
The case against Danish Prime Minister, Mette Frederiksen

Danish Prime Minister under fire for tyrannical measures - For the totalitarian Epidemic Act, for lying to the Population saying she had the authorities support for the lockdown, for killing all minks in Denmark with no authorization, she is also being sued for unconstitutional corona restrictions.

30 January 2020

OVERVIEW - Danish Prime Minister under fire for tyrannical measures

1. Advisory response to the tyrannical Epidemic Act - 14 January 2021 - The Danish population has been led astray by the Minister of Health. At the same time as the Minister of Health has removed the word "coercion" from the new bill and convened a consultation response, he has behind the backs of Danish citizens, including the Folketing, with the help of the Empowerment Act of March 2020, implemented a SECOND law containing all the "necessary" provisions on coercion; namely BEK 36, which entered into force on 15 January this year. In our view, this is an expression of boundless infidelity. In our opinion, this new law is contrary to the Constitution, the ECHR and several other conventions.
 2. Danish citizens' proposal to put the Prime Minister before a Supreme Court for illegal mink killing reached parliament - 28 January 2021 - Prime Minister had no legal authority to demand that all mink in Denmark be killed. A citizens' proposal to put the Prime Minister before a Supreme Court on Thursday reached the required 50,000 supporters. The government decided in November that all mink in Denmark should be killed. This should be done to prevent the mutated coronavirus, which spread from mink to humans, from inhibiting the effect of a vaccine. The decision to kill all mink, about 17 million, was announced by Mette Frederiksen at a press conference. Subsequently, it turned out that there was no legal authority to demand that all mink in Denmark be killed.
 3. Danish Prime Minister lied to the Population and Parliament when stating that authorities had recommended lockdown - 29 January 2021 - Report shows Danish Prime Minister lied to the population on authority for lockdown - Mette F. misled everyone: Authorities did not recommend a major shutdown, as she claimed. It was herself and Barbara Bertelsen, the Prime Minister's Head of Department, who would send alarm emails with attached articles from the media to the heads of department, creating the panic.
 4. Lawsuit against the Prime Ministers unconstitutional corona restrictions started in Copenhagen City Court - 29 January 2021 - OOC - Prime Ministers corona laws are unconstitutional - The Organization for Information about Corona, started a lawsuit against Mette Frederiksen in Copenhagen City Court. OOC claims that lockdown, assembly ban, face masks, etc. are unconstitutional. The city court must then decide on this now.
-

1. Advisory response to the tyrannical Epidemic Act

Advisory response to the tyrannical Epidemic Act

14 January 2021 - At the request of the Ministry of Health and the Elderly, Frihedsbevægelsens Fællesråd has the 14.1.2021, submitted advice response to bill on epidemics etc. (Epidemic Act) submitted on 22 December 2020 by Minister of Health and the Elderly (Magnus Heunicke).

The Danish population has been led astray by the Minister of Health. At the same time as the Minister of Health has removed the word "coercion" from the new bill and convened a consultation response, he has behind the backs of Danish citizens, including the Folketing, with the help of the Empowerment Act of March 2020, implemented a SECOND law containing all the "necessary" provisions on coercion; namely BEK 36, which entered into force on 15 January this year. In our view, this is an expression of boundless infidelity. In our opinion, this new law is contrary to the Constitution, the ECHR and several other conventions.

The so-called Covid-19 pandemic has revealed a number of fatal shortcomings in the health professional and parliamentary preparedness. The Joint Council of the Freedom Movement therefore concludes that there will, with the adoption of this proposals, as formulated by the government, have created an insurmountable gap in the population between those who want to live in a state governed by the rule of law and those who, by different, mainly unknown causes want to leave the path of democracy and Human Rights.

No special legal or medical expertise is required to realize that

- 1) the proposal is contrary to all applicable legal principles,
- 2) the proposed measures are completely disproportionate to the present one health situation.

The numerical facts speak for themselves. The claim that Covid-19 poses a serious threat to public health or society as a whole is a so far unsubstantiated conspiracy theory. On the other hand, we believe that the government's actions - including this bill - constitute a significant and serious threat to the Danish population and the Danish democracy.

