

**Date:** 2022,

**To:** \_\_\_\_\_, the living man/woman, acting in the office of \_\_\_\_\_, at \_\_\_\_\_, and all assigns, nominees, heirs and successors

**Address Sent and/or Physical Location Served:**

PO \_\_\_\_\_ Box, \_\_\_\_\_ (town) \_\_\_\_\_ (state) \_\_\_\_\_ (postcode)

**Email** \_\_\_\_\_

**Served to:** \_\_\_\_\_

**From:** (your first name) \_\_\_\_\_, the living (man/woman)

**Address:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Notice No:** \_\_\_\_\_ (if applicable)

**Served via Registered Mail No** RPP44 \_\_\_\_\_ [if sending by registered mail]

**THIS IS A LEGAL NOTICE CONSISTING OF:**

- **NOTICE OF LIABILITY**
- **NOTICE OF FURTHER & BETTER PARTICULARS**
- **NOTICE OF DEMAND FOR TENDER TO YOUR INSURERS AND LAWYERS**

This Notice is defined in LexisNexis Australian Legal Dictionary as an "Actual Notice" and there amounts to a legal contract.

**Notice to Agent is Notice to Principal; Notice to Principal is Notice to Agent**

Proverbs 19:9

*A false witness shall not be unpunished, and he that speaketh lies shall perish.*

[insert name of respondent]

You, as a [reporter, broadcaster, political commentator, panelist, and/or editor/manager/owner of a media organisation], have a duty of care to the public (men/women/children) to report and speak "the truth" as written in God's Law. This duty of care and the liability for this has been magnified greatly by the fact that in Australia, media information campaigns were announced by the Prime Minister Scott Morrison as "a source of information for the public during the evolving COVID-19 pandemic"<sup>1</sup>.

I send you this **NOTICE** with the intention of peaceful resolution, and as an opportunity for you to do your due diligence according to your duty of care. **TAKE NOTICE THAT** whether you do your due diligence or not, receipt of this document voids all "good faith" clauses or immunities you may try to rely on in future. I reserve the right to file a claim with your organisation's bonding and/or public liability insurer and your personal professional indemnity insurer, and further reserve the right to file a civil and/or criminal complaint in local, state, federal and international jurisdictions.

<sup>1</sup> The Prime Ministers Office. Prime Minister's Announcement Australia: Commonwealth of Australia. (2020). Available online at: <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/transcript-press-conference> <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00483/full>

All Western Law is predicated on the word of God. This is your opportunity to take heed of the warnings below, change your ways, fulfill your obligations, oaths and covenants with your Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to stand for Honour, Truth & Justice for all. God decreed the law or laws that would govern the world before the creation of the world.

**TAKE NOTICE THAT**, there is a current International Criminal Court (The Hague) case number: OTP-CR-473/21<sup>2</sup> regarding COVID-19 for Crimes against Humanity, which the subject of complaints are:

- Violations of the Nuremberg Code
- Violation of Article 6 of the Rome Statute
- Violation of Article 7 of the Rome Statute
- Violation of Article 8 of the Rome
- Violation of Article 8 bis3 of the Rome Statute

This complaint is also being investigated by the UK Metropolitan Police - Crime Number: 6029679/21.<sup>3</sup>

**TAKE NOTICE THAT**, The Australian Vaccination-risks Network, Inc. (AVN) filed a Judicial Review case in the Federal Court of Australia (Federal Court of NSW – NSD52/2022) on February 1, 2022, asking the court to order Dr Brendan Murphy, Secretary of the Department of Health, to meet his obligation to follow the science and cancel or suspend the provisional approval for all experimental COVID vaccines in Australia. This has now gone onto appeal in the Full Federal Court.<sup>4</sup> See link for explanatory outline by Julian Gillespie <http://amps.redunion.com.au/medico-legal-summit> given at a recent medico-legal summit held by the *Australian Medical Professionals Society* on 23.6.22. I implore you to watch this.

**TAKE NOTICE THAT** you risk being held personally liable for and or privately liable for and or civilly and or criminally liable for participating in unlawful, illegal and or criminal activity and or for supporting crimes against humanity, genocide, bio-warfare and or failing to prevent acts so defined, including but not limited to acts that are purposely committed as part of a widespread and or systematic policy, directed against living men and women, and in particular boys and girls (currently over 5 years of age), committed in furtherance of fraudulent government policy, under the guise of a public health emergency, which has no basis in fact/law.

**TAKE NOTICE THAT** all adults and children (ages 5-17) have not been adequately informed of all the dangers of these experimental “COVID-19 vaccines” (which are still in Phase III clinical trials until 2023 and hence qualify as medical experiments and all animal trials were ceased) which have since proven to be extremely dangerous to the health of the recipient, many serious side effects have failed to even be mentioned in government documents<sup>5</sup> about them, wherein these vaccines are still touted as “safe”<sup>6</sup> and “effective”<sup>7</sup>. This negates any consent they may have prima facie given.

#### **I CLAIM THAT:**

1. I am a Natural Person under Common Law and **I CLAIM** my unalienable rights [please refer attached Asseveration]

---

<sup>2</sup>

<https://thevaultproject.org/shocking-legal-document-shows-pharma-giants-fauci-others-accused-crimes-against-humanity-international-criminal-court/?print=pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <https://livingstones.blog/2022/01/01/misconduct-in-public-office-crime-report-ref-6029679-21-refers/>

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.einnews.com/pr\\_news/578181869/avn-files-appeal-in-the-full-federal-court-of-australia](https://www.einnews.com/pr_news/578181869/avn-files-appeal-in-the-full-federal-court-of-australia)

<sup>5</sup> [https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0007/1024891/covid-19-vaccine-faqs.pdf?v=0.3.2](https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1024891/covid-19-vaccine-faqs.pdf?v=0.3.2)

<sup>6</sup>

[https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/1024899/protect-yourself-and-family-info-about-covid-19-vaccine.pdf?v=0.1.1](https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/1024899/protect-yourself-and-family-info-about-covid-19-vaccine.pdf?v=0.1.1)

