

*Your Name*  
*Your Address & Postcode*  
*Contact Tel No or Email Address*

Dated: *(Today's Date)*

Name of Doctor administering the vaccine  
Address of Doctor Surgery

Copy to: *The Manager of Care Home*  
*Care Home Address*

Dear Sir/Madam or *(Doctors name)*

**Re: (Name of patient) – Date of Birth: (Date of birth for patient) -**

I am writing to you in my capacity as Lasting Power Of Attorney (LPA) over my *(relative to patient)*, (Name of patient) (DOB: *(Enter date of birth of patient)*) and who currently resides at the *(Address of patient)*

The purpose of this letter is to advise you that after very careful thought and extensive research, I as LPA **do not consent** to my *(relation)* being given the Pfizer or Astrazeneca (Oxford) vaccine or any other make of vaccine in relation to the Coronavirus, Covid19, SarsCov2 pandemic.

Reasons for my decision is listed clearly below.

1. First and foremost, the policy of mass vaccination based on Asymptomatic testing/vaccination has now been documented and proven to be incorrect by several valid research establishments for e.g. Medical Alliance Group to name but one.
2. In short, the claim that people with no symptoms are spreading the virus has been proven to be unfounded, using this false logic, everyone would need to be vaccinated against Smallpox, Ebola, HIV, Polio and every other virus known to man, simply because patients do not show symptoms of having such a virus. This logic is simply idiotic, so what makes Coronavirus, Covid19, SarsCov2 any different?
3. The Virus, listed above has never been successfully isolated or purified and has not been subjected to the accepted tests (Koch Postulates), used to determine the existence of a valid virus and therefore is not listed as such in the public domain. In short it doesn't exist as a killer strain of the common cold (Coronavirus).
4. Coronavirus has been with us for millennia and will be with us for many years to come. It is listed as one of the two hundred & forty variants of the 'common cold'.

5. The Virus Known as Coronavirus, Covid19, (SarsCov2) was removed from the High Consequence Infectious Disease (HCID) register in March 2020 and although other agencies are now controlling the 'virus' it has never been resubmitted under this or any other infectious disease register.
6. The Covid Vaccine (regardless of brand/pharma company product) having been developed, produced and licensed in only a matter of months, the Pfizer vaccine as an example, uses a method of vaccination that has never been used within the Human body (mRNA) and has not been sufficiently tested for potential medium or long term side effects. No predictions can be made as to the side effects of this untested, unproven cocktail of drugs which when combined are being called a 'Vaccine'. It has still to be shown that the vaccine stops transmission of the virus and it is still to be shown that taking the vaccine stops infection. Recent vaccinations have proven that the vaccine neither prevents transmission in fact it promotes transmission via shedding, the same as the Flu Mist vaccine.
7. At this point I would like to remind you of the Thalidomide fiasco, involving unnecessarily deforming unborn babies because of the drug Thalidomide which was tested and intended to relieve nausea in pregnant women. Accepting that this was not a vaccine, it was nevertheless subjected to stringent and arduous testing, yet still failed to detect a major serious fault with the drug causing horrendous suffering and heartache to many babies, children and parents alike.
8. All Covid vaccines have been subjected to minimal testing, having only been developed and licensed over the last few months. To claim that we should receive it anyway, without the full knowledge or information relating to side effects is nothing short of madness and irresponsible.
9. No Covid vaccine has been tested for it's reaction to patients taking other medication or other medical issues alongside the vaccine and so adverse reactions are unknown. Recent vaccinations have provided vaccinated people with fatal adverse reactions to the Covid vaccines confirmed by Freedom of Information requests to hospitals, doctors surgeries etc.
10. The 'vaccine' is not a 'vaccine' as such, it simply reduces symptoms. Symptoms are indicators of an underlying problem that the vaccine does nothing to combat. In effect the same can be achieved by using an Aspirin and a sachet of Lemsip without the patient being exposed to potentially lethal side effects. Why would anyone with a duty of care to their patients wish to vaccinate their trusting patients knowingly that their patients are risking their health more by receiving the vaccine than they are against a common cold virus which most people have inbuilt immunity and which does not prevent them from still being infected with Covid?
11. The vaccine does not match our own immune system, our immune system offering over 98% survivability for under 65 year olds, dropping to slightly lower 90% for over 70 year

olds (Office of National Statistics). In addition, our immune system offers this protection without the risk of potentially lethal side effects from a properly tested vaccine.

I would like to bring your attention to the legal ramifications of administering the vaccine.

