Uruguay Judge Demands Government, Pfizer Turn Over Documents as Court Considers Request to Halt COVID Vaccines for Kids

By Megan Redshaw
Global Research, July 07, 2022
Children's Health Defense 6 July 2022

Region: Latin America & Caribbean
Theme: Law and Justice, Science and Medicine

***

Uruguayan government officials and Pfizer were ordered to appear in court Wednesday to provide documents for review regarding vaccine ingredients, adverse effects and contracts shielding the pharma giant from liability.

Uruguayan government officials and Pfizer on Wednesday appeared in court after a judge gave them 48 hours to present detailed information on Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccine while the court considers an injunction request to halt COVID-19 vaccinations for children 5 and older.

Judge Alejandro Recarey of the Administrative Litigation Tribunal used his inquisitorial powers to demand the Uruguayan Ministry of Public Health, State Health Services Administration and the President's Office submit all information regarding the contracts for the purchase of COVID-19 vaccines, including contractual information related to any clauses of civil indemnity or criminal impunity of the suppliers in the event of adverse effects.

According to a court order released on Saturday, Judge Recarey ordered Pfizer and government officials to:

- Provide full and unredacted, certified copies of "each and every one of the purchase contracts (as well as any other related negotiation agreement), of the so-called anti-COVID vaccines that you have signed, own or are simply within your reach."
- Explain whether "these instruments" contain clauses of "civil indemnity and/or criminal impunity of the suppliers regarding the occurrence of possible adverse effects."
- Provide extensive detail about the biochemical composition of "so-called

vaccines against SARS-CoV-2 in supply to the national population, especially the one aimed at children."

- Explain if the "different doses are distributed in batches or differential (different) items," and if so, "clarify for what reason, and based on what criteria, each would be provided to different population levels, whether the drugs in each batch are diverse by their content and how and for whom they would be distinguishable. If it "turns out to be the real existence of different lots," doses of each are "requested for judicial expert examination."

- Specify if the "so-called vaccines" contain messenger RNA by explaining, if necessary, what that means. Explain what "therapeutic or extra therapeutic consequences — adverse or not — [mRNA] can have for the person inoculated with it. It must be specified with regard to the latter, and in a negative hypothesis in terms of alleged damages, if there is indeed — with scientific rigor — the possible safety of the messenger RNA, or if there is simply a lack of information on the point."

- State "very specifically and beyond what has been inquired, it is requested that it be said if it is known to you that those labeled as vaccines contain or may contain nanotechnological elements. Clarifying, if not, whether such a temperament would arise from an effective verification of its absence, or from mere ignorance of the components of the referred 'vaccinal' substances."

- Certify whether the substances contained in the "so-called vaccines" supplied in Uruguay are experimental or not. That is, "explain in full and detail whether they are approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), or equivalent body, according to the usual protocols, or if they have some other type of emergency permission." If this is the case, explain "granted by whom and with what guarantees and based on what regulations."

In short, you "must also respond if you are aware that either the manufacturer and/or supplier, or any academic or governmental body (domestic or foreign), have admitted — in any way that may be — the experimental nature of the aforementioned vaccines."

- Present complete and up-to-date information in your possession about "what is scientifically known — and what is not known — about the effectiveness of those labeled as vaccines" and their possible short, medium and long-term adverse effects.

- "Provide official figures that demonstrate the negative or positive incidence of so-called vaccination in the number of infections and deaths diagnosed with COVID from the beginning of the campaign to date."

- State whether "studies have been carried out to explain the noticeable increase in deaths for COVID-19 since March 2021 or if information is in your possession — with sufficient scientific support and evidence — about it."

- Provide information on the total number of deaths in Uruguay due to COVID-19

since the beginning of the "so-called pandemic," the global average age and how many were for "COVID-19 in an exclusive causal relationship" and how many were "with COVID-19" — that is, with the presence of the virus, but was not the main cause of death.

- "Demonstrate scientifically — with evidence of national or international studies that have been done — whether the status of non-vaccinated poses a health hazard to the entire population or third parties."

If it is the case, two other things will be required: the determination and demonstration of the degree of danger, and the reason that explains why, if this were eventually the case," vaccination would not have been mandated. Prove whether both the vaccinated and unvaccinated infect equally. If they do not, explain what this would be like and in what proportions — and prove what is stated.

- Clarify the reasons for the "lack of preview informed consent, in relation to the act components of what the government itself presents as a vaccination campaign."

- "Detail, with first and last names, the identity of the professional technicians who have directed and direct the aforementioned campaign, or anyone who has provided advice at any level."

Also provide relevant data for their location "for their judicial interrogation, adding to the required information, data about whether any of them are part of any foreign governmental or para governmental organization, or they have worked for one of them in any way, or, where appropriate, manage in a multinational company" focused on healthcare. "Detail, if necessary, the personal names and organizations or companies involved."

- Explain if alternative therapies for COVID-19 have been studied for any variants. If not, clarify why those were not explored. "If positive, give the research results — giving an account of whether those were used in Uruguay or not."