Advisory response to the tyrannical Epidemic Act by Joint Council of the Freedom Movement

Both doctors and lawyers have been involved in the preparation of this consultation response.

The adoption of this proposal, as drafted by the government, will create an insurmountable gap in the population between those who wish to live in a state governed by the rule of law and those who, for various, mainly unknown reasons, wish to leave democracy and The path of human rights. No special legal or medical expertise is required to realize, 1) that the proposal is contrary to all applicable legal principles, 2) that the proposed measures are completely disproportionate in relation to the current health situation. The numerical facts speak for themselves. The claim that Covid-19 poses a serious threat to public health or society as a whole is a so far substantiated conspiracy theory. We believe, in turn, that the government's actions - including this bill - constitute a significant and serious threat to the Danish population and Danish democracy.

The so-called Covid-19 pandemic has revealed a number of fatal shortcomings in the health professional and parliamentary preparedness. Primarily:

1. That the WHO's recommendations in a number of cases are not born of scientific, but rather political and commercial considerations, and that these should therefore be subject to a very critical assessment by the health authorities of the individual countries and not necessarily be followed.

a) Examples of this are the irrational change in the definition of a pandemic in 2009, which, despite the corrupt basis for this, has been allowed to continue. It was previously required that there should be "an enormous number of infected and dead". The removal of this condition means, for example, that by definition we experience "cold pandemics" annually during the winter months.

b) The irrational and totally unscientific recommendation to count all those who have tested positive for Covid-19 within a month with a test that has now proved totally useless (as used with a cycle wood team of 38) for Covid-19 19 victims, notwithstanding that the actual cause of death has been different, which has caused a highly distorted and unrealistic picture of the disease mortality. The current number of deaths and people hospitalized due to clinical symptoms of Covid (and not a PCR test) clearly document that Covid does not meet the above definition of an epidemic and dangerous disease. The final litmus test of whether there is an epidemic is mortality. And there is NO significant excess mortality in either Denmark or Sweden. We mention Sweden in order to reject the argument that the lack of excess mortality in Denmark is due to the closures and the other measures.)

c) Institution of a new concepts, "infection numbers" and "contact numbers", which are without scientific reference or definition. The global use of the PCR test - and in particular the way it is used - has been the subject of strong and fully justified scientific criticism.

The purpose of these steps must be presumed to be the promotion of vaccines, which the WHO - and a number of key staff - must be expected to benefit greatly from. We are in no way opposed to vaccination technology. On the other hand, we do not believe that mass vaccination serves any health purpose, against relatively harmless diseases with low mortality, to which Covid-19 must unconditionally be included. The reasons for this are, firstly, that the human immune system is so complicated that at present there is not the slightest possibility of foreseeing the consequences of the manipulation of the same with which the vaccines operate; secondly, the complete lack of control over the pharmaceutical industry, which prevails in the field of vaccines. Vaccine manufacturers are completely, contrary to all legal principles, exempted from product liability, which has led to unprecedentedly irresponsible and dangerous behavior on their part. There is a stark discrepancy between the fact that doctors in the field have died of Ebola, which must be assumed to be the most deadly infectious disease we currently know, because they have been denied experimental treatment, and the fact that now after a few months it is approved a vaccine that is entirely experimental and based on a completely new and untested technology, the risks of which are potentially enormous, including not least the completely unknown long-term side effects, for mass production and testing on humanity without intermediate animal testing. because they have been denied experimental treatment, and so that now, after a few months, a vaccine is approved which is entirely experimental and which is based on a completely new and untested technology, the risks of which are potentially enormous, including not least the quite unknown long-term side effects, for mass production and testing on humanity without intermediate animal experiments. because they have been denied experimental treatment, and so that now, after a few months, a vaccine is approved which is entirely experimental and which is based on a completely new and untested technology, the risks of which are potentially enormous, including not least the quite unknown long-term side effects, for mass production and testing on humanity without intermediate animal experiments.