<sup>7</sup> [https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0008/1009898/information-about-covid19-vaccine.pdf?v=0.3.2](https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0008/1009898/information-about-covid19-vaccine.pdf?v=0.3.2)

2. The ninth commandment of the ten given to Moses, "Thou Shalt Not Bear False Witness" is a strong declaration against all forms of untruth, including exaggeration, gross understatement, fabrication, and the willful giving of any explanation not supported by the facts. Partially sharing the truth can have the effect of lying when we tell only half-truths that do not give a full picture. We can also be guilty of bearing false witness if we say nothing, particularly if we allow another to reach a wrong conclusion while we hold back information that would have led to a more accurate perception. In this case, it is as though an actual lie were uttered.
3. You have been publishing false and misleading information regarding the COVID-19 SARS COV-2 pandemic and associated mRNA vaccines.
4. You have been omitting to publish the injury, harm and loss caused by governmental overreach, under the guise of a public emergency, and the administration of a bio- weapon in the form of Covid-19 mRNA vaccinations, on the people of Australia.
5. You are publishing the propaganda of a corporatized government that has no legal standing on the land known as Terra Australis (Australia). Ex High Court Judge Sir Harry Gibbs, stated that "I therefore have come to the conclusion that the current legal and political system in use in Australia and its States and Territories has no basis in law."<sup>8</sup>
6. The actions and omissions of journalists and their superiors/editors/owners and media organisations, are causing injury, harm and loss to the people of Australia.

You have legal obligations in this matter, as such **I DEMAND FURTHER & BETTER PARTICULARS** from you directly and specifically by way of point form in a Statutory Declaration, including any Law Documents, Written Statues, Written Statute Clauses, Acts, Legislation, all written and email evidence, Audio evidence, Video evidence and Photographs which evidence and irrefutably prove the following:

1. The wearing of masks reduces the transmission of viral matter from one person to another.
2. The wearing of masks is not detrimental to the health of the wearer, especially in tropical environments, and in children.
3. The Federal Health & Aged Care Minister, Greg Hunt, did not officially state "We're engaged in the world's largest ever vaccination rollout and, at the same time, effectively, clinical trial".<sup>9</sup>
4. In Australia, the Nuremberg Code and the related Declaration of Helsinki do not form the basis for the *Good Clinical Practice* (GCP) in Australia.<sup>10</sup>
5. *The National Health and Medical Research Council Act 1992* did not establish the *National Health and Medical Research Council* (NHMRC) as a statutory entity to pursue and foster issues relating to public health. And the NHMRC is not specifically required to issue guidelines for the conduct of medical research and ethical matters related to health.
6. The NHMRC did not produce the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research* (the National Statement) as the Australian ethical standard against which all research involving humans, including clinical trials, are reviewed.
7. The *National Statement* under CHAPTER 2.2: GENERAL REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSENT does not read:

GUIDELINES - Section 2.2.1 - The guiding principle for researchers is that a person's decision to participate in research is to be voluntary, and based on

<sup>8</sup> <http://nationalunitygovernment.org/sites/default/files/sites/default/files/pdf-doc/120813-%20Sir%20Harry%20Gibbs.pdf>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.health.gov.au/ministers/the-hon-greg-hunt-mp/media/doorstop-interview-about-the-covid-19-vaccine-rollout-on-22-february-2021>

<sup>10</sup> <https://www.australianclinicaltrials.gov.au/researchers/good-clinical-practice-gcp-australia>

sufficient information and adequate understanding of both the proposed research and the implications of participation in it. [emphasis added]

Coercion and pressure - 2.2.9 - No person should be subject to coercion or pressure in deciding whether to participate. [emphasis added]

8. The *Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Healthcare* did not state “Ensuring informed consent is properly obtained is a legal, ethical and professional requirement on the part of all treating health professionals and supports person-centred care”.<sup>11</sup> That it did not also state that:

Informed consent is a person's decision, given voluntarily, to agree to a healthcare treatment, procedure or other intervention that is made:

- Following the provision of accurate and relevant information about the healthcare intervention and alternative options available; [emphasis added] and
- With adequate knowledge and understanding of the benefits and material risks of the proposed intervention relevant to the person who would be having the treatment, procedure or other intervention.

9. The *Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency* (AHPRA) has not denied doctors the ability to give their patients the required information for their patients to make informed consent, by threatening them with de-registration if they “contradict or counter public health campaigns or messaging”<sup>12</sup>. That they did not state:

Any promotion of anti-vaccination statements or health advice which contradicts.... or seeks to actively undermine the national immunisation campaign (including via social media) is not supported by National Boards and may be in breach of the codes of conduct and subject to investigation and possible regulatory action

10. The Therapeutic Goods Association (TGA) has not taken away doctor's ability to discuss or prescribe proven prophylactics such as Ivermectin<sup>13</sup>, when it has been shown in a study published in the *American Journal of Therapeutics* entitled *Review of the Emerging Evidence Demonstrating the Efficacy of Ivermectin in the Prophylaxis and Treatment of COVID-19*, that:

...based on the totality of the trials and epidemiologic evidence presented in this review along with the preliminary findings of the Unitaid/WHO meta-analysis of treatment RCTs and the guideline recommendation from the international BIRD conference, ivermectin should be globally and systematically deployed in the prevention and treatment of COVID-19.<sup>14</sup>

11. In relation to consent by young persons, SECTION 4 of the National Statement, under ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS SPECIFIC TO PARTICIPANTS, it does not state:

4.2.9 A review body may also approve research to which only the young person consents if it is satisfied that:(a) he or she is mature enough to understand the relevant information and to give consent, although vulnerable because of relative immaturity in other respects;(b) the research involves no more than low risk (see paragraph 2.1.6); [emphasis added]

2.1.6 Research is ‘low risk’ where the only foreseeable risk is one of discomfort. Where the risk, even if unlikely, is more serious than discomfort, the research is not low risk. [emphasis added]

