

Transcript: A sequence of legal events - with Anna De Buisseret, 30 October 2021
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ScC0sSYuDsQ>

In the transcript below, words in *italic* are those of the interviewer and those in normal type are Anna De Buisseret's, E&OE:

00:34 *Hi. So, we're live in London for the Children's Health Defence. We've been at the Medical Freedom March today and I bumped into Anna De Buisseret a senior UK lawyer and I'm hoping that she's going to give us a few minutes to talk about the legal challenges in the UK and go to the notice of liability.*

00:53 Right. Hi Anna, hi everybody. Thank you for giving me a platform. As Anna says I'm manageability I'm a senior UK lawyer I've been practicing law for about 26/7 years, studying it for over 30 and I've been working with a team of UK lawyers and international lawyers now for about a year. We've been drilling down into the legal analysis, the evidential analysis working with experts from all around the world hearing their evidence about what's happening – so medical experts, scientific experts - and as I say what the legal analysis is I that this is crimes against humanity that are being committed, it is genocide, it's biowarfare and that's the view of senior lawyers from around the world

01:43 So, these are lawyers from America, from Canada. From Australia, from New Zealand, from Czechoslovakia, from Belgium, from Austria. We've all found each other. And, as I say, conducted extensive analysis. You know we're literally working 12 hours a day, seven days a week. Multiple zoom meetings. And it's really quite disturbing because actually when you hear lawyers from around the world say exactly the same thing, you know, as I've said to people: 'we're either all stupid' - but how do you practice for that length of time being stupid – or, 'we're all mad' - again the same point - or 'we're all senior lawyers who are capable of reading the law understanding it applying it'. And you know most of us on the front line are litigators so this is what we do. We look at the evidence, we look at the law and we bring cases to sort it out and uphold the rule of law. So that is us, all being peer reviewed by each other.

02:37 What we're doing is in various jurisdictions legal cases are being amounted so various judicial reviews of the vaccine roll out for children are being mounted. All around the world. In the UK there's a current judicial review we asked for an injunction to stop the roll out but the judge, Mr Justice Lay, said that you know it had already started so he wasn't going to grant an injunction. But he has ordered the government to produce evidence to confirm that this won't be harmful. And that you know it is all scientifically sound. Which of course ...

[Inaudible]

03:13 Well good question. I asked for an update last night from the legal team who are actually running the trial and unfortunately, I haven't had an update. So, I thought,

my recollection was, they were given 14 days and I would have thought the 14 days is up by now.

03:26 Okay. But I'm also working with the Malaysian team. They had a judicial review - unfortunately same thing. It's almost as if they're reading from a script "question mark." But the injunction was denied. It's going to appeal.

03:40 And, you know, us lawyers are helping each other with our legal submissions etc and we're swapping affidavits. So, what we're hoping is that in various jurisdictions these laws will be tested, the evidence will be attested. And obviously upheld in certain jurisdictions. But the problem we have is that we can't cherry-pick the judge that we're in front of. So, we don't know who we're going to be in front of. It's a huge amount of work to bring it to trial. Once you're in the trial process you're limited as to what you can say and do. It takes so long for a judgment to happen, that even if it goes in our favour, by that time thousands, millions of people are being injected, people are dying.

04:30 So one of the other ways that we're tackling this is by identifying who the perpetrators are of the harm that's being caused. So, for those of you who don't understand: we are a common law jurisdiction in this country and lots of countries around the world claim their jurisdiction from the UK. And the common law general principle is do no harm, first do no harm. And what that means is that you don't get to harm anybody's: person, property, liberty, etc. And that is a constitutional duty to act to prevent harm. Omitting to act is as guilty as acting to cause harm.

05:02 So what we're doing is we're identifying who is injecting people, who's masking them, who's testing them, who is breaching the body and bodily and psychiatric integrity of the individual. Because again under common law voluntary "*suprema lex*" that over his or own mind or body the individual is sovereign. And nobody gets to derogate from that fundamental inalienable human right. We are all sovereign. We are all equal in the eyes of God. We're all equal under the rule of law. No one is above it. And a fundamental maximum of law is that you have sovereignty over your own mind and body. Nobody gets to break that. Not even in times of public emergency threatening the life of the nation. There is no right to derogate from the fundamental right to life, from the right not to be tortured or to receive cruel inhumane or degrading treatment. Not to have your right to privacy and your right to family life affected. Those rights cannot be derogated from - even in war.