The pharmaceutical industry's unique irresponsibility has been shown, among other things, in connection with the HPV vaccine, where we can find a medical catastrophe for Denmark. (This also applies to other countries, but we only have the documentation for Denmark, Appendix A)

2. THAT the National Board of Health and the Statens Serum Institut are not independent of the pharmaceutical industry either. The Danish health authorities are financed for a large part of the income that is generated through various approval procedures. A large number of employees in both institutions have a background in the pharmaceutical industry, which is unacceptable, as personal relationships and "networking" with subsequent rewards in the form of lucrative positions must be assumed to affect the approval procedures and the entire workflow and work environment in these vital institutions.

3. THAT the Danish health authorities have proved to be subject to total political control, where the country's political leadership has without demonstrable reason chosen to disregard the health professional recommendations and even force or threaten the same authorities to change attitudes and modify their statements. This is completely unacceptable. Health policy decisions must, as far as possible, be taken by the health authorities, and these must in turn be completely independent of commercial interests and free from lobbying influence. The controls that the health authorities must necessarily be subject to must be of a health professional and legal / audit nature and not of a political nature.

We therefore make the following recommendations to the Epidemic Act and other health legislation, without wishing to dwell on the final wording of the provisions:

A1. There should be a statutory and unchangeable definition of a pandemic / epidemic with a dangerous infectious disease. Only when 5,000 deaths have been identified, where the cause of death has been determined according to normal diagnostic criteria, can measures be taken that infringe ordinary rights. Of course, this does not mean that you cannot take all possible other measures beforehand, prompted by the National Board of Health if it deems it necessary. The cause of death is determined according to normal criteria; i.e. the ACTUAL AND IMMEDIATE cause of death.

A2. The National Board of Health's management (Executive Board and Board of Directors) are appointed by election for 5-year periods by all holders of a Danish medical authorization. Doctors employed in the pharmaceutical industry do not have the right to vote. Management cannot be deposed politically unless there are criminal offenses. If this happens, immediate new elections must be held among those entitled to vote. The leadership must be subject to the same stricter economic control as participants in political life it is now. The Executive Board may not contest other positions or take on other work, including consulting work or board work in other organizations, but must deliver ALL of their workforce to the National Board of Health. However, this does not apply to unpaid work in cultural and social organizations unrelated to the health care system or industry. (eg.sports clubs or art associations.)

A3. All precautions in connection with a pandemic / epidemic are determined by the National Board of Health. The Danish Health and Medicines Authority's decisions can only be overridden by an 80% majority (143) votes in the Folketing. Pandemics / epidemics are not a party political issue.

A4. All medical / health science research in Denmark must be state-funded. Researchers at all the country's educational institutions complain that irrelevant and commercial considerations mean that privately funded research does not meet scientific requirements for objectivity, and that the actual results are required when allocating funds. This is utterly unacceptable and destructive of health policy and the general belief that research is independent and evidence-based. The pharmaceutical industry should be subject to a special research tax of 5% of turnover, which cannot be included in the state budget, but MUST be used for research. The Medical Research Council distributes the funds and must be elected in the same way as the Danish Health and Medicines Authority's management and be subject to the same restrictions and controls. New technologies, which arises as a result of public research must be patented and made available free of charge to companies that are Danish-owned, but not companies in Denmark that are controlled by foreign interests.

A5. No pharmaceutical company can be exempted from product liability. All vaccines must be FULLY declared and the requirements for clinical trials can NOT be waived. Animal experiments must be performed, all tests must be double-blind tests, and isotonic saline can ONLY be used as a placebo. These processes cannot be shortened, as the use of new technologies in particular gives rise to concern about long-term side effects and unforeseen complications. All Covid vaccines are based on new and untested technology, which is considered by many experts to be highly risky and even unethical, as the mechanisms in the human body one seeks to influence are not fully known.

A6. The focus of epidemic preparedness should be shifted from the reactive to the proactive, that is, first and foremost, strengthening the immune system. Prevention should be a top priority and significant funds should be set aside for research into the immune system. Vaccination is not definitively a strengthening of the immune system, as the immunity of all known vaccines ceases after a few years, but should be considered an emergency measure. In fact, there is a very significant amount of research from recent decades that is untapped because it cannot be the subject of patent development and massive commercial exploitation.

