 SC 2748, wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has, at length, dealt with the charge of criminal conspiracy, in the backdrop of the similar allegations, in a case arising out of the decision of the Court in the matter of Harishad Mehta and others. While dealing with the essential ingredients of the offence of criminal conspiracy, punishable u/s 120 B I.P.C., the Hon'ble Court was, in paragraph No.349 of its Judgment, pleased to hold that, "349. Privacy and secrecy are more characteristics of a conspiracy, than of a loud discussion in an elevated place open to public view. Direct evidence in proof of a conspiracy is seldom available, offence of conspiracy can be proved by either direct or circumstantial evidence. It is not always possible to give affirmative evidence about the date of the formation of the criminal conspiracy, about the persons who took part in the formation of the conspiracy, about the object, which the objects set before themselves as the object of conspiracy, and about the manner in which the object of conspiracy is to be carried out, all this is necessarily a matter of inference."

[Emphasis Supplied]

177. This Court can also place reliance on another landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of

- Does there is any evidence that Naturopathy treatment are not proper?

- Compensation between: How much expense in terms of money and time invested or spent on research and trial of vaccines on corona by (a) WHO (b) vaccines companies and (c) Concerned Governmental Health Agencies ?

- How much time and amount was invested/spent upon the research, trials to verify the efficacy of Ivermectin claimed by FLCCC, BIRD, Research Square etc. and other effective remedies claimed by Balu Randev and Dr. Biswasop Roy Chowdhury?

- Why there is a huge difference of expense on harmful vaccines and harmless Ivermectin and other Ayurvedic and Naturopathic treatment whose effectiveness is proved from the successful result of less of patients on whose instruction, recommendation the above decision was taken ?

- Investigation of Merlin- Annexure-R-21

- Investigation of Shri. Sunil Kumar, Directorate General of Health Services (DGHS)- Annexure-R-22

- Officials of Health Ministry-

Please see para 9.1 & 9.2 Annexure-R-23

22. Point No:- 18 #- ROLE OF OFFICIALS OF UN HUMAN RIGHTS DIVISION BY THEIR ACT OF COMMISSION & OMISSION IN ALLOWING THE ACCUSED TO COMMIT THE OFFENCE OF GENOCIDE.

NEED FOR CONDEMNING AND EXPOSING THE SELECTIVE AMNESIA AND DOUBLE STANDARD OF UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS DIVISION BY INTERVIEWING ON 11TH JUNE, 2024 FOR ALLEGED VIOLATION OF RIGHTS OF TWITTER BUT WILLFULLY KEEPING QUIET FOR CONTINUOUS GRAVEST VIOLATION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE ACROSS THE WORLD BY TWITTER, YOUTUBE, FACEBOOK ETC. BY NOT ALLOWING THE RENOWNED DOCTORS AND PUBLIC TO DISCUSS THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDICINES LIKE

23.5. Hence, it is just and necessary that immediately a Tribunal be set up and Special Act be brought into action for dealing with the cases effectively, immediately and efficiently.

23.6. Technicalities of the law and procedural wrangles should not be allowed to get the rid of the principles of natural justice to the poor and needy.

24. POINT NO:- 20 #-NEED FOR INVESTIGATION IN TO CAUSE FOR DELAY OF AROUND 8 YEARS IN INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION OF ACCUSED BILL GATES AND OTHERS UNDER SECTION 115, 304, 109, 302, 409, R.W.120(B) OF INDIAN PENAL CODE IN THIS EARLIER OFFENCES RELATED WITH MURDER OF 8 FEMALE CHILDREN THROUGH IPV VACCINES, DESPITE THE SPECIFIC FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS GIVEN BY PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE IN 72ND REPORT TO RAJYA SARDA.

24.1. Given in Annexure-T10 and additional information be provided at the time of investigation/enquiry.

25. # POINT NO:- 21 #- NEED FOR INVESTIGATING THE ROLE OF FORMER CJ DEEPAK MISHRA & OTJER TWO JUDGES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA SHRI PRAFULLA PANT AND SHRI ROHINTON FALU NARIMAN UNDER SECTION 218, 219, 260(B) & 34 OF INDIAN PENAL CODE FOR FRAMING THE QUESTIONS RELATED WITH DISPUTED QUESTION OF FACTS WHICH ARE BEYOND THE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT UNDER ARTICLE 32 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA AND ACTUALLY IN THE DOMAIN OF INVESTIGATING AGENCY AND THE TRIAL COURT BUT MALAFIDELY FRAMED IN THE SUPREME COURT ONLY TO DELAY THE ADJUDICATION AND PROSECUTION OF ACCUSED BILL GATES AND THEREBY TO DEMOLISH THE VICTIMS AND LAW LOVING CITIZENS.