06:03 The only time it's lawful is if it's in a lawful act of war. Well, when you read the war conventions what mains and methods of warfare are not unlimited. You cannot, for example, run a campaign of terror against the occupied enemy. You cannot conduct live human experiments, give people medical treatment without their informed consent voluntarily given. That is against the law - even in wartime.

06:31 So the idea that a bunch of bureaucrats in 2020/2021 get to come along and set aside our rule of law - claiming there's a public health emergency - is not legal. It's not lawful, it's not moral, it's not ethical. So, what we're doing is identifying people who

are breaking the law and we're serving them with a notice of liability which says to the individual: 'you personally are causing harm. You personally are in breach of, not only the common law, but the international treaties - the European conventions, UK domestic law'.

07:04 And we're saying to people is 'you are individually accountable and liable in your personal capacity - criminally and civilly. There is nowhere to run there is nowhere to hide. No one is going to defend you because the law says you must uphold the law, you must not cause harm and you are personally liable'.

07:24 So what I've done is we've drafted a notice of liability. It runs to 170 odd pages. And in this what you do is you set out: the name of the person, who they're acting as so, for example, I've just used the name Jane Brown acting as, for example, head teacher of the school; name and address; and, then whoever else is involved in perpetrating these crimes. And what we do is we set out the law so the first one being *Primum non nocere* is 'first do no harm'. You have a duty of care. You have legal, lawful, moral and ethical requirement to obtain freely informed consent.

08:03 And then I set out, literally there are pages and pages and pages of, the law. Including, for example: the Nuremberg code; part one of the schedule Medicine for Human Use Clinical Trials Regulations 2004; the Declaration of Helsinki; the Obiora Convention; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. And, I read this out to you earlier, can I just read the preamble? I just want to read a little bit of the preamble which says:

08:34 Whereas recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom justice and peace in the world, whereas disregard and contempt for human rights have resulted in barbarous acts which have outraged the conscience of mankind - bearing in mind this is 1948, right, and the advent of a world in which human beings shall enjoy freedom of speech 'note that Reuters and Facebook' and all the other platforms who are trying to censor us - and belief and freedom from fear and want has been proclaimed as the highest aspiration of the common purpose. Now, this is the most important point. Whereas it is essential if man is not compelled to have recourse as a last resort to rebellion against tyranny and oppression that human rights should be protected by the rule of law.

09:32 And it goes on and sets out article one, all humans are born free and equal in dignity and rights. Article one of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights says all peoples have the right to determination by virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic social and cultural development. And article two everyone is entitled to the rights and freedom set out in the declaration. Article three everyone has the right to life liberty and security of person and so it goes on and explains that those articles from the universal declaration of human rights are enshrined in multiple human rights treaties and conventions international, European and uk.

10:10 So it sets it all out all of those laws that, all of those rights, says that there's no right to derogate, as I've said. And then it talks about the evidence, about the fact that there is no public health emergency on, the evidence there are alternative treatments, there are early treatments that are being denied to people. I set out the evidence of where, for example, there's been a 70% reduction in mortality in countries where they've allowed hydroxychloroquine where ivermectin was used in India. The most prominent examples include the areas of Delhi, Uttar Pradesh etc. Cases have dropped by 98, 97, 94% - Uttar Pradesh is Covid free. So, I set out pages and pages of the evidence that's given from bold experts, open letters call for it to be stopped. Pages and pages of it and then it sets out the legal position which is that: you don't get to break the law.

11:06 And it sets out the contractual provisions and in fact they've got given an oath of office they have a duty of care: you are accountable. The GMC guidance the NMC guidance. There's a call for evidence - 45 points of evidence that needs to be fulfilled because the burden of evidence, the burden of proof, rather, is on those claiming the right to derogate to prove that it's necessary, it's proportionate, it's evidence-based, it's reasonable, it's rational, it's the least restrictive measures. Paragraph 58 of the Siracusa Principles specifically states that you don't get to do this, right? So, this sets out all of that and says to people: 'you will be held responsible'. Now, that's very powerful because once people realize that they are going to be personally held responsible they then have to stop. So, it's a cease and desist as well.