A7. All measures that can be perceived as a violation of the provisions of the Constitution or Human Rights cannot be initiated, unless the Folketing has declared a state of emergency. Such can only be declared if 2/3 vote in favor of the proposal. (120 members). In this connection, a statement to the Council of Europe must be prepared immediately, as required by EU law. (This has not happened in connection with the Covid-19 outbreak, and the government can therefore not invoke the emergency in connection with the restrictions on personal rights that have taken place.) A state of emergency should be brought at any time by one member of parliament or 25 citizens before the Supreme Court for review. For example, we do not believe that the approx. 1,200 deaths, where Covid cannot with certainty be assumed to be the real cause of death, justifies a state of emergency, cf. Recommendation 1.

A8. The Danish Agency for Patient Safety must not be an administrative body, but an independent NGO that looks after patients' interests. The management must be elected by the Patient Association. The Agency may at any time urgently issue injunctions from the National Board of Health which are contrary to the general freedoms, or which in the opinion of the Danish Agency for Patient Safety override considerations of public health, to the Supreme Court for review.

A9. Any form of discrimination in the form of vaccine passports is contrary to Articles 2, 3, 7, 13 of the Human Rights Charter and possibly more, depending on how one chooses to draw up rules in this regard. Such a step, which is provided for in various ways in the bill, (carriers', eg airlines' right and duty to demand various information from passengers, control of foreigners arriving in Denmark, right to participate in public events such as concerts and sporting events) will therefore be regarded as completely unacceptable, all the more so as it will have a permanent character.

A10. It follows from the above that the politically conditioned and non-specific definitions of the terms "socially dangerous" and "socially critical" disease are unacceptable and without scientific or other concrete reference. Their use will lead to something close to total arbitrariness in law enforcement, and they should therefore definitely be removed from the text of the law.

According to the definition, which includes both influenza and Covid, "generally dangerous" diseases are always spread in Denmark, and the Minister of Health can therefore at any time use the powers that are available under the law on the grounds that an influenza epidemic is flourishing. That is completely unacceptable. A definition of how dangerous an illness must be before restrictions on constitutional and convention-guaranteed rights can be considered is proposed in Recommendation A1.

The categorization of various diseases by the current law is also meaningless. As "Generally dangerous diseases" are categorized:

Smallpox: Was declared extinct by the WHO in 1980. Danish children are no longer vaccinated against smallpox.

SARS: Has never been found in Denmark. A total of 8,000 people around the world are believed to have had SARS, of which 800 have died. It does not make sense to consider the disease as "generally dangerous" in Denmark. The last case was found in Singapore in 2003.

MERS: Has only been found in 2,428 cases, all in the Middle East except a few in South Korea. No cases since 2012.

Ebola: Less than 50 cases have been recorded outside Africa since 1967. Lassa fever is known only in West Africa. Marburg is known in 21 cases where the originally infected had had contact with African green monkeys. The original carrier of this virus is believed to be the African fruit bat.

Plague: There have been no plague epidemics in Europe since 1711 and not in the world since 1894. Plague is caused by a bacterium and can therefore be adequately treated with antibiotics.

Diphtheria: All children in Denmark are vaccinated. The last single case was seen in 1998. As it is a bacterium, treatment with antibiotics is effective, although there is a special problem with toxins. Anti-toxin treatment significantly reduces the risk.

Multi-resistant tuberculosis: Chief physician Niels Seershold, specialist in medical lung diseases, writes: "If you do not take the medicine every day as prescribed or only take some of the preparations, the bacteria can become resistant. In the world, there are problems with resistance to rimactan and isoniazid, also called multi-resistance - a very serious problem. In the Baltics, many eastern countries and certain African countries, it is a very big problem. Fortunately, we have very few cases of multi-resistant tuberculosis in Denmark. It can be a difficult and expensive task to treat these patients, but in Denmark we have access to other medicines. If you can predict problems with getting a patient to take their medication regularly, you must arrange for supervised medication intake."

To this list then adds the new law Covid-19, which may have required a few hundred victims with an average age of 82 years, if one looks only at the primary cause of death.

Considering that an average of 15,709 people die of cancer in Denmark each year and about 12,000 of cardiovascular diseases, the completely excessive attention and the completely extraordinary costs that are sacrificed for these diseases must be described as pure paranoia.

LINKS

- Full letter - <https://www.fbf.one/hoerings svar-epidemilov>

Sadly the new proposal to the Epidemic Law was accepted.

