

Judge Davies ruling on "vaccine" terribly disappointing and a blow for science and society . Dr E V Rapiti, March, 9th, 2024, Cape Town

The dismissal of the case lodged by the three plaintiffs Children's health defense, Transformative Health for Justice and Covid Care alliance to stop the roll-out of the toxic gene mRNA covid "vaccines " with costs against the department of health is terribly disappointing and is a major blow for the health and wellbeing of society.

This judgement, if left unchallenged, will dampen the prospects of the vaccine injured, in the future, to lodge compensation claims against the manufacturers and government agencies, who have repeatedly sung the false narrative that this unproven/poorly tested gene therapy was safe and effective.

There are tons of evidence and data from highly reputable sources and data from VAERS, the UKs Office of National statistics and from thousands of honest, highly credentialled and reputable scientists, epidemiologists, vaccinologists and data analysts that strongly disprove the

claim that the jabs were, "safe and effective".

Before we address in detail some of the flaws in this ruling, it must be stated that people opposed to this toxic, infective and unsafe gene therapy are not anti-vaxxers, as was described by the journalist from the cheap tabloid ground-up. They were a group of people both from the medical field and from the public, who were sincerely concerned that the jab, based on tons of emerging evidence, were toxic, dangerous and highly ineffective.

The judge based his decision on a number of issues that need to be rectified, which will now be addressed.

The issue of experts

The judge stated in his ruling that none of the plaintiffs were experts. My reply to this comment is that you do not have to be an expert in medicine or health to challenge the safety and efficacy of a medicine or product.

Personal experience

You merely need to have the knowledge from personal experience, like the millions of people around the world, who lost healthy family members, suddenly, within a matter of

days after taking the vaccine or you could be a perfectly healthy individual, that has ended up permanently paralysed or a sportsperson that has become physically crippled/limited through a severe heart condition after taking the jab.

The second major source of knowledge can come from the research and opinion of highly reputable scientists and doctors, who understand the science. You do not have to be a professor to give expert witness, quoting the work and opinions of experts in their field should suffice.

The plaintiffs did not do a thumb-suck when they presented their evidence, they carefully studied the research, data and opinions of the experts. There were thousands of scientists and doctors who were opposed to these jabs on the grounds that they were neither safe nor effective.

Some of the scientists that come to mind are: Prof Gert VanDen Berg, (creator of vaccines), Dr Shukarit Bagdhi, a highly reputable virologist, Prof Peter MacCullough, (one of the highest published authors), Prof Arne Buchard (a world famous German pathologist), Prof Ryan Cole(a highly

published US pathologist), Prof Stephanie Zaneff (virologist), Prof Vinay Prasad (a top researcher and epidemiologist from UCLA and a regular critic on YouTube about the CDC, lockdowns and the FDA on its vaccine approval policy), Prof Jay Batacharya from Stafford university, Prof Martin Kuldorf, and Prof Sunetra Gupta, Prof Paul Marrick, an highly published infectious disease specialist. This list is merely a tiny of the number of doctors and scientists, who share the similar views on the pandemic and the vaccine

This list of doctors represents just a tiny fraction of doctors and scientists, who agreed that Covid mRNA vaccines, apart from being unsafe and were useless against the totally resistant delta and Omicron strains. Both strains as well as all the previous strains could be easily treated by highly effective, safe and inexpensive repurposed drugs, but these drugs were frowned upon by many captured health authorities for a variety of unscientific reasons.

The monovalent toxic jabs, were EUA drugs, because they were not tested against the highly resistant and 35 times mutated Omicron.

The Omicron strain, which appeared in November, 2021, was so innocuous even though it was highly infectious, it

did not need much medical intervention; it was no different from the ordinary flu. This view was repeatedly supported by Prof V Prasad.

The judge should understand that to get 50 experts from the rest of the world to give evidence was firstly unnecessary and secondly, it would have been costly and impractical for a group of poor NGOs, who took on this case, for the sole benefit of the whole of society and the country.

It is somewhat bewildering for the judge to require physical presence of experts if the opinions of experts were presented by the plaintiffs advocate.