25.1.1. That, the parliamentary committee in its 72nd report gave clear and specific findings about the serious offences of murder of 8 female children and recommended investigation and prosecution of office bearers of Bill & Melinda Gates foundation along with official of ICMR and other government officials involved in

"24. The aforesaid decisions, weighty as they are, lead us to conclude that to establish a charge of conspiracy knowledge about indulgence in either an illegal act or a legal act by illegal means is necessary. In some cases, intent of unlawful use being made of the goods or services in question may be inferred from the knowledge itself. Thus apart, the prosecution has got to establish that a particular unlawful use was intended, so long as the goods or service in question could not be put to any lawful use. Finally, when the ultimate offence consists of a chain of actions, it would not be necessary for the prosecution to establish, to bring home the charge of conspiracy, that each of the conspirators had the knowledge of what the collaborator would do, so long as it is known that the collaborator would put the goods or service to an unlawful use." (See State of Kerala v. P. Sugathan, (2000) 8 SCC 203, SCC p. 212, para 14)*"

178. While dealing with the offence of criminal conspiracy in respect of the financial frauds, the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of Ram NarainPoply (supra), in paragraph No.348, was pleased to observe that,

"244..... The law making conspiracy a crime, is designed to curb immoderate power to do mischief, which is gained by a combination of the means. The encouragement and support which co-conspirators give to one another rendering enterprise possible which, if left to individual effort, would have been impossible, furnish the ground for visiting conspirators and abettors with cognizant punishment. The conspiracy is held to be continued and renewed as to all its members wherever and whenever any member of the conspiracy acts in furtherance of the common design."

[Emphasis Supplied]

179. In the context of Section 19 of the Indian Evidence Act, it was held by the Hon'ble Apex Court, in paragraph No.348, that,

22.1. That, the United Nations Human Rights Committee is working for protection and safeguard of fundamental rights of the human across the world.

22.2. They have done many appreciable work to protect the fundamental rights of the people.

22.3. However, their approach towards India seems to be discriminatory and against their own principle i.e. Article 26 of International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights (ICCPR).

Article 26 of ICCPR reads thus:

"All persons are equal before the law and are entitled without any discrimination to the equal protection of the law. In this respect, the law shall prohibit any discrimination and guarantee to all persons equal and effective protection against discrimination on any ground such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth or other status."

22.4. The Human Rights division of UN had on two recent occasion has taken suo motu notice of the two instances in India:

B) In an issue related with Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), the Human Rights Division filed and intervention application before the Supreme Court of India.

i) In a case of legal action against twitter Special Rapporteur Mr. Irene Khan, Mr. Clement Voule and Mr. Joseph Cannataci vide their reference no. OL IND/8/2021 dated 11 June, 2021 has come in support of the writer.

22.5. But the entire world is unable to understand as to why there is a selective silence on their part when the writer, YouTube, Google, Facebook, WhatsApp have formulated the policies to deprive the people from correct and truthful information and forced to accept the narratives favorable to accused vaccine Syndicate.

The real science and evidences were suppressed and Pseudo Science, rhetorics and conspiracy theories were run.

The YouTube policy as mentioned in para 8.2 of this complaint exposed it.

22.6. There was no choice word about death of 8 female children due to the Bench of Justice Deepak Mishra in order to help the powerful & rich accused and frustrate the rights of the poor victims and their family members without having any jurisdiction framed the questions in a case pending under Article 32 of the Constitution of India.

The questions framed in the matter between Kalpana Mehta Vs. Union of India WP No. 558/2012 vide its order dated 12.08.2014 (see: (2017) 7 SCC 295) are as under:

"6) Whether before the drug was accepted to be used as a vaccine in India, the Drugs Controller General of India and ICMR had followed the procedure for said introduction?"

"6) What is the action taken after the Parliamentary Committee had submitted the 72nd Report on 30-8-2013?"

"6) What are the reasons for choosing certain places in Gujarat and Andhra Pradesh?"