For the latter option, provide the reasons that would have been taken to discard the use of alternative therapies, adding whether or not "you know that they have been used in other countries successfully, still relative, or not."

The order also required Pfizer to state within 48 hours whether it has "admitted, in any area, internal or external to it and its partners, the verification of adverse effects" of its COVID-19 vaccines in children.

> "I applaud Uruguayan judge Recarey for posing many tough questions to Pfizer over its COVID shots and the contracts it imposed on Uruguay," Mary Holland, president of Children's Health Defense (CHD), told The Defender in an email.
>
> "From the beginning, Pfizer has hidden its data and liability-free contracts to avoid liability from the shots," Holland said.

She explained:

> "Many countries, including those in Latin America, have relied on U.S. regulatory agencies in the past to guide health policy. But the U.S. regulatory bodies have failed regarding COVID.
>
> "There is no scientific or ethical justification to authorize COVID shots for children, as some countries, including Denmark, now acknowledge. We know that children are at almost zero risk of dying from COVID. The FDA has extended Emergency Use Authorization for the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine while illegitimately 'approving' Comirnaty, thus engaging in a fraudulent 'bait-and-switch' scheme to avoid all liability while hawking 'approved' vaccines."

Holland said CHD is currently pursuing two lawsuits against the FDA for its arbitrary and capricious decisions on COVID-19 shots, and she is "pleased to see that other countries are stepping into the scientific and legal breach."

> "I hope Pfizer complies with the judge's order, but given its long criminal rap sheet, it remains to be seen," Holland added.

Dr. Salle Lorier on Twitter called Judge Recarey's historic ruling a "judicial Maracanazo," and posted a video explaining the order.

> Fallo historico en Uruguay, un verdadero "Maracanazo judicial";Juez ordena al Gobierno mostrar contrato de las vacunas y múltiples medidas investigativas, como por ejemplo, declaración de autoridades de Pfizer. Video explicativo del fallo del Juez Recarey https://t.co/35tSe599CP
>
> — Dr. Salle Lorier (@sallelorier) July 2, 2022

Although Judge Racarey took it upon himself to review data presented by Pfizer and government officials on COVID-19 vaccines, Uruguay is one of 47 co-sponsoring countries that agreed to the Biden administration's amendments to the World Health Organization's (WHO) 2005 International Health Agreements that attempted to place member states' health sovereignty in the hands of WHO Director-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus and its regional directors.

U.S. judge requires FDA to turn over Pfizer COVID-19 documents

This is not the first time government officials or Pfizer have been required to turn over data regarding COVID-19 vaccines.

A federal judge on Feb. 2 rejected a bid by the FDA, with the support of Pfizer, to delay the court-ordered release of nearly 400,000 pages of documents pertaining to the approval of Pfizer's COVID-19 vaccine.

Federal Judge Mark Pittman of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order requiring the FDA to release redacted versions of the documents in question according to the following disclosure schedule:

- 10,000 pages apiece, due on or before March 1 and April 1, 2022.
- 80,000 pages apiece, to be produced on or before May 2, June 1 and July 1, 2022.

- 70,000 pages to be produced on or before Aug. 1, 2022.
- 55,000 pages per month, on or before the first business day of each month thereafter, until the release of the documents has been completed.

The ruling was part of an ongoing court case that began with a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request filed in August 2021 by Public Health and Medical Professionals for Transparency (PHMPT).

PHMPT, a group of more than 30 medical and public health professionals and scientists from institutions such as Harvard, Yale, and UCLA, in September 2021 filed a lawsuit against the FDA after the agency denied its original FOIA request.

In that request, PHMPT asked the FDA to release "all data and information for the Pfizer vaccine," including safety and effectiveness data, adverse reaction reports, and a list of active and inactive ingredients.

The FDA argued it didn't have enough staff to process the redaction, claiming it could process only 500 pages per month. This would have meant the cache of documents would not be fully released for approximately 75 years.

In his Jan. 6 order, Pittman rejected the FDA's claim and instead required the agency to release 12,000 pages of documents by Jan. 31 and an additional 55,000 pages per month thereafter.

Pfizer responded to the Jan. 6 order with a request to intervene in the case for the "limited purpose of ensuring that information exempt from disclosure under FOIA is adequately protected as FDA complies with this court's order."

Pfizer claimed to support the disclosure of the documents, but asked to intervene in the case to ensure that information legally exempt from disclosure will not be "disclosed inappropriately."

Lawyers for PHMPT, in a brief submitted Jan. 25, asked Pittman to reject Pfizer's motion, prompting the Feb. 2 order.

The first batch of documents produced in Nov. 2021, which totaled a mere 500 pages, revealed more than 1,200 vaccine-related deaths within the first 90 days following the release of the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine.

Since then, thousands of documents released as a result of Pittman's court order raise serious questions about the data used by U.S. regulatory agencies to justify the authorization and approval of Pfizer and BioNTech's COVID-19 vaccines.

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Megan Redshaw *is a staff attorney for Children's Health Defense and a reporter for The Defender.*

Featured image is from CHD

Articles by: **Megan Redshaw**