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.safetyandquality.gov.au/our-work/partnering-consumers/informed-consent>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.ahpra.gov.au/documents/default.aspx?record=WD21/30751&dbid=AP&chksum=zrOQ56xJaaLbasNxLDyqMA%3d%3d>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.tga.gov.au/media-release/new-restrictions-prescribing-ivermectin-covid-19>

<sup>14</sup> [https://journals.lww.com/americantherapeutics/fulltext/2021/06000/review\\_of\\_the\\_emerging\\_evidence\\_demonstrating\\_the.4.aspx](https://journals.lww.com/americantherapeutics/fulltext/2021/06000/review_of_the_emerging_evidence_demonstrating_the.4.aspx)

12. That it hasn't already been conclusively proven globally that young people are at much more risk than one of merely discomfort. e.g. Public Health Scotland official Government data does not show a 73% increase in the number of Young Adults & Teens suffering Heart Attack, Myocarditis & Stroke since the Covid-19 Vaccine roll-out, and the negative effect of vaccinations on mortality has not been recently substantiated by the UK's Office for National Statistics<sup>15</sup> - that their findings do not show that 70,000 people have died within 28 days of Covid-19 vaccination in England, and 179,000 people have died within 60 days, and that Covid-19 vaccination increases children's risk of death between 8,100% and 30,200%.

13. COVID-19 mRNA Gene Therapeutic Injections are "vaccines"

14. If COVID-19 mRNA Gene Therapeutic Injections were defined as vaccines, their administration would be in line with the Australian Immunisation Handbook's definition of legally valid consent, for which the following elements must be present:

- It must be given by a person with legal capacity, and of sufficient intellectual capacity to understand the implications of receiving a vaccine.
- It must be given voluntarily in the absence of undue pressure, coercion or manipulation. [emphasis added]

15. The threat of losing one's ability to earn a living or freedom to travel, is not pressure, coercion and manipulation.

16. On 27<sup>th</sup> April 2020 the United Nations Human Rights Office of the High Commissioner did not release an "EMERGENCY MEASURES AND COVID-19: GUIDANCE" document.<sup>16</sup> That this document does not state:

The suspension or derogation of certain civil and political rights is only allowed under specific situations of emergency. ...Some safeguards must be put in place including the respect of some fundamental rights that cannot be suspended under any circumstances.

17. One of the ICCPR rights that can be derogated is:

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.<sup>17</sup>

18. The document EMERGENCY MEASURES AND COVID-19: GUIDANCE also, under the heading RESTRICTIONS ON HUMAN RIGHTS AS A RESULT OF EMERGENCY MEASURES, does not state:

Some rights....may be subject to restrictions for public health reasons, even in the absence of a state of emergency. These restrictions, however, must meet the following requirements....

**Proportionality.** The restriction must be proportionate to the interest at stake, i.e. it must be appropriate to achieve its protective function; and it must be the least intrusive option among those that might achieve the desired result

**Non-discrimination.** No restriction shall discriminate contrary to the provisions of international human rights law.

---

<sup>15</sup>

<https://constitutionwatch.com.au/uk-governmentreleases-bombshell-study-showing-covid-vax-increases-risk-of-death-and-kills-hundreds-ofthousands-after-five-months/>

<sup>16</sup> [https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Events/EmergencyMeasures\\_COVID19.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Events/EmergencyMeasures_COVID19.pdf)

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/ccpr.aspx>


All limitations should be interpreted strictly and in favour of the right at issue. No limitation can be applied in an arbitrary manner. The authorities have the burden of justifying restrictions upon rights. [emphasis added]

19. Former Prime Minister of Australia Scott Morrison did not state publicly on the 6<sup>th</sup> of August 2021 or thereabouts “Australia does not have a mandatory vaccination policy.....Employers need to consider these matters and make their own decisions remembering we do not have a mandatory vaccination policy in this country, we do not have that, we are not proposing to have that, that is not changing”.
20. That COVID-19 Directions (no. 55) 2021: Directions for mandatory vaccination of workers to attend the workplace [hereinafter referred to as CHO 55] does not state arbitrarily that “a person is considered to be vulnerable to infection with COVID-19.....if the person is under 12 years of age”<sup>18</sup> whilst failing to provide any evidence of such fact.
21. That CHO 55 is not discriminative, despite it classing all aboriginal persons as “vulnerable” – i.e. that this term is not clearly applied in an arbitrary manner, as many, if not most aboriginal people would not consider themselves to be classed as “vulnerable”.
22. COVID-19 Directions (No. 52) 2022: Directions for additional vaccination requirements for certain workers to attend the workplace does not state arbitrarily that a person is considered to be vulnerable to infection with COVID-19 if “the person is under 5 years of age”.<sup>19</sup>
23. The Australian Government has not stated:

“The virus can infect children however, they are less likely to have symptoms. Their symptoms are milder and they are less likely to develop severe illness. Children dying from COVID-19 is rare” and

“children...appear less likely to spread the virus among themselves and to adults”.<sup>20</sup>

24. Official statistics as at 10<sup>th</sup> June 2022 <sup>21</sup> do not show that whilst cases by age group are higher in younger persons, however the death rate is opposite.



25. More than 20 epidemiological studies in a dozen countries have not searched for contamination from children under 15 years of age: with none of them being able to find a single truly conclusive example.<sup>22</sup>
26. A well-established principle of statutory interpretation in Australian courts is not that Parliament is presumed to not have intended to limit fundamental rights, unless it indicates

<sup>18</sup> [https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0009/1058346/cho-directions-no55-2021.pdf](https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1058346/cho-directions-no55-2021.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> [https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/\\_data/assets/pdf\\_file/0003/1093449/cho-directions-no-52-of-2022-directions-for-additional-vaccination-requirements-for-certain-workers-to-attend-the-workplace-signed.pdf](https://coronavirus.nt.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0003/1093449/cho-directions-no-52-of-2022-directions-for-additional-vaccination-requirements-for-certain-workers-to-attend-the-workplace-signed.pdf)

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2020/07/coronavirus-covid-19-and-children.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/06/coronavirus-covid-19-at-a-glance-10-june-2022.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.eu/eu-issues/sacrificing-children-with-an-experimental-vaccine-will-not-save-our-forefathers/>

this intention in clear terms. In *Coco v The Queen* (1994) 179 CLR 427 at 437 the High Court restated this principle as follows:

The courts should not impute to the legislature an intention to interfere with fundamental rights. Such an intention must be clearly manifested by unmistakable and unambiguous language.