12:04 Absolutely. So, thank you for explaining all of that and showing us. Does that mean that if somebody was to serve a vaccination center or a school that would cover everybody within that, that's operating?

12:12 Yeah basically. As I say, the person is injecting someone is committing the actual act. Anyone who's facilitating that promoting it, marketing, is aiding and abetting. If they're silent they are complicit. And so, as I say, you have a constitutional duty to act to prevent harm. Staying silence not an option.

12:36 Thank you and do they all need to be named on there or ...?

12:40 Yes, they do because it's the individual living man or woman. Yeah. So, when somebody would be serving it, you would have to take this

12:47 Yes yeah.

12:50 Yeah and they have to give them because any nurse, for example under the NMC code, doctor has to state who they are. They have to give their personal identification number they're required to.

13:02 Okay. And do they have to get back to you?

13:04 Yes. 14 days is set out in here. And the beauty of this is, it contains an affidavit. And now an affidavit, for people who don't know, is a statement of truth to the best of your knowledge and beliefs, so help me God. And what that is, is a solemn oath that what you are saying is the best of truth, it's the best to your knowledge of truth. To the best of your knowledge and belief, sorry I'm tired folks, and the point about that is that you swear that as an oath in front of a commissioner for oaths. Now, unless someone can rebut everything you've said in their own affidavit - their own statement of truth so help them God - your affidavit stands. So, this notice of liability includes an affidavit which says everything in here is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. And unless they can rebut that with their own evidence and not just to say things like 'oh, you know, we haven't got time to answer' or you know, 'give it's not going to stand'. And so, the problem is that for people who are perpetrating this they cannot give that affidavit. They cannot say that they can rebut 175 pages of law and evidence.

14:11 So when would we be expecting to hear?

14:12 Well, for example, I think it was the association of teachers said that 79 percent of schools have been served. And the Dorset schools have pulled back because they've been served lots of notices. There's a team in Chester who are currently getting an arrest warrant out for a headmaster, that school was served in the summer with notice. They now have evidence that a 12-year-old girl was injected without her informed consent - she was not told the material risks, she was not showing the yellow card. She took it because she was told she couldn't go on holiday with her grandmother without it. So, she did it under duress and wasn't informed. She was 12. She has been experimented on with an experimental novel genetic treatment and didn't even know that's a crime. If she suffers harm from that then the individual who's injected her, as well as the school who's facilitated it, are on the face of it - guilty of crimes and civil offences. So, the police have been engaged. They've also been served notice and you know it's now going to this criminal prosecution service; crime reference being obtained.

15:20 Well, not for this one at the moment. I'm aware of but there's another family whose child has died and they have obtained a crime reference. So clearly if one set of police are giving a crime reference for the same sessions. And the fact is on the evidence it's wounding with intent. Under section 20 of the offences against the person at the moment you pierce someone's skin, that's a wound. It's only lawful if they've consented lawful. Consent if they haven't you've committed the crime of wounding them and you intended to do it because you intended to stick the needle in. So, anything that flows from that is your personal liability anyone who's facilitated that. So, people have to understand that they're on the wrong side of the law and on the wrong side of history. And for people who say to me I'm threatening them - I am not threatening them. I am a messenger. I am reading the law I'm telling people what the law says. It's the law that's threatening them.

16:19 The international military tribunal judgments of the Nuremberg trials set out very clearly what the law is. I invite anyone to read those judgments. They are critical

reading and they clearly say you are responsible for your own actions and omissions. You don't get to say 'I was just following orders'; you don't get to turn a blind eye. And those people who do are held accountable. And unfortunately, those who were found guilty, because the death penalty applied, they were either hanged or they were put in prison. That's what people face. They need to understand it. And ignorance of the law is no defence.

16:51 You're offering them an education

16:53 Yeah

16:56 Okay and I gathered sadly there have been some deaths. From what I'm hearing between twelve ..?