"6) What has actually caused the deaths and other ailments who had been administered the said vaccine?"

"6) Assuming this vaccine has been administered, regard being had to the nature of the vaccine, being not an ordinary one, what steps have been taken for monitoring the same by the competent authorities of the Union of India, who are concerned with health of the nation as well as the State Governments who have an equal role in this regard?"

"6) The girls who were administered the vaccine, whether proper consent has been taken from their parents/guardians, as we have been apprised at the Bar that the young girls had not reached the age of majority?"

"6) What protocol is required to be observed/followed, assuming this kind of vaccination is required to be carried out?"

25.1.3. It is against the Constitution of India and it is also against the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court itself. The disputed question of fact which needs investigation & trial cannot be decided in writ jurisdiction.

It is also an offence under contempt of court to not to follow the binding precedent (*Subrata Roy Sahara Vs. UOI* (2014) 8 SCC 470, In Re: C.S. Karna (2017) 7 SCC 1)

25.1.5. The only reason and the inference which should be drawn from such act of a Judge in adopting any procedure in wanton breach of rule of law is that the Judge was actuated with corrupt and ulterior motives to help the accused, as has been ruled in the case of *R.P. Parikh Vs. High Court of Gujarat* (2016) 14 SCC 1, case Hon'ble Supreme Court had upheld the order of dismissal of a Judge. It is ruled as under:

"A Judge passing an order against provisions of law in order to help a party is said to have been actuated by an oblique motive or corrupt practice - breach of the governing principles of law or procedure by a Judge is indicative of judicial officer has been actuated by an oblique motive or corrupt practice - No direct evidence is necessary - A charge of misconduct against a Judge has to be established on a preponderance of probabilities - The Appellant had absolutely no convincing explanation for this course of conduct - Punishment of compulsory retirement directed.

A wanton breach of the governing principles of law or procedure by a Judge is indicative of judicial officer has been actuated by an oblique motive or corrupt practice. In the absence of a cogent explanation to the contrary, it is for the disciplinary authority to determine whether a pattern has emerged on the basis of which an inference that the judicial officer was actuated by extraneous considerations can be drawn - It is not the correctness of the verdict but the conduct of the officer which is in question. There is on the one hand a genuine public interest in protecting fearless and honest officers of the district judiciary from motivated criticism and attack. Equally there is a genuine public interest in holding a person who is guilty of wrong doing responsible for his

the order in the SLP dated 29.08.2017 is annexed as Annexure C24 (335-334).

105. Thereafter on 4th September 2017, Justice DipakMisra issued notice to the new writ petition filed by the Prasad Education Trust (writ petition no. 797/2017). It was surprising that notice should have been issued on this fresh writ petition of the college if indeed the matter stood concluded by disposing of the writ petition of the college in the High court on the basis of Mr. MukulRohatgi's statement that he does not seek any relief other than encashment of the bank guarantee. It was even more unusual because on 1st September 2017, the same bench had already given a judgment in the matter of a similar medical college namely Shri Venkateshwara University (Writ petition no. 445/2017), by stating that:

"The renewal application that was submitted for the academic session 2017-2018 may be treated as the application for the academic session 2018-2019. The bank guarantee which has been deposited shall not be encashed and be kept alive".

106. This indeed became the basis of the final order in the prasad Education Trust writ petition which was shown to be dated 18th September 2017. If the matter had to be disposed off mechanically by following the judgment of 1st September 2017, in the other medical college case where was the occasion for first giving liberty and then entertaining the fresh petition of the college on 4th September 2017 and keeping it alive all at least the 18th of September 2017?

107. It is also important to note that officials of Venkateshwara College are mentioned in the CBI FIR as under:

Information further revealed that Shri B P Yadav got in touch with Shri I.M.Qaddus, Retd. Justice of the High Court of Odisha and Shri Bhavans Pandey (c/o N-7, G.K.-J, New Delhi through Shri ShudhirGiri of Venkateshwara Medical College in Merut and entered into criminal