Surely the evidence and opinions of these scientists should have sufficed. In defence of the judge, it is quite possible that the plaintiffs' counsel did not prepare sufficiently to present the evidence accurately.

I, as a family physician, have presented 50 hours of evidence in three CCMA cases as an expert witness. I based my evidence firstly as an expert treating COVID with a 99.97% success rate during the deadly Delta strain and on

my enormous amount of research on COVID and the mRNA vaccine.

None of the commissioners had an issue with me presenting my evidence, because I produced references for my opinions.

One commissioner was kind enough to thank me for presenting insights into COVID and the vaccine because much of what I shared was totally new to him.

The other two commissioners, it was clear to me, found science behind the disease and the vaccine, way above their heads.

I have no doubt, that Judge Davies, must have felt out of his depth trying to understand mRNA technology, lipid nano-particles, gain of function, randomised control trial requirements, risk benefit analysis, the role and efficacy of repurposed drugs during Covid because I, too, as an academic doctor was left puzzled about the mRNA technology and vaccinology.

I made a concerted effort to study it over the past three

years in order to understand this complexity around mRNA technology and I must concede that it still remains a puzzle for me.

Based on my extensive research on COVID on the vaccine I have realised that no one doctor or scientist, no matter how well qualified, can claim to be an expert on a new disease like COVID because COVID and the new mRNA technology have many intricate facets to them. They require the expertise of a number of medical and scientific disciplines in order to grasp the etio-pathogenesis and treatment of Covid.

An FDA scientist admitted in a podcast interview that even the FDA scientists were finding it hard to understand the mRNA technology.

Some of the disciplines around Covid and the vaccine would include: virology, vaccinology, bio-chemistry, pathology, immunology, radiology, epidemiology, infectious disease specialist, pharmacologists, physicians and the clinical experience of frontline doctors with a critical mind-set to deal with a completely new disease.

The other group of experts would be statisticians, medical data analysts and economists with knowledge on cost

benefit analysis in medical treatments.

This is a formidable list, so I fail to understand how judge Davies arrived at the conclusion that the people presenting the evidence for the plaintiffs opposing the jab were not capable of quoting all the experts in the field.

The people, who prepared the evidence for the plaintiff include a scientist in molecular biology and frontline doctors, who are experts in the field of clinical medicine.

The role of frontline doctors like the late Dr Zelenko, Dr Jackie Stone, Dr Shankara Chetty, Prof Paul Marrik, Dr Pierre Kory and me and several other doctors in Asia, South America and Africa have played a far greater role than any other discipline in medicine to save the lives of millions of people from dying through COVID. These doctors had success rates of 99% to 100%, treating some of the most severely ill COVID patients. Such high success rates should have obviated the need for vaccines and crippling lockdowns.

During the deadly Delta strain, I had 99.97% success rate. I

successfully treated patients with 35% oxygen levels using minimal investigations and inexpensive repurposed drugs. Some of them included the so-called high risk elderly.

In the UK, the high death rate amongst elderly in old age homes from COVID was because these healthy patients were given the ludicrous combination of midazolam and morphine.

This combination of drugs was criminally inappropriate and lethal for a Covid pneumonia and led to a huge number of healthy elderly to die in droves, prematurely.

All that the high death rate did was to instill fear into the world's population that Covid was a deadly disease and compel the ignorant masses to immediately get jabbed several times.

The evidence that was presented to the courts was extracted from the research and papers of hundreds of experts from around the world, so it is somewhat shocking how Judge Davies could say that the people presenting the evidence were not presenting expert evidence.

The claim that the Vaccines are safe and effective is

grossly incorrect

Judge Davies in his judgement and the journalist reporting on his judgement, created the impression to the general public that the vaccines were safe and effective and that Covid was a highly dangerous disease.

Anyone, who holds the view that the jabs were safe and effective and that Covid was dangerous doesn't have a clue about the science around Covid, it's treatment and about the inefficacy of the vaccine and its dangers.