27. That In *Electrolux Home Products Pty Ltd v Australian Workers' Union*, Chief Justice Gleeson did not say:

The presumption is not merely a commonsense guide to what a parliament in a liberal democracy is likely to have intended; it is a working hypothesis, the existence of which is known both to parliament and the courts, upon which statutory language will be interpreted. The hypothesis is an aspect of the rule of law.

28. That this presumption does not include fundamental rights recognised by the common law.

29. That a similar presumption does not apply regarding consistency with international law obligations, including human rights treaty obligations, which came into force for Australia prior to the passage of the legislation concerned. That High Court Chief Justice Mason and Justice Deane in the *Teoh* case, did not state:

Where a statute or subordinate legislation is ambiguous, the courts should favour that construction which accords with Australia's obligations under a treaty or international convention to which Australia is a party, at least in those cases in which the legislation is enacted after, or in contemplation of, entry into, or ratification of, the relevant international instrument. That is because Parliament, *prima facie*, intends to give effect to Australia's obligations under international law."<sup>23</sup>.

30. Section 51A of the Australian Constitution does not state that the parliament has the power to make laws for "with respect to the provision of maternity allowances, widows' pensions, child endowment, unemployment, pharmaceutical, sickness and hospital benefits, medical and dental services (but not so as to authorise any form of civil conscription), benefits to students and family allowances".

31. That Justice Webb in the High Court in *British Medical Association v Commonwealth* (1949) 79 CLR 201; did not state:

If Parliament cannot lawfully do this directly by legal means it cannot lawfully do it indirectly by creating a situation, as distinct from merely taking advantage of one, in which the individual is left no real choice but compliance.....and that no law in this country can compel any medical service on behalf of the Australian government.

32. That vaccination status is not considered sensitive health information protected under the *Privacy Act 1988*. That [one] does not have to freely consent to the collection of their vaccination status information....<sup>24</sup> [emphasis added]

33. That Section 109 of the Australian Constitution does not state that an act of a state or territory cannot override a Federal Act i.e. when a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid.

34. That *COVID-19 Directions (No. 55) 2021: Directions for mandatory vaccination of workers to attend the workplace* were not ultra vires. (ULTRA VIRES is defined legally as "A body

---

<sup>23</sup> <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/rights-and-freedoms/common-law-rights-human-rights-scrutiny-and-rule-law>

<sup>24</sup> <https://www.apsc.gov.au/circulars-guidance-and-advice/circular-202109-covid-19-vaccination-policies-australian-government-workplaces>

exercising an invalid excess or power of authority”).) The Chief Health Officer and NT Government did not fail to have regard to the relevant constraints upon the exercise of power conferred upon him under section 52 of the *Public and Environmental Health Act 2011*.

35. That there was provision in the *Public and Environmental Health Act 2011* for the CHO to mandate a medical treatment be imposed upon Territorians.
36. That orders issued by a state or territory Chief Health Officer have lawful power and effect when inconsistent with the federal *Biosecurity Act 2015*, with regard to the mechanism of formulating and of issuing of a Public Health Directive or Order to an individual or to group of people, “mandating” or conscription of medical procedures and quarantine measures and restrictions to workplace site access.
37. That the government and police have not therefore been taking full liberty while issuing false warnings via the media by shrewdly using words like ‘possibly’ ‘may be’ ‘might be’ etc. which ordinary people might not notice and would fall prey to the agenda of spreading fear and anxiety.
38. That murder is not defined as:
  - intentionally inflicting serious bodily harm that causes the victim’s death, or
  - behaving in a way that shows extreme, reckless disregard for life and results in the victim’s death.
39. That PART 2. JURISDICTION, ADMISSIBILITY AND APPLICABLE LAW, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court [hereinafter referred to as Rome Statute], Article 5 Crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court <sup>25</sup> does not state:

The jurisdiction of the Court shall be limited to the most serious crimes of concern to the international community as a whole. The Court has jurisdiction in accordance with this Statute with respect to the following crimes:

- (a) The crime of genocide;
- (b) Crimes against humanity;
- (c) War crimes;
- (d) The crime of aggression.

40. The Rome Statute, under Article 6 – Genocide does not state:

For the purpose of this Statute, “genocide” means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- a) Killing members of the group;
- b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;

41. Article 7 of the Rome Statute, Crimes against humanity, does not state:

---

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.icc-cpi.int/NR/rdonlyres/ADD16852-AFF9-4757-ABE7-9CDC7CF02886/283503/RomeStatutEng1.pdf>

1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack:
  - a) Murder;
  - b) Extermination;
  - c) Enslavement;...
  - e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of international law
  - f) Torture;...
  - h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic, cultural, religious, gender...or other grounds that are universally recognized as impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court;...
  - k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or to mental or physical health.

2. For the purpose of paragraph 1:

- i. "Attack directed against any civilian population" means a course of conduct involving the multiple commission of acts referred to in paragraph 1 against any civilian population, pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack;
- ii. "Extermination" includes the intentional infliction of conditions of life, inter alia the deprivation of access to food and medicine, calculated to bring about the destruction of part of a population;...
- v. "Torture" means the intentional infliction of severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, upon a person in the custody or under the control of the accused; except that torture shall not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to, lawful sanctions;...
- vii. "Persecution" means the intentional and severe deprivation of fundamental rights contrary to international law by reason of the identity of the group or collectivity;

42. That Julius Streicher (12 February 1885 – 16 October 1946) a member of the Nazi Party, and founder and publisher of the virulently antisemitic newspaper Der Stürmer (which became a central element of the Nazi propaganda machine) was not, after the war, convicted of crimes against humanity at the end of the Nuremberg trials, for his incitement to the mass murder of Europe's Jewish population, and he was not executed for his crimes.<sup>26</sup>
43. That Streicher's conviction did not establish a precedent-setting link between inflammatory speech and criminal action in international law.
44. That soon after the IMT had completed its mission, direct and public incitement to commit genocide did not become a crime under international law.<sup>27</sup>
45. That "incitement" does not mean encouraging or persuading another to commit an offense by way of communication, for example by employing broadcasts, publications, drawings, images, or speeches.