interim order in favor of Prasad Education Trust. It was learnt from reliable sources that the CBI officers went to the Chief Justice of India on the 6th of September 2017, with the transcript and other evidence recorded by them in the FIR and preliminary enquiry, showing almost conclusively the involvement of Justice Shukla in this conspiracy and his receiving gratification of at least one crore in the matter. The CBI Preliminary Enquiry report was registered on the 6th of September 2017 after the Chief Justice of India refused permission to register an FIR against Justice Shukla on the 6th of September 2017. Even after being made aware of this extremely important and virtually conclusive evidence against Justice Shukla in accepting gratification, the Chief Justice of India refused permission to the CBI for registering even a regular FIR against Justice Shukla, without which further investigation against him could not be done and he could not be charge-sheeted. It was also reliably learnt that the officers of the CBI had made a record of this denial of permission by the CJ in a notesheet. By preventing the registration of an FIR against Justice Shukla and later by dismissing the CJI's petition seeking a SIT probe into the allegation in the CBI FIR by a bench constituted by the Chief Justice, all investigation into the conspiracy by the judges for obtaining a favourable order had been virtually stalled. Ensuring that no further investigation was undertaken, into this serious charge of alleged judicial corruption, amounted to a seriously problematic use of power by the Chief Justice of India.

116. It was however subsequently reported that Justice DipakMisra had set up an in-house inquiry against Justice NarayanShukla on the basis of some orders that he passed in another similar case of a Medical College. If this warranted an in-house inquiry, why was an in-house inquiry not ordered in the case of Prasad Education Trust where an identical interim order was passed by Justice Shukla and which came up before Chief Justice DipakMisra well before this. Also if this was serious enough for in-house inquiry why was permission denied to CBI to register an FIR particularly when the CBI had presented documentary evidence in the case.

Judge has to be established on a preponderance of probabilities - No reason appears from the record of the judgment, for We have duly perused the judgments rendered by the Appellants and find merit in the finding of the High Court that the Appellant paid no heed whatsoever to the provisions of Section 133."

25.1.6. Former CJJ Deepak Misra is habitual in doing corruption to pass orders with ulterior motive to help accused and underserving persons. Following instances are sufficient to prove the same:

(i) Dying Declaration cum suicide Note of former Chief Minister Shri. Kalikash Pali [Annexure-R-25]

Where it is clearly explained as to how bribes of more than Rupees 100 of Crores was demanded by the Chief Justice of India to stay the CBI investigation against the powerful accused and for passing orders.

(ii) Rs. 77 Crores by former Chief Justice of India J. S. Khehar through his son.

(iii) Rs. 27 Crores by former Chief Justice of India Deepak Misra through his brother.

(iv) Rs. 47 Crores by former Chief Justice of India H. L. Dattu.

The above所述 allegations are never denied by all the honored Judges who were Chief Justice of India

25.1.7. Justice Deepak Misra is also named as accused in an another related with to FIR regarding Medical Council case where Allahabad High Court Judge Shri Narayan Shukla is charge - sheeted by CBI

25.1.8. In a reply affidavit filed by Sr. Adv. Prashant Bhushan before Hon'ble Supreme Court on 02.08.2020 in *Sua Motu Contempt (Crl.) No. 1 of 2020 Re: Prashant Bhushan* he made serious submissions against Chief Justice DipakMisra. Stal paras reads thus;

Medical College Betihwa Case

"101. The facts and circumstances relating to the Prasad Education Trust case, suggest that chief Justice DipakMisra may have been involved in the conversations of annexure 32, wherein the same was uploaded 2 days after the registration of FIR by the CBI. This puts a question mark on whether indeed the order was dictated in open court that day or whether it was kept pending and dictated after the registration of the FIR and the reporting of that in the media. Besides the order uploaded to the website has the date of 21st September 2017 stamped on it.

Evidence available with the CBI

110. The CBI lodged an FIR on the 19th of September 2017, in the matters relating to criminal conspiracy and taking gratification by corrupt or illegal means to influence the outcome of a case pending before the Supreme Court. The FIR reveals a nexus between middlemen, hawala dealers and senior public functionaries including the judiciary. The case in which the FIR had been filed involved a medical college set up by the Prasad Education Trust in Lucknow. As it appeared from the FIR lodged by the CBI, an attempt was being made to corruptly influence the outcome of the petition which was pending before the Supreme Court. The said petition was being heard by a bench headed by Justice Dipak Misra.

111. The evidence with the CBI before it registered this FIR, included several tapped conversations between the middleman Biswanath Agarwala, Shri I.M. Qaddus, Retd. Judge of the Orissa High Court and the Medical College officers. The transcripts of some of these conversations dated 3.09.2017 and 4.09.2017, had been received by the Campaign from reliable sources and may be verified from the CBI. A copy of the transcript of conversation tapped by the CBI on the 3.09.2017 in Hindi original and translated into English is annexed as Annexure C30 (348-351). A copy of the transcript of conversation tapped by the CBI on the 4.09.2017 in Hindi original and translated into English is annexed as Annexure C31 (352-359).