The deluge of evidence from several court cases, research papers and data from VAERS and from the office of national statistics in the UK coupled with the information from Pfizer's contract with the government in which Pfizer clearly stated that they did not know about the safety and efficacy of their poorly tested vaccine, begs the question: how did Judge Davies arrive at the conclusion that the vaccine was safe and effective to protect society, stop the spread of Covid and end the contrived pandemic or that COVID was a serious disease?

Judge Davies, should have been informed about the Pfizer data, which Pfizer and the FDA were forced to release on the order of US circuit judge, Judge Pitman, as far back as March, 2022. The data was obtained from the the trial phase of the vaccine, with about 44.000 participants. The data was extensively analysed by Dr Naomi Woofe and her team and they found that there were 1200 deaths, 1293 side effects and there were 42,000 side effects reported.

There were 9 pages of side effects mentioned. Pfizer had this information in March, 2021, well before they signed the contract with the South African government. In this contract Pfizer with the South African government, Pfizer stated that they did not know about the safety and efficacy of their vaccine.

This act by Pfizer to claim that they did know about the safety of their jab was utterly dishonest after they had the data in their possession as far back as March, 2021. Pfizer should not have been granted indemnity for vaccine injuries because of their dishonesty.

Pfizer's and the FDA's plea to the judge to stop the data from being released till 2085 made it highly suspicious that they had something to hide? The answer was obvious when

the complete data was released by September, 2022.

Defence experts' evidence, highly questionable.

The experts for the Department of health SAPHRA, on whom Judge Davies relied upon to make his judgement, about the safety and efficacy of the vaccine, are guilty of a severe crime by declaring the vaccine was Safe and effective in the light of the evidence from the Pfizer data.

These experts were fully aware that Pfizer stated unequivocally in its contract that Pfizer did not know about the safety and efficacy of the vaccine, yet these experts pronounced these jabs to be safe and effective not only in court but to the desperate ignorant public.

The high vaccine death rate was a major red flag that was ignored.

Dr Dennis Rancroft, a highly credible data analyst and scientist presented a paper showing that the vaccines were associated with 17 million deaths.

VAERS data revealed that there were over 25,000 deaths reported to the CDC in people who took the vaccine by 2021. This figure only represents about 1% of the actual numbers reported, due to gross under-reporting for a variety of reasons. One of the reasons for the gross under-reporting was because the vaccine injured feared being labelled anti-vaxxers by the media.

Pfizer did not test for transference.

Pfizer's senior representative mentioned in a German television interview that Pfizer did not test their jab for transference because, according to her, Pfizer did not have the time. If Pfizer did not test for transference, where did our experts, who judge Davies trusted, get the information that taking the jab would prevent the spread of Covid and end the pandemic?

Boosters increase susceptibility of individuals to get infected

An issue worth mentioning is that people in the UK, who took the boosters were responsible for 92% of the deaths,

hospitalisations and infections through COVID clearly proving that the boosters did not work.

Dr Brian Hooker, PhD, in his presentation on the covid vaccines to the US senate hearing, presided by Sen Ron Johnson, stated that the one Covid death in children that was saved through the vaccine, resulted in 30 deaths in the children that were vaccinated.

The risk/benefit ratio of 30 to 1 made the vaccine 30 times riskier than not to take it. To promote such a dangerous vaccine that had 30 times greater risk than benefit was utterly reckless and criminal.

In the first month that the vaccine was given, Pfizer recorded 664 deaths in January, 2021. In 1999, when the Rota vaccine was launched, it resulted in 550 cases of a fatal intussusception in children. This vaccine was immediately pulled out due to safety signals.

Why, the covid vaccines weren't stopped by the authorities after 1200 deaths, is a matter of grave concern to everyone. This is the view that was expressed by top international researchers and academics like Prof Peter

McCullough and Dr Jessica Rose.

Contents of the vaccine vials - toxic and in some instances undisclosed.

The vaccine contains substances like polyethylene glycol, which can lead to severe allergic reactions, graphene oxide, which are highly toxic and extremely unsafe for the human body, highly toxic lipid nano-particles, SUV 40 molecule, which is associated with the risk of cancer and DNA strands of e. coli, which could be incorporated into the human genome with devastating outcomes.