17:02 Yeah and rates of myocarditis, strokes. I heard an interview with a girl the other day who said out of a class of 30, 12 of them were off - having been injected. We know that children are already dying. We know they're dying in the womb; we know breastfeeding children are dying, we know young infants are dying. They now want to inject 5- to 11-year-olds. How do you obtain informed consent about the long-term consequences to their fertility to their health? To their heart, to their immune system from an injection where none of us knows? Nobody knows what's going to happen. We don't have the long-term safety data. How can a child of 5 agree to that? And the parents can't agree because on the evidence they are being lied to.

They are being misled. It's deceitful, it's fraudulent - criminally fraudulent - and the expert evidence of the psychiatrists and the psychologists who have been analysing the mind space document, they've been analysing the messages from the media etc they've been analysing the Stephen Hawkins foundation document. And they have said, and I quote and I summarize, that: not a single person in the UK is able to give their informed consent due to the military-grade psychological warfare that's being conducted on them now let alone children. Now, what that means is that no consent that's been obtained is lawful or legal. So that means that every person who's been injected, even though they appear to have given their consent, have been battered. They've been assaulted. They've been wounded, right? So, any deaths, any injury that's a criminal act. This is very serious. These are the biggest crimes against humanity ever committed in the history of humankind. And the fact is that the law prohibits it. We have precedence, we have the law.

19:00 So it's not like this is a new situation. We've been through this all before. So, anyone who thinks that they're not going to be blamed and not going to be held accountable does not know their history - what happened after the last war. People's courts were formed in all jurisdictions. People knew who the perpetrators were. Who the complicit people were in their local communities. They found them, they took them from their homes, they put them in court, they judged them and they handed down the sentence. And I watched, for example, the execution of the Ceausescu's from the Romanian revolution. I watched their trial last night and they were found guilty. They

were taken outside and they were shot. And unfortunately, I didn't write that history. That's nothing to do with me. I'm telling people that, that's what happens people seek justice beyond the grave.

19:56 People have died for millennia over freedom. So, anyone who thinks that people aren't going to fight for justice and freedom I don't know what they're thinking. They need to give their head a wobble.

20:04 Well, thank you so much for explaining all of that. Is there anything that we can do, that the public can do to support you?

20:12 Well, the first thing is please spread the message. Anyone who's speaking out, who is telling the truth and giving evidence - please spread the message, we all need to hear it. The second thing is: learn what your fundamental inalienable human rights are. So, anyone who can access google, you google: the universal declaration of human rights 1948, read it. Read the European convention of human rights, read the UK human rights act, okay? Read the international covenant of social and political and economic rights. Those rights are all there. It's all there in the law. The reason this is happening is people don't know the law so they don't know how to uphold it and assert it. And the people who are getting away with this are getting away with it because people aren't upholding the law. And that's the responsibility of every single citizen. There aren't enough of us lawyers to go round and hold your hands. You have to do it yourself. We have to educate ourselves, yeah?

21:10 And you're all sovereign - every single person is.

21:14 So much for sovereign time every once again thank you I'll say goodbye now okay

21:20 Can I just say one more thing everyone? Hold the line. Stand your ground. Step into your sovereignty because this is all just a matter of time. These measures are illegal unlawful and unethical immoral they will not stand up to court's scrutiny around the world. They might get away with it in certain jurisdictions. But there are countries running these cases all around the world. We are going to get the right results. So be patient. Be patient, hold the line. In the meantime, use that time to spread the word. Gen up on your rights. It's as simple as saying no. We are ruled by consent, right? We're not actually ruled - these are our public servants - we are governed by consent, right? So, if you don't consent to these measures, they cannot force you to. They might claim that they can but you've found that a lot of the cases that have gone to court have been dropped because they're illegal, yeah? It's all just a threat, a coercion. It's a way to make you comply.

22:15 Okay so that would be your final word on it, would be to hold the line?

22:19 Yeah. Hold the line. Stand your ground. Uphold the rule of law. Step into your sovereignty. The law is all there to protect you but you're not going to get protected unless you know what it is and you uphold it.

22:29 Exactly thank you so much for your time

My pleasure

22:33 Thank you

22:34 Thank you everyone