112. It is important to note that the tapped conversation on 3.09.2017 between Shri Qaddus and Biswanath Agarwala (middleman), indicate that negotiations were on to get the matter of the Prasad Education Trust Medical College settled in the Apex Court. It is

against him. This recommendation was reiterated by the next Chief Justice Mr. RajanGogoi as well. Nonetheless, the government failed to take action as per the recommendation and Justice Shukla was allowed to retire on 17th July, 2020, with all the benefits of retirement. This shows a serious lack of accountability."

25.1.8. JOINING OF CONSPIRACY BY JUSTICE ROHINTON FALI NARIMAN-

25.1.9. That, Justice Rohinton Fali Nariman in the abovesaid case presided the bench along with Justice Deepak Misra and in order to further delay the matter passed an order.

In *Kalpana Mehta Vs. Union of India* (2017) 7 SCC 295, it is ruled as under:

"73. As advised at present, we are prima facie of the view that the Parliamentary Standing Committee report may not be tendered as a document to augment the stance on the factual issue that a particular activity is unacceptable or erroneous. However, regard being had to the substantive question of law relating to interpretation of the Constitution involved, we think it appropriate that the issue be referred to the Constitution Bench under Article 145(3) of the Constitution. We frame the following questions for the purpose of reference to the Constitution Bench:

73.1. (i) Whether in a litigation filed before this Court either under Article 32 or Article 136 of the Constitution of India, the Court can refer to and place reliance upon the report of the Parliamentary Standing Committee?

73.2. (ii) Whether such a report can be looked at for the purpose of reference and, if so, can there be restrictions for the purpose of reference regard being had to the concept of parliamentary privilege and the delicate balance between the constitutional institutions that Articles 105, 121 and 122 of the Constitution conceive?

74. Let the papers be placed before the Hon'ble the Chief Justice of India for constitution of appropriate Bench."

facts and circumstances which raised reasonable apprehension about the role of Justice DipakMisra in prasad Education Trust matter were as follows:

102. By order dated 1.08.2017 the bench headed by Justice DipakMisra in the Prasad Education Trust petition ordered that the government consider afresh the materials on record pertaining to the issue of confirmation or otherwise of the letter of permission granted to the petitioner colleges/institutions and that the central Government should re-evaluate the recommendations of the MCI, Hearing committee, DGHS and the oversight Committee. This by itself was not extraordinary. A copy of the order dated 1.08.2017 is annexed as Annexure C21 (302-323).

103. On 24th August 2017, a Bench headed by Chief Justice DipakMisra granted leave to the Prasad Education Trust to withdraw the said writ petition and to approach the Allahabad High Court. This was certainly unusual, given the fact that Justice DipakMisra was directly dealing with many other cases of similarly placed medical colleges to whom MCI had refused recognition. A copy of the order dated 24.08.2017 is annexed as Annexure C22 (324-321).

104. Then on the 25th of August 2017 itself, the Allahabad High Court granted an interim order to the Prasad Education Trust allowing them to proceed with counselling and detecting the Medical Council of India not to encash their bank guarantee! Thereafter on 26th August 2017, in hearing the SLIP filed by the Medical Council of India from the order of the Allahabad High Court granting relief to the Prasad Education Trust, the Bench headed by Chief Justice DipakMisra, directed that while the writ petition before the High Court shall be deemed to have been disposed of, liberty is granted to the Prasad Education Trust to again approach the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution of India. The granting of liberty to the college to approach the Supreme Court again in such circumstances was very unusual. This is expounded by the fact that the interim order of the High Court allowing counselling to continue and thereby admissions to continue,

writ petition filed by the Prasad Education Trust. Reference had been made in the conversations to the "Captain" who would get the waiver favourably settled on the payment of the bribe.

113. Further, the tapped conversation from 04.09.2017 between Biswanath Agarwala, Shri I.M. Qaddus and Mr. RP Yadav of Prasad Education Trust, referred to the said petition under article 32 being filed on 4.09.2017 and that the next date for hearing given by the Court being "Monday". The Monday after 4.09.2017 is 11.09.2017 since the matter of Prasad Education Trust was indeed listed and again heard by a bench headed by the chief Justice of India that directed the matter to be further listed on the 18.09.2017.