<sup>26</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius\\_Streicher](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Julius_Streicher)

<sup>27</sup> <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/incitement-to-genocide-in-international-law>

46. It is not “public” under international law if it is communicated to a number of individuals in a public place or to members of a population at large by such means as the mass media.<sup>28</sup>
47. That in 1997, the *United Nations International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda* (ICTR) did not indict three Rwandans for “incitement to genocide.”
48. That these three Rwandans were not:
  1. Hassan Ngeze who founded, published, and edited *Kangura* (Wake Others Up!), a Hutu-owned tabloid that in the months preceding the genocide published vitriolic articles dehumanizing the Tutsi as *inyenzi* (cockroaches), although never called directly for killing them.
  2. Ferdinand Nahimana and Jean-Bosco Barayagwiza, founders of a radio station called *Radio Télévision Libre des Mille Collines* (RTLM) that indirectly and directly called for murder... [ibid]
49. That in December 2003, the ICTR did not convict Ngeze, Nahimana, and Barayagwiza for direct and public incitement to genocide.
50. That Hassan Ngeze was not sentenced to 35 years' imprisonment for the charges of "aiding and abetting the commission of genocide in Gisenyi prefecture; direct and public incitement to commit genocide through the publication of articles in his *Kangura* newspaper in 1994; aiding and abetting extermination as a crime against humanity in Gisenyi prefecture".<sup>29</sup>
51. That Ferdinand Nahimana was not sentenced to life imprisonment, guilty of genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, incitement, directly and publicly, to commit genocide, complicity in genocide and crimes against humanity.<sup>30</sup>
52. That Jean-Bosco Barayagwiza was not sentenced to 35 years' imprisonment after being found guilty of genocide, conspiracy to commit genocide, public and direct incitement to genocide and extermination and persecution constituting crimes against humanity.
53. That the judges did not declare “Without a firearm, machete or any physical weapon, you caused the deaths of thousands of innocent civilians” and, whilst framing their verdict, the judges did not state “This case raises important principles concerning the role of the media, which have not been addressed at the level of international criminal justice since Nuremberg. The power of the media to create and destroy fundamental human values comes with great responsibility. Those who control the media are accountable for its consequences.”
54. That the crime of incitement does not remain firmly in place on the international legal stage and that in 1998, an incitement provision was not included in Article 25(3)(e) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (in conjunction with Article 6—Genocide). [ibid]
55. That in Australia, media information campaigns were not announced by the Prime Minister as “a source of information for the public during the evolving COVID-19 pandemic”.<sup>31</sup>
56. That Mark Crispin Miller, professor of Media, Culture and Communication at New York University, who has been teaching courses on Propaganda since 1997 did not state in an article he wrote (which was published in the magazine *Propaganda in Focus* on May 24,

<sup>28</sup> <https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/incitement-to-genocide-in-international-law>

<sup>29</sup>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20160406235542/http://www.trial-ch.org/en/resources/trial-watch/trial-watch/profiles/profile/107/action/show/controller/Profile/tab/legal-procedure.html>

<sup>30</sup> [https://web.archive.org/web/20070930210123/http://www.rsf.org/print.php3?id\\_article=8709](https://web.archive.org/web/20070930210123/http://www.rsf.org/print.php3?id_article=8709)

<sup>31</sup> The Prime Ministers Office. Prime Minister's Announcement Australia: Commonwealth of Australia. (2020). Available online at: <https://www.pm.gov.au/media/transcript-press-conference>

2002 entitled *What we don't know is killing us: The urgency of propaganda study under COVID* <sup>32</sup>) that the “free press” has been turned into a “bio-fascist fear machine”.

57. That Mark Crispin Miller did not also state in his article:

....the propaganda inescapably instructing everybody to mask up (“Wearing is caring”), on the lunatic collectivist presumption that your mask will not “protect” you unless everybody’s wearing them, was now suddenly and inescapably instructing everybody to “get vaccinated,” as if anyone not getting jabbed was thereby (somehow) putting all those jabbed “at risk.” Thus, “vaccination” was now not only certified as “safe and effective” — by governments at every level, and by all the media, both corporate and “alternative,” and by hundreds upon hundreds of celebrities, and by every pharmacy, and by the schools, from grade schools up to colleges and universities, and, of course, by the “vaccine” manufacturers, along with Dr. Fauci and Bill Gates — but one’s own “vaccination” was now urged weirdly as (to quote Pope Francis) “an act of love.”

And having thundered on through 2021, and into 2022 — with all those blithe assurances of “safety” and “effectiveness” disproved ever more dramatically by data out of country after country, harrowing research by independent scientists and doctors the world over, Pfizer’s and Moderna’s own clinical trials, and the ever-rising global toll in “sudden deaths” and incapacitating “vaccine injuries”....and so those of us who study propaganda critically, as public intellectuals, must speak out loud and clear, to set things right.

This means, first of all, doing what the “fact-checkers” claim to do, and doing it far more conscientiously, and thoroughly, than they “debunk” whatever facts or theories contradict, or complicate, the narrative pumped out by governments and media. Whereas the “fact-checkers” do quick and sloppy work, and then move on, we work in depth, in scholarly commitment to the truth, which may take decades to discover.... throughout these last two years, have we been digging for, and trying to tell, the widely buried truth about the COVID crisis, its true origins, the actual lethality of SARS-CoV-2 (whatever that may really be), the PCR tests used to measure “cases,” the “COVID measures” hatched (allegedly) to “slow the spread,” the absolute futility of lockdowns, and their catastrophic harms, the homicidal impact of the standard COVID “treatment,” and the actual availability of valid remedies, the cynical redefinition of such key terms as “pandemic,” “cases,” “herd immunity,” “vaccine” and, “fully vaccinated,” the likely motives driving this whole crisis (and those still to come), the actual low number of those killed worldwide by COVID, and — above all — the ever-growing global toll of the experimental “vaccination” program.