Pfizer failed to disclose to purchasers of the vaccine that two processes were used to manufacture the vaccine.

During the trial phase, the slow method of using the PCR technique was used.

E. coli was used to mass produce billions of doses to be used on the public. When a different method is used to produce a drug, then the drug has to go through a new trial process. In this case, Pfizer and other manufacturers did not study the drug before releasing it to the public. This is

criminal.

Several scientists and researchers have found traces of e. coli DNA in the vials which should have not been in these vials

A huge concern is that we do not know the impact that the e.coli DNA would have on the progeny/children of the vaccinated when the e.coli DNA is incorporated into the DNA of the vaccinated.

The statement by the judge that no one was forced to take the jab is not entirely true.

Our president stated publicly on television that no one will be forced to take the vaccine, yet the poorly written labour laws on covid, gave companies and universities the right to dismiss employees and students, who were against taking the experimental toxic gene therapy on scientific, religious and constitutional grounds. According to the labour law on Covid, employers were given the right to force their employees to take the vaccine on the unsubstantiated premise that it will stop the spread.

Many people were dismissed, after years of loyal service to

their companies and were rendered penniless because they refused to take the vaccine. Many vaccinated employees, who were forced to take the job, angrily regret their decision after suffering severe adverse events from the job.

Unvaccinated employees humiliated.

Many employers humiliated their unvaccinated staff on a weekly basis like pariahs by forcing them to do useless PCR tests and wear masks.

This was done even though it was common knowledge that the vaccinated carried the same risk of transferring the virus as the unvaccinated and not previously infected.

The previously infected had robust natural immunity, which protected them and did not make them a threat to others.

Africa had the lowest vaccination rate yet had the lowest death, infection and hospital admission rates compared to the heavily vaccinated West. This fact, it seems, was not taken into account.

The dictatorial insistence by companies, compelling their staff to vaccinate with the totally ineffective monovalent toxic vaccine, during the safe but resistant Omicron strains,

from the early part of 2022 went ahead unabated. This was and is criminal.

Sweden dumped 3 million vials of the vaccine on the grounds that Omicron was not a serious strain and the vaccine could not prevent its spread nor protect its citizens from getting infected.

Even the obnoxious non-medically trained fake philanthropist, Bill Gates, a big investor in the mRNA vaccines and advocate of the vaccines, admitted on a German television that Omicron was nature's vaccine that ended the pandemic. He dumped his shares after he made a 200 billion dollar profit through his investment in vaccines.

South African insurance companies still insisted on their staff taking the vaccine in spite of the wealth of evidence that they were toxic and ineffective against the delta and Omicron strains.

Many employees, who took the vaccine against their will ended up with severe adverse events like sudden

unexplained deaths, total paralysis with little hope of recovery, stiff person's syndrome (an extremely painful, crippling and suicidal condition) and a variety of turbo cancers.

The greatest crime of these injuries is that victims of severe vaccine injuries were thrown under the bus by their employers, SAPHRA and the government.

I had to treat several of these patients pro-deo because our ignorant state doctors and specialists dismissed patients with these debilitating injuries as nut-cases in need of psychiatric care.

As someone, well versed in mental health, I failed to understand how useless psychotropics were going to help a paralysed person regain muscle function.

FLAW IN THE LAW

I was informed that Judge Davies is an extremely competent judge. If that is the case, then it is highly possible that the advocate representing the plaintiff was not fully versed in the multitude of intricacies of Covid and the new experimental mRNA technology, which might have contributed to the case being lost so easily.

It took me three years of learning to understand Covid and the mRNA technology, so I fail to fathom how legally trained advocate can learn all that I know about COVID and the vaccine in just two months.

Ideally, she should have been allowed to call in a doctor that is well versed in the science to explain the intricacies and nuances of Covid and the dangers of the vaccine.

Judges, no matter how competent, cannot make proper decisions if they are not presented with the correct information and in a manner that they can understand. I suspect that justice was derailed by this flaw in the law that prevents medical doctors from giving evidence in high courts on controversial issues pertaining to serious medical issues.