114. This evidence available with the CBI of the tapped conversations between Shri Qaddus, middlemen and the medical college officials, revealed that a conspiracy, planning and preparation was underway to baffle the judges/judges who were dealing with the case of this medical college. It further revealed that negotiations regarding the amount of bribe to be paid were still on while the matter was listed before a Bench headed by Chief Justice DipakMisra on 4.09.2017 and 11.09.2017. The references in the conversations between the middleman BiswanathAgarwala from Orissa and the officers of Prasad Education Trust to "Captain... has all over India" and to "it will sit for 10-15 months" seem to be referring to the Chief Justice. In light of the convoluted course that the case followed and in light of these tapped telephonic conversations, this matter needed an independent investigation to ascertain the veracity of the claims being made in the conversations, of the plan to allegedly pay bribes to procure favorable order in the year of the Prasad Education Trust in the Supreme Court and to also clear the doubt about the role of the then Chief Justice of India.

Dental permission to the CBI to register an FIR against Justice Narayan Shukla of the Allahabad High court

115. The most serious circumstance that emerged, which further strengthened the doubt regarding the role of the Chief Justice of India

Misra himself overruled his own judgment. However despite being serious matter of highest importance till date there is no final adjudication by the Supreme Court.

25.1.11. **Justice Rohinton Fali Nariman is habitual in passing unlawful order to save the mighty accused.** His involvement in the conspiracy of offences of forgery of court records, theft of documents, outsourcing the order and then publishing it on the Supreme Court website, fabrication of false evidence in conspiracy with Justice (Retd.) Deepak Gupta, Justice Anrundha Basu is proved from the information given by the office of Chief Justice of India. Already a contempt petition and perjury petition are filed by the victim and Chief Justice of India withdrawn the case from the bench of Justice Anrundha Basu. Through the copy of petition is served upon the accused Judges, but they have neither disputed nor denied the serious allegations.

[Link:-http://www.worldestdianews.com/2021/04/Contempt-mailed-in-court-supreme-court.html](http://www.worldestdianews.com/2021/04/Contempt-mailed-in-court-supreme-court.html)

25.1.12. Under these circumstances the act of framing of case without jurisdiction to indirectly help the mastermind accused Bill Gates needs on investigation by the CBI.

25.1.13. Constitution Bench in *K. Neeravaswami Vs. Union of India* (1991) 3 SCC 655, has ruled that the Judges of the Supreme Court including CJJ is having no protection from the criminal prosecution and they can be prosecuted like a common man.

Even otherwise the offences committed by the Judges are punishable under section 409, 201, 302, 218, 219, 120B etc. of Indian Penal Code and it is not a part of their official duty and they cannot take the shelter of protection of rancion. *[Raman Lal vs. State 2001 Cri. L. J. 800, K. Rama Reddy Vs. State 1998(3) ALD 305]*

25.1.14. Earlier few Judges of the Constitutional Courts are investigated for similar reasons;

i) *Shameet Mukherjee 2003 SCC Online W21*.

ii) *Justice NirmalYadav, 2011 SCC Online P&H 415*.

iii) *Justice Shukla of Allahabad High Court*

iv) *V. K. TahilRaiuni*

25.1.152 See Also:

- i) K. K. Dhawani (1992) 2 SCC 56.
- ii) Umesh Chandra 2006 (5) AWC 4519 ALL.
- iii) Jagat Patel (2018) SCC OnLineGuj 4517.
- iv) Srirang Waghmare 2019 SCC OnLine SC 1237.

25.1.15. In Raman Lal Vs State 2001 Cri. L. J. 800 it is ruled as under:

"A) Cri. P.C. Sec. 197 – Sanction for prosecution of High Court Judge – Accused are Additional High Court Judge, Superintendent of Police Sanjeev Bhart and others – The accused hatched conspiracy to falsely implicate a shop owner in a case under N.D.P.S. Act and when shop owner submitted to their demands he was discharged – Complaint u.s. 120-B, 195, 196, 342, 347, 357, 368, 388, 458, 482, I.P.C. and Sec. 17, 50 (1), (2) of N.D.P.S. Act – Held – there is no connection between official duty and offence – No sanction is required for prosecution – Registration of P.I.R. and investigation legal and proper;

B) Cri. P.C. Sec. 156 – Investigation against accused Addl. High Court Judge – Whether prior consultation with Chief Justice is necessary prior filing of F.I.R. against a High Court Judge as has been laid down by Supreme Court in K. Veeravani's case (1991) 3 SCC 655 – Held – In K. Veeravani's case Supreme Court observed that the Judges are liable to be dealt with just the same as any other person in respect of criminal offence and only in offence regarding corruption the sanction for criminal prosecution is required – the directions issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court are not applicable in instant case.