...And yet our goal must be not merely to instruct the public in those many truths blacked out by the propaganda over COVID...but to urge the public toward a firmer grasp of propaganda overall; and so our larger goal must be to explain the factors that have ultimately helped turn the West’s “free press” into the propaganda juggernaut now keeping millions upon millions in ferocious ignorance.

...Specifically, we need to rebuild journalism, so that it actually reports the news, just as we need a whole new medical establishment — one that will reclaim its Hippocratic duty to make people well instead of very profitably sick (or dead).

58. That Under case law precedent, in *Hart v Watt* (2015) <sup>33</sup> A Crim R 221, Pritchard J did not state that:

‘[a] requirement for a person to undergo a blood test, or to provide a mouth swab, constitutes an interference with that person’s right to bodily integrity’.

59. That an injection of a vaccine is not more invasive than a mouth swab or blood test.

---

<sup>32</sup> <https://propagandainfocus.com/what-we-dont-know-is-killing-us-the-urgency-of-propaganda-study-under-covid/>

<sup>33</sup> *Hart v Watt* (2015) A Crim R 221, 229 [34] (Pritchard J).

60. That other international case law precedents regarding rejection of vaccination mandates do not include:
- a. Supreme Court of the United States on Jan 13, 2022 cases Nos. 21A244 and 21A247 blocked mandates that employees of large businesses be vaccinated against COVID-19 or face weekly testing
  - b. PIL No. 6/2021, Registrar General, High Court of Meghalaya Vs. State of Meghalaya ordered that it could not mandate vaccination for shopkeepers, vendors, local taxi drivers and others to resume their businesses.
  - c. Airedale NHS Trust v Bland 1993 - by use of force or through deception if an unwilling capable adult is made to have the “flu vaccine would be considered both a crime and tort or civil” wrong.
  - d. Schloendorff v Society of New York Hospitals 1914 - NY Justice Cardozo ruled that “every human being of adult years and sound mind has a right to determine what shall be done with their body”.
  - e. European Commission and Court of Human Rights [X vs. Netherlands of 1978; X vs. Austria of 1979] - vaccination by force or being made mandatory by adopting coercive methods, vitiates the very fundamental purpose of the welfare attached to it.
  - f. In *Yardley v Minister for Workplace Relations and Safety & Anors* [2022] NZHC 291 the High Court of New Zealand on February 28th 2022 struck down a vaccine mandate for police officers and defense staff for being “a gross violation of human rights”. In the decision, Justice Francis Cooke stated “The associated pressure to surrender employment involves a limit on the right to retain that employment, which the above principles suggest can be thought of as an important right or interest recognized not only in domestic law, but in the international instruments”.
61. That Ivermectin is a not a cheap and long term tested drug, and that many doctors and scientists don't believe Ivermectin is effective against COVID-19.
62. That Indian States that used Ivermectin did not have far better outcomes and far fewer COVID deaths than the Indian states that did not use Ivermectin. (That in areas of Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, Uttarakhand, and Goa, did not have COVID-19 cases drop by 98%, 97%, 94%, and 86%, respectively. And that by contrast, cases in Tamil Nadu (who opted out of Ivermectin) skyrocketed and rose to the highest in India - that Tamil Nadu deaths did not increase ten-fold.<sup>34</sup>
63. That the High Court of Bombay at Goapil WP NO. 1216 OF 2021 did not prove that Ivermectin was an effective treatment pre and during COVID infection
64. That the Indian Bar Association<sup>35</sup> did not threaten criminal prosecution against Dr. Swaminathan of the WHO “for each death” caused by her acts of commission and omission stating “That your misleading tweet on May 10, 2021, against the use of Ivermectin had the effect of the State of Tamil Nadu withdrawing Ivermectin from the protocol on May 11, 2021, just a day after the Tamil Nadu government had indicated the same for the treatment of COVID-19 patients.”
65. That the brief did not accuse Swaminathan of misconduct by using her position as a health authority to further the agenda of special interests to maintain an EUA for the lucrative vaccine industry. The brief did not reference the peer-reviewed publications and evidence compiled by the ten-member *Front Line COVID-19 Critical Care Alliance* (FLCCC) group and

<sup>34</sup>

<https://www.cnbsnews.live/state-and-affairs/india-could-sentence-who-chief-scientist-to-death-for-misleading-over-ivermectin-and-killing-indians/>

<sup>35</sup> [https://indianbarassociation.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/LEGAL-NOTICE-FOR-CONTEMPT\\_JUNE-13-2021.pdf](https://indianbarassociation.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/LEGAL-NOTICE-FOR-CONTEMPT_JUNE-13-2021.pdf)

the 65-member *British Ivermectin Recommendation Development* (BIRD) panel headed by WHO consultant and meta-analysis expert Dr. Tess Lawrie.

