

Federal Lawsuit Seeks Immediate Halt of COVID Vaccines, Cites Whistleblower Testimony Claiming CDC Is Under-Counting Vaccine Deaths

By [Megan Redshaw](#)

Global Research, July 21, 2021

[Children's Health Defense](#) 20 July 2021

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [Science and Medicine](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

Visit and follow us on Instagram at [@crg_globalresearch](#).

America's Frontline Doctors filed a motion to stop the use of Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) COVID vaccines for anyone under 18, anyone with natural immunity or anyone who hasn't received informed consent.

America's Frontline Doctors (AFLDS) [filed a motion](#) July 19, seeking immediate injunctive relief in Alabama Federal District Court to stop the use of Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) COVID vaccines — [Pfizer/BioNTech](#), [Moderna](#) and [Johnson & Johnson](#) (J&J) — for three groups of Americans.

According to a [press release](#), AFLDS is asking to immediately stop administration of [experimental](#) COVID vaccines in anyone 18 and younger, all those who have recovered from [COVID](#) and acquired [natural immunity](#), and every other American who has not received [informed consent](#) as defined by federal law.

The [67-page motion](#) requests the judge issue a preliminary injunction pursuant to [§ 360bbb-3\(b\)\(1\)\(C\)](#) for the following reasons:

- There is no emergency, which is a prerequisite to issuing EUA and EUA renewals for COVID vaccines.
- There is “no serious or life-threatening disease or condition.”
- Vaccines do not diagnose, treat or prevent SARS-CoV-2 or COVID.
- Known and potential risks of the vaccine outweigh their known and potential benefits.
- There are adequate, approved and available alternatives to vaccines.
- Healthcare professionals and vaccine candidates are not adequately informed.

The authors of the motion attached a [declaration by a whistleblower](#) who came forward alleging deaths occurring within 72 hours of receiving a COVID vaccine are significantly under-reported in the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) [Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System](#) (VAERS) maintained by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration

(FDA).

As of July 9, [reported deaths in the VAERS](#) totaled 10,991. Of those, 4,593 occurred within 72-hours of vaccination.

The whistleblower — a computer programmer who developed more than 100 distinct healthcare fraud algorithms, and who has expertise in healthcare data analytics that allows her to access Medicare and Medicaid data obtained by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Systems (CMS) — [filed a sworn statement](#) under penalty of perjury alleging the actual number of COVID vaccine-related deaths is closer to 45,000.

The whistleblower alleged that VAERS, while extremely useful, is under-reported by a conservative factor of at least five.

In her statement, she said:

“On July 9, 2021, there were 9,048 deaths reported in VAERS. I verified these numbers by collating all of the data from VAERS myself, not relying on a third party to report them. In tandem, I queried data from CMS medical claims with regard to vaccines and patient deaths, and have assessed that the deaths occurring within 3 days of vaccination are higher than those reported in VAERS by a factor of at least 5. This would indicate the true number of vaccine-related deaths was at least 45,000. Put in perspective, the swine flu vaccine was taken off the market which only resulted in 53 deaths.”

AFLDS said the findings were shocking, and informed consent is impossible when safety data is not accurate.

In a press release, AFLDS said:

“It is unlawful and unconstitutional to administer experimental agents to individuals who cannot make an informed decision as to the true benefits and risks to the vaccine on an independent basis. They must be of an age or a capacity to make informed decisions and have been provided with all of the risk/benefit information necessary to make an informed decision.”

One of the named plaintiffs, Deborah Sobczak, the mother of a 15- and 17-year-old, said in the press release:

“My child will not be the subject of an experiment. What kind of monsters are we allowing to control us? Perfectly healthy children have developed heart inflammation, brain bleeding and even died! I have had enough. I am not sacrificing my child so a [pharmaceutical](#) company can experiment on her. This madness has to stop.”

There is no emergency warranting EUA of COVID vaccines, plaintiffs allege

According to the [complaint](#), the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) secretary, named as one of the defendants in the lawsuit, declared on Feb. 4, 2020, pursuant to [§ 360bbb-3\(b\)\(1\)\(C\)](#), that SARS-CoV-2 created a “public health emergency.”