C) The applicant – Ram Lal Addl. High Court Judge hatched criminal conspiracy – The Bar Association submitted a representation to Hon'ble Chief Justice of India on 11-09-1997 requesting to not to confirm Ramon Lal as Judge of the High Court – Later on he was transferred to Principal Judge of city Civil and Session Court of Ahmedabad – S.P. (C.J.D.) Jaipur sent a questionnaire through the registrar, Gujrat High Court to accused Addl. High Court Judge –

- xii) The dangerous effects of vaccine were suppressed and the accused managed many 'media houses' who covered it up.
- xiii) The inefficiency of vaccines and death of many people and many doctors even after getting two doses of vaccines were twisted, concealed, suppressed and people were misguided with the help of straw man fallacies.
- xiv) The deaths due to vaccines were underreported by creating rules suitable to them.
- xv) They tried to counter the Real Science with the help of rhetoric i.e., Rogus Science, straw man fallacies, sophistry, intellectual dishonesty and Pseudo Scientific conspiracy theories.
- xvi) The mastermind of the conspiracy and head of Vaccine Syndicate Mr. Bill Gates has been already found guilty of unlawful and unauthorized trials of vaccines and causing death of 8 female children and Parliamentary Committee of India's Raja Sabha in their 72nd Report dated 28.08.2013 have already recommended for legal action against office bearers of Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, officials of ICMR and other various accused responsible for such heinous crimes against humanity.
- xvii) All the accused were and are well aware that by way of their act of commission and omission they are going to cause death of millions of innocent people.
But they have chosen money over the human values.
They are the offenders of humanity. They are guilty of Genocide.
They committed mass murders with cool mind and cold blood.
They have taken away the livelihood of common man and made the life of poor people no less than hell. Due to their conspiracies many people who managed to survive by taking their wrong and harmful medicines are now suffering with serious side effects which have made their lives miserable.
They don't deserve any sympathy or leniency. Else it will be injustice

rejected by High Court and Supreme Court in limine – No relief is required to be granted to petitioner in view of the facts of the case.

D) Conspiracy – I.P.C. Sec. 120 (B) – Apex court made it clear that an inference of conspiracy has to be drawn on the basis of circumstantial evidence only because it becomes difficult to get direct evidence on such issue – The offence can only be proved largely from the inference drawn from acts or illegal omission committed by them in furtherance of a common design – Once such a conspiracy is proved, act of one conspirator becomes the act of the others – A Conspirator who joins subsequently and commits overt acts in furtherance of the conspiracy must also be held liable – Proceeding against accused cannot be quashed.

E) Jurisdiction – Continuing offence – Held – Where complainants allegations are of striking magnitude and the authority which ought to have redressed it have closed its eyes and not even tried to find out the real offender and the clues for illegal arrest and harassment are not enquired then he can not be let at the mercy of such law enforcement agencies who adopted an entirely indifferent attitude – Legal maxim Necessitas sub lege Non contrinetur Quia Quod Alius Non Est, Iustitia Necesse est ad Iustitiam. Means necessity is not restrained by laws – Since what otherwise is not lawful necessity makes it lawful – Proceeding proper cannot be quashed.

26. POINT NO:- 22 B- MAIN CHARGE AGAINST ALL THE ACCUSED:-

26.1. On the basis of materials, evidence and proofs of sterling nature the accused are liable to answer the following charge which is ex-facie proved.