66. That the brief did not cite US Attorney Ralph C. Lorigo's hospital cases in New York where court orders were required for dying COVID patients to receive the Ivermectin. That in multiple instances of such comatose patients, following the court-ordered Ivermectin, the patients recovered.
67. That Master of Mathematics mathematician from the University of Utah, Kathy Dopp, did not collate and review officially released death rates worldwide<sup>36</sup>, to conclude:  
As of October 10th, 2021, COVID-19 death rates following vaccine rollouts are higher in 70% of the 178 countries for which we obtained vaccination rollout dates and number of total vaccine doses administered. COVID-19 vaccine rollouts have not slowed the rate of serious COVID-19 disease or COVID-19 deaths caused by SARS-CoV-2 viral variants.<sup>37</sup>
68. That the *Australian Bureau of Statistics* has not confirmed that in the months of January and February 2022, there was a 20.5% increase in mortality in Australia.<sup>38</sup>
69. That Master in Mathematics, Kathy Dopp, has not analysed Australia's excess mortality statistics and confirmed that the three areas in which Australia has the highest excess death rates for the 12 months in 2021 and in January 2022 are all consistent with Covid vaccination injuries from mRNA and DNA-adenovirus-vector vaccines, and does not provide links to all medical studies supporting this.<sup>39</sup>
70. That Kathy Dopp has not identified the three areas that have the highest excess death rates are Cancer, Dementia and Diabetes.<sup>40</sup>
71. That Covid vaccines have not been proven to suppress cancer fighting cells, suppress DNA repair mechanisms and resulted many aggressive cancers occurring post-vaccination.<sup>41</sup>
72. That Covid "vaccines" have not been proven to cause various types of Dementia due to the destruction of the blood-brain barrier by the clotting in capillaries surrounding the brain and for anyone who gets long Covid infections due to the reduced immunity after the shots, spike proteins may travel up the Vagus nerve into the brain.<sup>42</sup>
73. That in regard to Diabetes, anyone susceptible to the original SARS-CoV-2 virus is not going to be much more sickened by orders of magnitude greater number of blood clotting, pseudouridine, beefed up synthetic strengthened furrin cleavage site, LNPs, PEG poisons, in the Covid "vaccine" as compared to a much less invasive SARS-CoV-2 infection.<sup>43</sup>
74. That the Australian Government Department of Health report as at 12 May 2022, does not shows 1418 Covid deaths<sup>44</sup> have been reported by aged care providers so far in 2022. That this is not double the amount of deaths postvaccine rollout in 2022 as compared to all of 2020, which was 686 deaths.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations>

<sup>37</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/index.php/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/COVIDdeathRateIncrease2021>

<sup>38</sup> <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/health/causes-death/provisional-mortality-statistics/latest-release>

<sup>39</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/AustralianExcessDeaths2021>

<sup>40</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/AustralianExcessDeaths2021>

<sup>41</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/AustralianExcessDeaths2021>

<sup>42</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/AustralianExcessDeaths2021>

<sup>43</sup> <http://www.kathydopp.info/COVIDinfo/Vaccines/AustralianExcessDeaths2021>

<sup>44</sup>

<https://www.health.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/2022/05/covid-19-outbreaks-in-australian-residential-aged-care-facilities-13-may-2022.pdf> see pg 2

<sup>45</sup> <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2022/may/19/scale-of-aged-care-covid-deaths-laid-bare-as-staff-prepare-to-strike>

75. That in the first 3.5 Months of 2022 Australia has not experienced double the COVID-19 deaths from 2020 & 2021 combined.<sup>46</sup>
76. That Official UK Government reports do not suggest the Triple Vaccinated have been developing Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS) since the turn of the year 2022.<sup>47</sup>
77. That it's not a common misconception that AIDS is only caused by the HIV virus. That AIDS does not have many different causes, and that Covid-19 injections have not been shown to cause AIDS.
78. That UK Government data does not suggest the Triple Vaccinated population in England have been developing AIDS since the beginning of 2022.<sup>48</sup>
79. That official UK Government reports have not also proven that the fully vaccinated have been suffering Anti-body Dependent Enhancement (ADE) since the turn of 2022.<sup>49</sup>
80. That intensive research conducted by health experts throughout the years has not brought to light increasing concerns about "Antibody-Dependent Enhancement" (ADE), a phenomenon where vaccines make the disease far worse by priming the immune system for a potentially deadly overreaction.<sup>50</sup>
81. That official data published by the UK *Health Security Agency* does not strongly suggest the fully vaccinated population in England have been suffering Antibody-Dependent Enhancement since the beginning of 2022. With figures showing the fully jabbed are up to 2 times more likely to be hospitalised with Covid-19, and 2 times more likely to die of Covid-19.<sup>51</sup>
82. That an updated *Cost / Benefit Analysis of Vaccine Fatality Rates versus Covid-19 Fatality Rates by Age Cohort* carried out by Master of Mathematics Kathy Dopp and Jessica Rose PhD with official UK & US data, does not show that Covid-19 and all-cause mortality data by age group reveals risk of covid vaccine-induced fatality is equal to or greater than the risk of covid death for all age groups under 80 years old as of 6 February 2022.<sup>52</sup>

## TAKE NOTICE THAT

1. There is no material evidence, proving beyond reasonable doubt, that COVID-19 "vaccines":-
  - are incapable of harming a Child or Adult, causing physical illness in the short or long term.
  - have undergone rigorous double-blind placebo safety studies.
  - will not cause a Child / adult death or to suffer or develop any adverse reactions including, but not limited to, myocarditis, neurological problems, blood clots, blindness, nerve damage, deafness, autoimmune disease, anaphylaxis, anaphylactoid reactions, allergies, fertility complications, Guillain-Barré Syndrome, etc and/or suffer any other form of harm, complication.
  - provide full and lasting Immunity from either SARS-COV-2 or COVID-19.

<sup>46</sup>

<https://www.trialsitenews.com/a/heavily-vaxxed-australia-first-3.5-months-of-2022-has-double-the-covid-19-deaths-from-2020-2021-combined-b46d9e28>

<sup>47</sup> <https://expose-news.com/2022/04/24/gov-reports-triple-jabbed-developing-a-id-s-since-new-year/>

<sup>48</sup> <https://expose-news.com/2022/04/24/gov-reports-triple-jabbed-developing-a-id-s-since-new-year/>

<sup>49</sup> <https://expose-news.com/2022/04/24/gov-reports-triple-jabbed-developing-a-id-s-since-new-year/>

<sup>50</sup> <https://expose-news.com/2022/04/24/gov-report-fully-vaccinated-suffering-ade-since-new-year/>

<sup>51</sup> <https://expose-news.com/2022/04/24/gov-report-fully-vaccinated-suffering-ade-since-new-year/>

<sup>52</sup> <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1P7DzhlWJNM473B-5ke6xui2WMA4rWyZs/view>