This is a major flaw in our legal system that must be urgently reviewed.

Even the HPCSA relies on the evidence of medical experts when deciding on issues of malfeasance and misconduct, so why is the legal system different.

Vaccine fails to meet its promises.

The vaccine was supposed to remain in the deltoid muscle; it was supposed to be destroyed within a few days; it was supposed to end the epidemic; it was supposed to protect one from getting infected and prevent transference.

There are mountains of evidence that the vaccines have not accomplished any of its objectives. The financially strangulating cost of the vaccines and the useless lockdowns ruined the economies of the entire world and made the lives of billions of people, jobless homeless, starving and utterly miserable with no hope in sight.

The jabs have led to millions of people losing their lives, directly and through all-cause mortality, and led to millions more to suffer painfully on their own from the adverse events of the toxic jabs.

I happen to be one of the people who helped to research and prepare the evidence to make our case a solid one.

It took me years of painstaking research to understand the intricacies of this new, strange and constantly evolving disease and the multifaceted aspects of the Covid jab as well as the complexity of mRNA technology.

This mRNA technology was being used for the first time on a massive scale without being properly tested for its safety and efficacy. A risk, history will reveal, we should never have taken when good treatment was available and affordable..

Participants in the group worked for free

Except for the two advocates involved in this case, the doctors, the scientist, the lawyer and the members of the public involved in this case for over two years, have volunteered their services and time for free, because they were driven by their conscience to protect the citizens of this country and the rest of the world from what would be dubbed as one of the harshest crimes in human history.

Anti-vaxxer, a misleading term

The people involved in this case were not anti-vaxxers but people opposed to the use of a substance that was highly

toxic and ineffective. We were compelled to act on behalf of society guided by our Hippocratic oath and our conscience, "to do no harm" and to ensure that citizens rights of bodily integrity is protected in accordance with our Bill of rights and the Nuremberg code of 1947.

We were no different from the people who ended the thalidomide disaster. The journalist, who referred to the group opposing the vaccines with the reprehensible terms, "anti-vaxxers" is typical of other naive journalists in the world, who do not understand the science, in spite of tons of data and evidence supporting our case, or she might be part of the hordes terribly captured journalists that are heavily sponsored by their despicable sponsors from the WEF to carry out their outrageous agenda to harm society with lies and propaganda.

Finances and funding

The group was funded purely by the donations from a tiny number of people from the struggling public because they saw the value in our work. The funds we raised were way too little to engage the services of a legal team that would have been better prepared to argue our case than the

counsel that represented us in this case.

Defendants used tax money

The government agencies, like SAPHRA and the DOH, had tons of taxpayers' money at their disposal in addition to the very generous sponsorship of private funders with a vested interest in the rollout of the jabs. We did not have that kind of resources. We were strong on substance but were sabotaged by a lack of finances and a committed legal team.

It is a pity that Judge Davies ruled against the group with costs because we would have to go to the financially struggling public to raise these funds. The public have responded to this ruling on costs with complete outrage, based on their posts on social media

I sincerely hope that this case can be reviewed and we can acquire the funding of a generous sponsor for the truth and the services of a crack legal team that is willing to do their best to ensure that justice is done and that medical experts are called in to give evidence to an unbiased judiciary so that the public is protected from further abuse.

The judgment by Judge Davies, though highly disappointing, is not the final nail in the coffin in our pursuit for justice.

I remain totally optimistic that with the weight of evidence in our favour and the right legal team, justice will eventually prevail.

For the moment, I am satisfied that in the court of public opinion, the judgement handed against our group was met with absolute scorn and disdain by thousands of people and millions silently suffering job victims who have been stunned and outraged by the verdict.

Author's note: This response was made out in the hope that it will correct the numerous misconceptions around Covid and the vaccine for the public and the historians of the future. The four years of Covid will be remembered in history as the dark ages, when there was an orchestrated attempt by a few people to destroy the lives of millions.

Dr E V Rapiti

March, 9th, 2024

Cape Town