26.2. The main accused Bill Gates and his outfit of GAVI (Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunizations) hatched a conspiracy to create a free market for their vaccines and other drugs and in said conspiracy they joined other accused:

- i) Bill Gates.
- ii) Dr. Anthony Fauci, Chief Medical Advisor to the President of US.
- iii) Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director-General of the World Health Organization.
- iv) Taking over all their movable & immovable properties and distributing it equally to all the people across the World;

27. REQUEST:- It is sincerely requested for:

- i) Immediate direction for implementation of Parliamentary Committee's 72nd Report and recommendations of investigation and prosecution of office bearers of 'Insie philanthropist' and Vaccine Syndicate's Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the concerned officials of Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) responsible for death of 8 female children because of unauthorized, unlawful & unapproved vaccines.
- ii) Immediate direction to the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) for registration of First Information Report (FIR) for investigation and strict action under sections 115, 109, 302, 307, 304, 419, 420, 471, 474, 188, 505, r/w 120 (B) & 34 of IPC & sections of Disaster Management Act 2005 and other provisions of the special acts against all the anti-national, anti-humanity elements, by terrorists, 'Pharma Syndicates', 'Tech Syndicates' and 'Tech Bullies', who are involved in offences against entire humanity which are genocide (Mass Murders) of the citizens, caused by their acts of commission and omission related to Covid-19 pandemic as detailed in the draft charges given in the present complaint.
- iii) Immediate direction to concerned Authorities:
 - i) To issue Lookout Notices/Lookout Circulars (LOC) and arrest warrants against the accused whose involvement is ex-facie proved;
 - ii) To initiate action for attachment of movable and immovable properties of all of the accused and their companies;
 - iii) To commence custodial interrogation of the accused;
- iv) To conduct a Lie – Detector Test, Brain Mapping Test, Nitro Analysis test of all the prime accused such as Dr. Soumya Swaminathan, Dr. Randeep Guleria, Mr. Arvind Kejriwal Dr. Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Dr. Balram Kaur, Dr. Gurjeet Singh

v) Mark Zuckerberg, Chief Executive Officer of Facebook.

vi) Jack Dorsey, Chief Executive Officer of Twitter.

vii) Steve Chen, Chad Hurley, and Jawed Karim, YouTube (Google).

viii) Arvind Kejriwal, Chief Minister, Delhi.

ix) Many others as mentioned in Annexure-T13 and many other who which can be joined after thorough investigation.

26.3. In furtherance of said conspiracies they committed overt act and following act of commission and omission:

- i) Created fake data;
- ii) Suppressed and dishonestly concealed the actual data.
- iii) Twisted the material facts.
- iv) Created narratives and conspiracy theories.
- v) Prepared policies of YouTube, Twitter, Facebook etc. to suppress and stop the truth and real information reaching.
- vi) Removed the original and scientific information from platforms like YouTube, Twitter and others on the basis of bogus policies which are against the scientific data.
- vii) Published bogus and sponsored 'facts check' to counter the truth and to create confusion in the mind of common public and to discourage the people, Scientists and Doctors who possess scientific data.
- viii) Managed to take control of Government Health Agencies of many countries to get the policies and rules framed to suit their ulterior purposes.
- ix) Allowed the people to die but insisted that, people should not get the easily available, safe and affordable medicine such as Ivermectin, Hydroxychloroquine, Vitamin D3 etc. and Ayurvedic, Naturopathic treatments.
- x) This was done to create fear in the minds of people so that the vaccine can be portrayed as the only alternative to save their lives and this
 - i) Seriously consider the American Frontline Doctors (AFLDs) White Paper on Covid-19 and experimental Vaccine candidates.
 - ii) To not to force anyone for vaccination and strictly abide by the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court and various High Courts regarding the fundamental right of each citizen to his/her choice of treatment.
 - iii) To inform the public about real dangers of the vaccine.
 - iv) To inform the public about other proven, safe and more effective medicines.
 - v) To not to spread fear about any further wave without verifying science evidence.

(v) Appropriate Direction as per the Report submitted by the Expert Committee to the office of Hon'ble Prime Minister with recommendations to not to administer vaccines on persons who have recovered from Covid-19 infection and have antibodies developed within their bodies.

(vi) Immediate direction for providing protection to all the Whistleblowers and their witnesses who have already exposed and continue to expose the Syndicates comprising of BIG PHARMA, BIG TECH and BIG SCIENCE.

(vii) Direction for constituting separate enquiry committee regarding the timing of sudden warning of panic around the second corona wave in India which was fuelled by incessant reporting in media over shortage of oxygen and this panic and how & why the said hype got vanished after the investigation in 'Tool Kit' was commenced by the Delhi Police.

Date : 30.06.2021

Place : Mumbai

M.A. Shaikh
Secretary General