12. Article 6.1 of the 2005 UNESCO (Bioethics & human rights) statement that is integrated into UK law is reproduced below

**Article 6 – Consent**

***1. Any preventative, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention is only to be carried out with the prior, free and informed consent of the person concerned, based on adequate information. The consent should, where appropriate be express and may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without disadvantage or prejudice.***

Clearly this allows an individual the choice to accept or refuse preventative, diagnostic and therapeutic medical intervention based on informed consent. Sections 1 to 10 of this document clearly shows that large amounts of information is not available to the patient and so it is not possible to give informed consent based on data provided thus far.

Article 6.2 of the same article clearly states that the patient is allowed to refuse consent for treatment at any time. Reproduced below.

***2. Scientific research should only be carried out with the prior, free, express and informed consent of the person concerned. The information should be adequate, provided in a comprehensible form and should include modalities for withdrawal of consent. Consent may be withdrawn by the person concerned at any time and for any reason without any disadvantage or prejudice. Exceptions to this principle should be made only in accordance with ethical and legal standards adopted by States, consistent with the principles and provisions set out in this Declaration, in particular in Article 27, and international human rights law.***

Reproduced below for clarity, clearly states that should legal representatives of a group or community agree upon a course of action, in no case should the collective community agreement or consent for such treatment, substitute the decision for an individual's consent.

**Article 6.3**

***In appropriate cases of research carried out on a group of persons or a community, additional agreement of the legal representatives of the group or community concerned by be sought. In no case should a collective community agreement or the consent of a community leader or other authority substitute for an individual's informed consent.***

**Article 7 -Persons without the capacity to consent.**

In accordance with domestic law, special protection is given to persons who do not have the capacity to consent and is reproduced below for clarity.

**Article 7**

***(a) authorization for research and medical practice should be obtained in accordance with the best interest of the person concerned and in accordance with domestic law. However, the person concerned***

*should be involved to the greatest extent possible in the decision-making process of consent, as well as that of withdrawing consent;*

*This clearly indicates that the person or legal representative of the person, is to be involved to the greatest extent possible in the decision making process of consent as well as that of withdrawing consent. In conjunction with article 6.3 it is clear that as Lasting power of attorney for my mothers Health and Welfare, my decision cannot be ignored over the collective decision. Failure to consider this would be a breach of my mothers human rights under the 2005 UNESCO (bio ethics Human right) statement has occurred.*

*I feel that you should also be made aware of Article 3 of this same statement, again reproduced below*

*1. Human dignity, human rights and fundamental freedoms are to be fully respected.*

*2. The interests and welfare of the individual should have priority over the sole interest of science or society.*

I draw your attention to part two of this article that puts the rights of the individual above the interest of science or society. This is particularly pertinent when try to claim that a vaccination is required for the 'greater good' of society.

In essence this would mean that if my loved one was given a vaccination against their will, or the will of their legal representative charged with looking after their Health and Welfare. **The authorities and individuals involved would be guilty of breaching Articles 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3, Article 7(a) and Article 3.1 and 3.2 of the 2005 UNESCO (bio ethics Human rights) statement, which is required to be integrated into the laws of every member state of which the United Kingdom(UK) is a full member.**

I am aware of the daily 'death' figures 'relating' to Covid being broadcast through the media and is in my opinion these numbers are meaningless. Firstly, the overall comparison is not substantially different from the same period in any other year (figures according to Office of National Statistics) the announcements do not decipher deaths 'with' covid or 'because' of covid – There is a major difference and are completely misleading in nature because of the now (Sixty day period) where an automatic Covid label is assigned to the death certificate. I would like to elucidate a little.

If a person is tested, using the PCR test, which has been deemed as unfit for purpose because of several variables making results meaningless, and that person dies under any circumstance within 60 days of the positive test, the recorded death is Covid regardless of the real cause of death. This has the same meaning as saying if I had a haircut within the last 60 days of death, it was the haircut that killed me. I personally know of two such cases where Covid has been falsely claimed as cause of death. Freedom of Information (FOI) requests for 41 different postcodes and Mortuaries around the UK have also shown that Covid has not caused as many deaths as claimed in the media.

It is my decision that my (*relative*) not be in receipt of this untested vaccine that does nothing to cure a virus of any kind and has not been tested or proven long term to stop infection or transmission and simply reduces symptoms at best yet offers the possibility of serious side effects of which have been proved potentially lethal.

As is my right as Lasting Power of Attorney for (*Name of patient*) I have not been provided with enough information to allow me to give an 'informed consent' and so therefore insist that (he/she) **is not vaccinated** with a cocktail of drugs that are not indemnified by the manufacturer because they along with the UK government refuse to guarantee the safety of their product or compensate for vaccine damage.

I expect you to adhere by this request as lawful Lasting Power of Attorney for Health & Welfare for (*Name of patient*).

**Non compliance with my request will result in legal action.**

Yours sincerely

(*Your Name*)