This initial emergency declaration has been renewed repeatedly and remains in force today

— a necessary legal prerequisite for the issuance of vaccine EUAs, the complaint states. EUA allowed the mass use of the vaccines by the American public before the completion of the standard regimen of clinical trials and FDA approval.

Plaintiffs allege the emergency declaration and its multiple renewals are illegal because there is no underlying emergency. Using HHS COVID death data, SARS CoV-2 has an overall survivability rate of 99.8% globally, which increases to 99.97% for persons under the age of 70. This is consistent with the seasonal flu, the complaint states.

Plaintiffs argue HHS deliberately inflated COVID case data

Plaintiffs allege HHS' data is deliberately inflated. On March 24, 2020, HHS changed the rules applicable to coroners and others responsible for producing death certificates and making "cause of death" determinations exclusively for COVID.

The rule change states: "COVID-19 should be reported on the death certificate for all decedents where the disease caused or is assumed to have caused or contributed to death."

According to the [complaint](#), HHS statistics showed 95% of deaths classified as "COVID-19 deaths" involved an average of four additional comorbidities. Plaintiffs claim the CDC knew the rules for coding and selection of the underlying cause of death would result in COVID being the underlying cause more often than not.

Plaintiffs said the actual number of COVID cases is also far lower than the reported number due to emergency use of [polymerase chain reaction \(PCR\) tests](#), which are used as a diagnostic tool for COVID. The PCR tests are themselves experimental products, authorized by the FDA under separate EUAs. The package inserts state PCR tests should not be used to diagnose COVID.

The complaint alleges the way in which the PCR tests are being administered knowingly guarantees an unacceptably high number of false positive results.

COVID vaccine risks undisclosed and under-reported, lawsuit says

AFLDS medico-legal researchers [analyzed](#) the accumulated COVID vaccine risk data and found [migration of the pathogenic SARS-CoV-2 spike protein](#) in the body. Yet vaccines were authorized [without any studies](#) demonstrating where the spike proteins traveled in the body following vaccination, how long they remain active and what effect they have, the complaint states.

AFLDS [researchers analyzed](#) VAERS and discovered an increased risk of death from COVID vaccines. The database indicated vaccine deaths in the first quarter of 2021 represented a 12,000% to 25,000% increase in vaccine deaths, year-on-year.

From 2009 to 2019, there were 1529 reported deaths associated with all vaccines reported to VAERS, according to the motion. In the first quarter of 2021, there were more than 4,000 reported deaths with 99% of all reported vaccine deaths in 2021 attributed to the COVID vaccine. Only 1% were attributed to other vaccines in the system.

Plaintiffs also disclosed evidence of reproductive harm, vascular disease, autoimmune disease, neurological damage and they highlighted an increased [risk of harm](#) for children with COVID vaccines to support their position.

Why the secrecy around V-Safe data?

The [complaint](#) called attention to the secrecy of the CDC's [V-Safe system](#) — a parallel system used to track reported adverse events via a smartphone app controlled exclusively by the CDC.

Plaintiffs [raised concerns](#) that information in V-Safe exceeds that in VAERS. They claim VAERS is inaccurate because it potentially includes fewer than 1% of all vaccine adverse events, and the federal government is failing to provide data from other monitoring sources such as V-Safe, CMS and the military.

Plaintiffs stated informed consent cannot be given without understanding the risks. They said they can't help but wonder why HHS would fail to disclose to the public critical information related to risk from its reporting systems, "particularly in light of the fact that they have had the time and resources to study and extend the authorizations on the vaccines, build an enormous vaccine marketing machine and roll out vaccine clinics all over the nation."

The lawsuit was filed by several law firms, including [RENTZ Law](#). The complaint and whistleblower declaration can be read [here](#).

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, @crg_globalresearch. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

Megan Redshaw is a freelance reporter for The Defender. She has a background in political science, a law degree and extensive training in natural health.

Featured image is from CHD

The original source of this article is [Children's Health Defense](#)
Copyright © [Megan Redshaw](#), [Children's Health Defense](#), 2021

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Megan Redshaw](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those

who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca