

**Attn: School Board Trustees, Superintendents, Employees and Officers**

**Re: Vaccinating Teachers/School Staff and the Letter from the British Columbia School Trustee Association**

In a letter<sup>1</sup> to its members addressing the Notices of Liability the BCSTA provides false information when advising that "trustees, employees and officers of a board are statutorily immunized from claims against them personally." Section 94 of the School Act was referenced but only in part.

The BCSTA neglected to include Section 94 (2) and (4) which defines when a defence is NOT provided and a board is NOT absolved from personal liability. According to the named Sections, trustees, officers, or employees of the board are not absolved of liability for any injuries sustained by a person due to dishonesty, gross negligence, malicious or wilful misconduct, or any injury arising out of a tort.

#### **Division 4 -- Limitation of Actions and Indemnification Interpretation**

##### **Actions against board**

94 (1) No action for damages lies or may be instituted against a trustee, an officer, or an employee of a board for anything said or done or omitted to be said or done by him or her in the performance or intended performance of his or her duty or the exercise of his or her power or for any alleged neglect or default in the performance or intended performance of the duty or the exercise of the power.

(2) Subsections (1) and (1.1) do not provide a defence if

- (a) the trustee, officer, employee, or volunteer has, in relation to the conduct that is the subject matter of the action, been guilty of dishonesty, gross negligence or malicious or **wilful** misconduct, or
- (b) the cause of action is libel or slander.

(4) Subsections (1), (1.1) and (3) do not absolve a board from vicarious liability arising out of a **tort** committed by a trustee, officer, or employee of the board, a student, or a volunteer for which the board would have been liable had subsections (1), (1.1) and (3) not been in force.

**What is Wilful Misconduct?** Conduct that is either intentional or committed under circumstances exhibiting a reckless disregard for the safety of others, such as a failure after knowledge of impending danger to exercise ordinary care or a failure to discover the dangers through recklessness or carelessness.

**What is Tort Law?** Tort law provides compensation to individuals who have been injured due to physical, psychological or emotional distress by the wrongdoing of others, whether through negligence or intention. Types of tort includes battery and assault and is an indictable, criminal offense.

Intentionally coercing people into taking a harmful and deadly experimental injection, under threat of losing their job, qualifies as an indictable, criminal tort offense.

The School Boards are being instructed by the government to make the decision regarding teachers being injected with the experimental gene therapy referred to as a COVID-19 vaccine. This is opening up the Trustees to personal liability as outlined in Section 94 (2)(4) of the School Act.

The School Board Superintendents have already been served a Notice of Liability fully advising them of the harms associated with this injection, the criminal code violations associated to forcing or coercing anyone

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://schools.canada.com/wp-content/uploads/NOI-Educators-BCSTA-Letter-to-all-Trustees-Notice-of-Liability-Letters.pdf>

to take the 'vaccine' (or risk losing their income, medical and pension), as well as the blatant violations to the Privacy Act, the Constitution, Charter of Rights and Freedoms and International Agreements.

Legal action has commenced against the BC and federal government<sup>2</sup>. The BC Minister of Education, Jennifer Whiteside, is named as a defendant. As a result, Ms. Whiteside understands the threat of liability associated with mandating and coercing employees to take the vaccine and, therefore, is putting the onus on the School Boards to implement the vaccine mandate.

It is the responsibility of every Canadian citizen to respect the "guaranteed" rights of others and to know and uphold the law.

According to Section 52(1) of the Constitution Act, 1982, any law that is inconsistent with the Constitution is of no force and effect. There is no law in Canada legislating that anyone must be vaccinated. In fact, vaccines cannot be mandated in Canada because the Constitution protects the guaranteed right of the individual to decide what happens to their body.

In addition to this letter, you are being served an official and personal Notice of Liability. By attempting to enforce a vaccine mandate you are in violation of the law and your actions will be met with a human rights complaint, civil litigation, and/or potential criminal charges against you.

If action against you is pursued, the Courts will see that every effort has been made to warn you

It is highly recommended that you vote against the vaccine mandate.

Yours truly,

Name: Katie Capadoura

Signature: K Capadoura

Date: Nov 4, 21

<sup>2</sup> [https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/21\\_08-17-FILED-Notice-of-Civil-Claim-Action4Canada.pdf](https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/21_08-17-FILED-Notice-of-Civil-Claim-Action4Canada.pdf)

**“Vaccine” Notice of Liability  
Elected/Appointed Officials**

On Notice To: Ms. Charlene McKay

**Re: COVID-19 injections recommended, encouraged, advertised, mandated, facilitated, or incentivised in any way by you to the public**

**This is your official and personal Notice of Liability.**

**You are unlawfully practicing medicine by prescribing, recommending, facilitating, advertising, mandating, incentivising, and using coercion to insist citizens, including minors, submit to ANY vaccine including the experimental gene therapy injections for COVID-19, commonly referred to as a “vaccine”.**

**Experimental vaccines are only authorized to be used under an official State of Emergency and only if there are no other adequate, approved or available alternatives. The Federal Government did not enact a State of Emergency for COVID-19 and effective alternatives including Vitamin D, Ivermectin and Hydroxychloroquine have been available from the onset but their use was prohibited.**

The emergency measures are based on the claim that we are experiencing a "public health emergency". There is no evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact, the evidence indicates that we are experiencing a rate of infection consistent with a normal influenza season<sup>1</sup>.

The purported increase in “cases” is a direct consequence of increased testing through the inappropriate use of the PCR instrument to diagnose so-called COVID-19. It has been well established that the PCR test was never designed or intended as a diagnostic tool and is not an acceptable instrument to measure this so-called pandemic. Its inventor, Kary Mullis, has clearly indicated that the PCR testing device was never created to test for coronaviruses<sup>2</sup>. Mullis warns that, “the PCR Test can be used to find almost anything, in anybody. If you can amplify one single molecule, then you can find it because that molecule is nearly in every single person”.

In light of this warning, the current PCR test utilization, set at higher amplifications, is producing up to 97% false positives<sup>3</sup>. Therefore, any imposed emergency measures that are based on PCR testing are unwarranted, unscientific, and quite possibly fraudulent. An international consortium of life-science scientists has also detected 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level in a 3-peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-2<sup>4</sup>.

In November 2020, a Portuguese court ruled that PCR tests are unreliable<sup>5</sup>. On December 14, 2020, the WHO admitted the PCR Test has a ‘problem’ at high amplifications as it detects dead cells from old viruses, giving a false positive<sup>6</sup>. Feb 16, 2021, BC Health Officer Bonnie Henry, admitted PCR tests are unreliable<sup>7</sup>. On April 8, 2021, the Austrian court ruled the PCR was unsuited for COVID testing<sup>8</sup>. On April 8, 2021, a German Court ruled against PCR testing stating, “the test cannot provide any information on whether a person is infected with an active pathogen or not, because the test cannot distinguish between “dead” matter and living matter”<sup>9</sup>. On May 8, 2021, the Swedish Public Health Agency stopped PCR Testing for the same reason<sup>10</sup>. On May 10<sup>th</sup>, 2021, Manitoba’s Chief Microbiologist and Laboratory Specialist, Dr. Jared Bullard testified under cross-examination in a trial before the court of the Queen's Bench in Manitoba, that PCR test results do not verify infectiousness and were never intended to be used to diagnose respiratory illnesses<sup>11</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.bitchute.com/video/nQgq0BxXfZ4f>

<sup>2</sup> <https://rumble.com/vhu4rz-kary-mullis-inventor-of-the-pcr-test.html>

<sup>3</sup> <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491/5912603>

<sup>4</sup> <https://commandrostenreview.com/report/>

<sup>5</sup> <https://unitynewsnetwork.co.uk/portuguese-court-rules-pcr-tests-unreliable-quarantines-unlawful-media-blackout/>

<sup>6</sup> <https://principia-scientific.com/who-finally-admits-covid19-pcr-test-has-a-problem/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://rumble.com/vhww4d-bc-health-officer-admits-pcr-test-is-unreliable.html>

<sup>8</sup> <https://greatameindia.com/austria-court-pcr-test/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://2020news.de/sensationsurteil-aus-weimar-keine-masken-kein-abstand-tests-mehr-fuer-schueler/>

<sup>10</sup> <https://tapnewswire.com/2021/05/sweden-stops-pcr-tests-as-covid19-diagnosis/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://www.jccf.ca/Manitoba-chief-microbiologist-and-laboratory-specialist-56-of-positive-cases-are-not-infectious/>

Based on this compelling and factual information, the emergency use of the COVID-19 experimental injections are not required or recommended.

**Whereas:**

1. The Nuremberg Code<sup>12</sup>, to which Canada is a signatory, states that voluntary informed consent is essential before performing medical experiments on human beings. It also confirms that the person involved should have the legal capacity to give consent, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved so as to enable him/her to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This requires, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experiment's subject, that there should be made known to him/her the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonable to be expected; and the effects upon his/her health or person which may possibly come from participation in the experiment.
2. The treatments being marketed as COVID-19 "vaccines", are still in Phase III clinical trials until 2023<sup>13</sup>, and hence qualify as a medical experiment. People taking these treatments are enrolled as test-subjects and many are unaware that the injections are not actual vaccines as they do not contain a virus but instead an experimental gene therapy.
3. Most vaccines are trialed for at least 5-10 years<sup>14</sup>. COVID-19 injections have only been in trials for just over a year so there is no long-term safety data available and therefore fully informed consent is not possible.
4. No other coronavirus vaccine (i.e., MERS, SARS-1) has ever been approved for market due to antibody-dependent enhancement, which results in severe illness and death in animal models<sup>15</sup>.
5. Numerous doctors, scientists, and medical experts are issuing dire warnings about the short and long-term effects of COVID-19 injections, including but not limited to, death, blood clots, infertility, miscarriages, Bell's Palsy, cancer, inflammatory conditions, autoimmune disease, early-onset dementia, convulsions, anaphylaxis, inflammation of the heart<sup>16</sup>, and antibody-dependent enhancement leading to death; this includes in children ages 12-17 years old<sup>17</sup>.

Dr. Byram Bridle, a pro-vaccine Associate Professor of Viral Immunology at the University of Guelph, gives a terrifying warning of the harms of the experimental treatments in a new peer reviewed scientifically published research study<sup>18</sup> on COVID-19 shots. The Spike Protein added to the "vaccine" gets into the blood and circulates throughout the individuals over several days post-vaccination. It then accumulates in the tissues such as the spleen, bone marrow, liver, adrenal glands, testes, and of great concern, it accumulates in high concentrations in the ovaries. Dr. Bridle notes that they "have known for a long time that the Spike Protein is a pathogenic protein, it is a toxin, and can cause damage if it gets into blood circulation". The study confirms the combination is causing clotting, neurological damage, bleeding, heart problems, etc.

There is also a high concentration of the Spike Protein getting into breast milk, and subsequent reports of suckling infants developing bleeding disorders in the gastrointestinal tract. There are further warnings that this injection will render children infertile, and that people who have been vaccinated should NOT donate blood.

6. Minors are at nearly zero percent risk of contracting or transmitting this respiratory illness and are, instead, buffers which help others build their immune system. The overall survival rate of minors is 99.997%.<sup>19</sup> In spite of these facts, the government is pushing the experimental treatment with the tragic outcome of a high incidence of injury and death;

<sup>12</sup> [https://media.rghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ\\_No\\_7070\\_Volume\\_313\\_The\\_Nuremberg\\_Code.pdf](https://media.rghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ_No_7070_Volume_313_The_Nuremberg_Code.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728?term=NCT04368728&draw=2&rank=1>

<sup>14</sup> <https://hillnotes.ca/2020/06/23/covid-19-vaccine-research-and-development/>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21645515.2016.1177688>

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/coronavirus/connecticut-confirms-at-least-18-cases-of-apparent-heart-problems-in-young-people-after-covid-19-vaccination/2494534/>

<sup>17</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/vaers-data-reports-injuries-12-to-17-year-olds-more-than-triple/>

<sup>18</sup> <https://onny.fm/shows/on-point-with-alex-pierson/new-peer-reviewed-study-on-covid-19-vaccines-sugge>

<sup>19</sup> <https://online.anyflip.com/inblw/ufbs/mobile/index.html?s=08%20> (pg. 9)

7. According to Health Canada's Summary Basis of Decision, updated May 20, 2021, the trials have not proven that the COVID-19 treatments prevent infection or transmission. The Summary also reports that both Moderna and Pfizer identified that there are six areas of missing (limited/no clinical data) information: “use in paediatric (age 0-18)”, “use in pregnant and breastfeeding women”, “long-term safety”, “long-term efficacy” including “real-world use”, “safety and immunogenicity in subjects with immune-suppression”, and concomitant administration of non-COVID vaccines”.

Under the Risk Management plan section of the Summary Basis of Decision<sup>20</sup>, it includes a statement based on clinical and non-clinical studies that “one important potential risk was identified being vaccine-associated enhanced disease, including VAERD (vaccine-associated enhanced respiratory disease)”. In other words, the shot increases the risk of disease and side-effects, and weakens immunity toward future SARS related illness.

The report specifically states, “the possibility of vaccine-induced disease enhancement after vaccination against SARS-CoV-2 has been flagged as a potential safety concern that requires particular attention by the scientific community, including the World Health Organization (WHO), the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) and the International Coalition of Medicines Regulatory Authorities (ICMRA)”<sup>21</sup>.

8. As reported to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) in the United States, there have been more deaths from the COVID-19 injections in five months (Dec. 2020 – May 2021) than deaths recorded in the last 23 years from all vaccines combined<sup>22</sup>. It is further reported that only one percent of vaccine injuries are reported to VAERS<sup>23</sup>, compounded by several month's delay in uploading the adverse events to the VAERS database<sup>24</sup>.

On September 17, 2021, VAERS data release for the period December 14, 2020 to September 10, 2021, showed 701,561 adverse events reports following COVID-19 injections, including 14,925 deaths and 91,523 serious injuries. Of that total, 19,827 adverse injury reports were among 12–17-year old's with 19 reported deaths and included 488 reports of myocarditis from the Pfizer jab and 106 reports of blood clotting disorders, again from the Pfizer injection<sup>25</sup>.

Dr. McCullough, a highly cited COVID doctor, came to the stunning conclusion that the government was “...scrubbing unprecedented numbers of injection-related-deaths”. He further added, “...with a typical new drug at about five deaths, unexplained deaths, we get a black-box warning, your listeners would see it on TV, saying it may cause death. And then at about 50 deaths it's pulled off the market”<sup>26</sup>.

9. Canada's Adverse Events Following Immunization (AEFI) is a passive reporting system and is not widely promoted to the public, and is extremely time-consuming for physicians to use hence, many adverse events are going unreported there.

#### 10. **Safe and effective treatments and preventive measures already exist for COVID-19 yet the government is prohibiting their use**<sup>27 28</sup>.

Messaging from individuals including yourself, has placed pressure on the public to receive injections in exchange for the loosening of implemented lockdowns, restrictions, and infringements of various freedoms. This includes an inability to make income or see family members as a result of these restrictions, which adversely affects people's ability to meet basic needs and care for themselves and their families.

<sup>20</sup> <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/14760584.2020.1800463>

<sup>21</sup> <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/Summary-Basis-of-Decision-COVID-19-Vaccine-Moderna-Health-Canada.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> <https://vaccines.mma.ca/2021/CDC-death-toll-following-experimental-Covid-injections-now-at-4863-more-than-23-previous-years-of-recorded-vaccine-deaths-according-to-vaers/>

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.lewrockwell.com/2019/10/no\\_author/harvard-medical-school-professors-uncover-a-hard-to-swallow-truth-about-vaccines/](https://www.lewrockwell.com/2019/10/no_author/harvard-medical-school-professors-uncover-a-hard-to-swallow-truth-about-vaccines/)

<sup>24</sup> <http://vaxoutcomes.com/thelatestreport/>

<sup>25</sup> <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/vaers-cdc-covid-deaths-vaccine-injuries/>

<sup>26</sup> <https://leohohmann.com/2021/04/30/highly-cited-covid-doctor-comes-to-stunning-conclusion-govt-scrubbing-unprecedented-numbers-of-injection-related-deaths/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/study-finds-84-fewer-hospitalizations-for-patients-treated-with-controversial-drug-hydroxychloroquine>

<sup>28</sup> <https://alethonews.com/2021/05/26/five-recently-published-randomized-controlled-trials-confirm-major-statistically-significant-benefits-of-ivermectin-against-covid-19/>

You have incentivised the receiving of injections, measuring the public's compliance against the degree, prevalence and severity of lockdowns and restrictions. This is a form of coercion as it makes clear specific consequences of non-compliance, which includes continued difficulty to make income, to maintain businesses, to maintain living standards and meet personal/familial responsibilities due to the continuation of these lockdowns and restrictions. This has also impacted the medical and care home system where family members have been unable to see other family members in the care of these systems, due to the nature of lockdown measures.

As for children, they have been exposed to unprecedented amounts of fear, instability, shaming, psychological trauma, bullying, and segregation through the COVID-19 measures and are therefore, even more susceptible to being influenced by those in authority than their developmental stage would usually entail. Schools include vaccine and COVID-19 "vaccine" curriculum, which is politically and medically biased, prejudicial, and is a form of undue influence on any minor child.

The curriculum, and indeed all government narratives, exclude full disclosure of the growing risks (adverse reactions and death) of the experimental injection, and the emerging evidence that the shots do not provide protection, as claimed. Informed consent with FULL disclosure is mandatory and yet, due to lack of research data, "full" disclosure cannot be provided.

Further to this, suggestions/recommendations from you that people take COVID-19 injections are being made without adequate training and credentials that would qualify you to make 'medical' decisions or recommendations for other people. These recommendations/suggestions have also been made in complete contradiction to statements, recommendations, and findings of qualified medical practitioners, many of which are listed in this document. Among these 'qualified' individuals are those who have made clear certain medical consequences that have resulted from the receiving of COVID-19 injections, meaning recommendation from 'medically unqualified' people such as yourself, have placed pressure on the public to receive an injection that might (according to medical specialists) jeopardize their health by harming or even killing them.

Your actions may further constitute breach of trust and deception.

Under the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act of Canada*<sup>29</sup>, a crime against humanity means, among other things, murder, any other inhumane act or omission that is committed against any civilian population or any identifiable group and that, at the time and in the place of its commission, constitutes a crime against humanity according to customary international law, conventional international law, or by virtue of its being criminal according to the general principles of law are recognized by the community of nations, whether or not it constitutes a contravention of the law in force at the time and in the place of its commission. The *Act* also confirms that every person who conspires or attempts to commit, **is an accessory after the fact**, in relation to, or counsels in relation to, a crime against humanity, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for life.

Under sections 265 and 266 of the Criminal Code of Canada<sup>30</sup>, a person commits an assault when, without the consent of another person, he applies force intentionally to that other person, directly or indirectly. Everyone who commits an assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Based on the *Genetic Non-Discrimination Act, Bill S-201*<sup>31</sup>, it is an indictable offence to force anyone to take an DNA/RNA test or deny any service, employment, or education opportunity to anyone who refuses to take such a test. The punishment is a fine not exceeding \$1,000,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both.

---

<sup>29</sup> <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-45.9/page-1.html>

<sup>30</sup> <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/page-57.html#docCont>

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/bill/S-201/royal-assent>

It is a further violation of the Canadian Criminal Code,<sup>32</sup> to endanger the life of another person. Sections 216, 217, 217.1 and 221.

#### **Duty of persons undertaking acts dangerous to life**

**Sec. 216:** Everyone who undertakes to administer surgical or medical treatment to another person or to do any other lawful act that may endanger the life of another person is, except in cases of necessity, under a legal duty to have and to use reasonable knowledge, skill and care in so doing.

R.S., c. C-34, s. 198

#### **Duty of persons undertaking acts**

**Sec. 217:** Everyone who undertakes to do an act is under a legal duty to do it if an omission to do the act is or may be dangerous to life.

#### **Duty of persons directing work**

**Sec. 217.1:** Everyone who undertakes, or has the authority, to direct how another person does work or performs a task is under a legal duty to take reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm to that person, or any other person, arising from that work or task.

#### **Causing bodily harm by criminal negligence**

**Sec. 221:** Every person who by criminal negligence causes bodily harm to another person is guilty of  
(a) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than 10 years; or,  
(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Domestically, in the seminal decision of *Hopp v Lepp*, [1980] 2 SCR 192,<sup>33</sup> the Supreme Court of Canada determined that cases of non-disclosure of risks and medical information fall under the law of negligence. Hopp also clarified the standard of informed consent and held that, even if a certain risk is only a slight possibility which ordinarily would not be disclosed, but which carries serious consequences, such as paralysis or death, the material risk must be revealed to the patient.

The duty of disclosure for informed consent is rooted in an individual's right to bodily integrity and respect for patient autonomy. In other words, a patient has the right to understand the consequences of medical treatment regardless of whether those consequences are deemed improbable, and have determined that, although medical opinion can be divided as to the level of disclosure required, the standard is simple, "A Reasonable Person Would Want to Know the Serious Risks, Even if Remote." *Hopp v Lepp*, supra; *Bryan v Hicks*, 1995 CanLII 172 (BCCA); *British Columbia Women's Hospital Center*, 2013 SCC 30.<sup>34</sup>

**Vaccination is voluntary in Canada**<sup>35</sup>. Even if the government attempts to mandate it, there is no law, nor can there be, as it is a violation of Human Rights, International Agreements, etc. Yet, as already mentioned in this document, some federal, provincial, municipal officials have incentivised the taking of COVID-19 injections, even suggesting that lockdowns and lockdown measures will not end until enough of the population has received these injections. This is despite the negative impacts lockdowns have had on the health and well-being of the citizenry. Officials are not only infringing on human rights, but they are also putting themselves personally at risk of a civil lawsuit for damages and potential imprisonment by attempting to impose these experimental injections on citizens, including minors. Canadian law has long recognized that individuals have the right to control what happens to their bodies, law which is being directly infringed upon by these officials.

<sup>32</sup> <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/page-51.html#docCont>

<sup>33</sup> <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2553/index.do>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/2013/2013scc30/2013scc30.html?resultIndex=1>

<sup>35</sup> [https://web.archive.org/web/20080414131846/http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/ccdr-rmtc/97vol23/23s4/23s4b\\_e.html](https://web.archive.org/web/20080414131846/http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/ccdr-rmtc/97vol23/23s4/23s4b_e.html)

The citizens of Canada are protected under the medical and legal ethics of express informed consent, and are entitled to the full protections guaranteed under:

- **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**<sup>36</sup> (1982) Section 2a, 2b, 7, 8, 9, 15.
- **Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights**<sup>37</sup> (2005)
- **Nuremberg Code**<sup>38</sup> (1947)
- **Helsinki Declaration**<sup>39</sup> (1964, Revised 2013) Article 25, 26

All Canadian law, contrary to misinformation spread by the WHO, does not allow for “implied consent.” The Mature Minor doctrine cannot override the wishes and consent of the parents outside of the emergency threat of imminent harm or death. Vaccinations do not fall under the Mature Minor doctrine<sup>40</sup>.

In conclusion, administration of vaccinations is defined as a “medical procedure”. Therefore, you have no authority or jurisdiction to prescribe medical treatments and you must cease and desist or be held personally, civilly, and criminally liable for any injuries or deaths that may occur as a result of recommending, encouraging, advertising, mandating, facilitating, incentivising, coercing, or administering ANY vaccine including the experimental COVID-19 injections to members of the public, including myself, and/or including minors.

Name (print): Katie Capadonea

Signature: KCapadonea

Date: Nov 4 . 21

Source: [action4canada.com](http://action4canada.com)

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/how-rights-protected/guide-canadian-charter-rights-freedoms.html>

<sup>37</sup> <https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/bioethics-and-human-rights>

<sup>38</sup> <http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/>

<sup>39</sup> <https://www.wma.net/what-we-do/medical-ethics/declaration-of-helsinki/>

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.bitchute.com/video/WSqSPiv1onXt/>