2. If a man/woman/child is injected with COVID-19 “vaccines” due to propaganda put out by you or your organisation, or omission of reporting facts by the same, which falls under your duty of care:
  - You shall be held personally liable in tort on the basis that the injecting of the man/woman/child amounts to the tort of battery. Damages shall be sought, to be paid from you personally.
  - You shall be held personally liable in tort for any harm or illness that arises to said man/woman/child, no matter when the harm or illness becomes known, and damages shall be sought, to be paid from you personally, on the basis that you have acted negligently and failed in your duty of care to that man/woman/child.
  - You shall be held personally liable if a man/woman/child dies after the same, and damages will be sought to be paid from you personally, on the basis that you have acted negligently and failed in your duty of care to said man/woman/child.
3. A survey of 18,500 people showing that those who did not get the COVID-19 vaccine had a lower rate of suffering severe COVID-19 amid the pandemic, was originally reported on by MSM, was subsequently removed, as well as the actual survey results.<sup>53</sup> This is an example of intent to deceive and omitting to report facts.
4. Part of the findings of this survey were that around 40% of respondents reported mental health problems due to the psychological stress of the pandemic. It is suggested that “the mental health burden may be associated more to the human response to the pandemic, rather than psychological, fear-based reactions to any threat posed by the SARS-CoV-2 virus itself. This includes discrimination in the workplace, by peers or by family members, as well as victimisation by states (governments/health authorities) owing to ‘unvaccinated’ status.”<sup>54</sup>
5. This study also stated that much of this disproportionate and discriminatory treatment is likely the result of widespread misunderstandings about, and over-stated benefits of, COVID-19 ‘vaccines’, false claims over societal risks posed by the unvaccinated, media and state propaganda and coercion to ensure high rates of COVID-19 vaccination, institutional mandates, and the desire for in-group identity as explained by social identity theory (Scheepers and Derks, 2016).<sup>55</sup>
6. Receipt of this notice shows that you have been made aware that death or other serious injuries are possible outcomes for injection with the COVID-19 experimental vaccinations, and that you are liable for any harm or death where informed consent is not obtainable due to either propaganda being published, or omission by you/your organisation to report the facts of vaccine injury, death and excess mortality rates since vaccination started in Australia.
7. You are hereby placed on notice that you stand to be held personally and individually responsible for causing foreseeable and preventable harm and death from COVID-19 “vaccines”, and for supporting crimes against humanity, defined as acts that are purposely committed as part of a widespread or systematic policy, directed against civilians, committed in furtherance of state policy.

## I DEMAND THAT

<sup>53</sup> <https://nakedemperor.substack.com/p/disappearing-msm-article-severe-covid>

<sup>54</sup>

[https://web.archive.org/web/20220609133442/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361175995\\_Self-reported\\_outcomes\\_choices\\_and\\_discrimination\\_among\\_a\\_global\\_COVID-19\\_unvaccinated\\_cohort](https://web.archive.org/web/20220609133442/https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361175995_Self-reported_outcomes_choices_and_discrimination_among_a_global_COVID-19_unvaccinated_cohort)

<sup>55</sup>

[https://web.archive.org/web/20220609132151/https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Robert-Verkerk-2/publication/361175995\\_Self-reported\\_outcomes\\_choices\\_and\\_discrimination\\_among\\_a\\_global\\_COVID-19\\_unvaccinated\\_cohort/links/62a0dc94c660ab61f86cb8c5/Self-reported-outcomes-choices-and-discrimination-among-a-global-COVID-19-unvaccinated-cohort.pdf](https://web.archive.org/web/20220609132151/https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Robert-Verkerk-2/publication/361175995_Self-reported_outcomes_choices_and_discrimination_among_a_global_COVID-19_unvaccinated_cohort/links/62a0dc94c660ab61f86cb8c5/Self-reported-outcomes-choices-and-discrimination-among-a-global-COVID-19-unvaccinated-cohort.pdf)

1. You comply with all international human rights conventions and treaties as ratified or adopted by the Australian Parliament.<sup>56</sup>
2. You cease and desist all actions / operations pertaining to publishing of false information regarding the efficacy of wearing of masks and omitting to report on and publish the dangers of wearing them.
3. You cease and desist all actions / operations pertaining to publishing of false information regarding the efficacy of COVID-19 vaccinations, which is serving to coerce persons into taking said vaccines, which are causing injury, harm and death.
4. You cease in publishing false and misleading information regarding alleged SARS-COV2 pandemic, on tv, radio, websites, paraphernalia, social media, newsletters inter alia.
5. You cease omitting to report on and publish vaccine injuries and deaths (and excess mortality since vaccines) which are causing thousands of Australians injury, harm and loss.
6. You cease omitting to report on increased mortality since the vaccination roll-out in Australia, and around the world.

## NOTICE OF DEMAND FOR TENDER TO YOUR INSURERS AND LAWYERS

**I DEMAND** you tender this instrument to your organisation's legal representative and any insurer your principal and parent company/s are required to contract with for liability of potential injuries, as well as to your personal professional indemnity insurer. If you do not understand the content of this communication and choose by your own free will not to tender this communication to your legal representative and insurer, you, your person, and your principal accept full personal, official, and commercial liability for injuries caused by negligent due diligence, improper due process, and other tortious and/or criminal offences.

**I DEMAND** that you provide me with your organisation/s public liability and personal indemnity insurance certificates of currency.

**TAKE NOTICE THAT** failure by you to lawfully and/or legally rebut or refute this Notice and provide any evidence giving full grounds, and provide your insurance certificates of currency, within twenty-eight (28) days of the date of this Notice, it shall be taken that you have no claim in this matter and shall entitle me to investigate legal remedy at your cost and no further notice to you.

*Nemo Est Supra Legis* – No one is above the Law

### **Colossians 3:25**

But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done, and there is no respect of persons.

---

**[insert name of sender]**

Errors and Omissions Excepted  
WITHOUT RECOURSE– NON ASSUMPSIT

---

<sup>56</sup> <https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/commission-general/chart-australian-treaty-ratifications-may-2012-human-rights-your>