2. Danish citizens' proposal to put the Prime Minister before a Supreme Court for illegal mink kylling reached parliament

DANISH CITIZENS' PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL COURT CASE AGAINST PRIME MINISTER REACHES THE PARLAMENT - PRIME MINISTER HAD NO LEGAL AUTHORITY TO ORDER ALL MINK IN DENMARK TO BE KILLED

A citizens' proposal to put the Prime Minister before a Supreme Court on Thursday reached the required 50,000 supporters. The Prime Minister ordered the killing of mink animals in Denmark under the fear of dangerous virus mutations. This is a citizens proposal to put Mette Frederiksen for a national court case Now - Mette Frederiksen will explain the lack of authority to kill healthy mink breeding animals. Due to many misleading conditions that have taken place, with regard to the Armed Forces, the police and the Danish Emergency Management Agency, as well as hauliers and mink breeders.

A citizens' proposal to put Prime Minister Mette Frederiksen before a Supreme Court has on Thursday received support from more than 50,000 citizens. It appears from a count on Citizen Proposal - <https://www.borgerforslag.dk/se-og-stoet-forslag/?Id=FT-06220> This means that the proposal can be discussed in the Folketing Hall as a resolution.

The rules are such that when a citizens' proposal obtains 50,000 supporters, the parties in the Folketing must decide who will submit the proposal in question as a concrete resolution proposal.

The proposal will not be submitted automatically in the Folketing, even though it has received 50,000 supporters. This is because the Constitution says that only members of the Folketing and ministers can make proposals in the Folketing.

However, the proposal receives support from the Liberal Alliance. "We are voting in favor of the citizens' proposal. We completely agree that Mette Frederiksen is the right person to stand for a national court for the mink scandal," says Ole Birk Olesen. "We support the establishment of a commission inquiry into the matter, because it is the process that a parliamentary majority wants, but if it was up to us, we could go directly to the Supreme Court, because the crime here is recognized by everyone, including the government. . «

If the citizens' proposal is submitted to the Folketing, it must go through the same processing process as the ordinary decision-making

proposals that are submitted by parties.

The government decided in November that all mink in Denmark should be killed. This should be done to prevent the mutated coronavirus, which spread from mink to humans, from inhibiting the effect of a vaccine. The decision to kill all mink, about 17 million, was announced by Mette Frederiksen at a press conference.

Subsequently, it turned out that there was no legal authority to demand that all mink in Denmark be killed. The case ended up costing Mogens Jensen (S) the post of Minister of Food, but thus the case did not die. The parties in the blue bloc in particular have been critical of the government in general and Mette Frederiksen in particular. The Folketing has set up a commission called the Investigation Commission to uncover the process.

Source - <https://www.berlingske.dk/politik/borgerforslag-om-rigsretssag-mod-mette-f-naar-til-folketinget>

3. Danish Prime Minister lied to the Population and Parliament when stating that authorities had recommended lockdown

DANISH PRIME MINISTER LIED TO THE DANES AND THE PARLAMENT WHEN SHE CLAIMED THE AUTHORITIES RECOMMENDED THE LOCKDOWN OF DENMARK

Report submitted by the study group set up by the Folketing's Committee on the Rules of Procedure regarding the handling of covid-19: Danish Prime Minister Mette F. misled everyone: Authorities did not recommend a major shutdown, as she claimed. It was herself and Barbara Bertelsen, the Prime Minister's Head of Department, who would send alarm emails with attached articles from the media to the heads of department, creating the panic.

Mette Frederiksen has repeatedly said that it was a 'broad group of authorities' who recommended the closure of Denmark on 11 March 2020. But the plans for closure can only be devised in the Prime Minister's Office. That is the conclusion of a 595-page report on the government's handling of coronavirus, which was presented in the Folketing on Friday.

Now the Liberal Party accuses Mette Frederiksen of lying and misleading the population.

Since March 11, 2020, there has been a heated debate about whether the Prime Minister spoke untruths at the historic press conference. Here, Mette Frederiksen said that the closure of Denmark took place following a recommendation from the authorities: "Therefore, it is the authorities' recommendation that we shut down all unnecessary activity in those areas for a period," said Mette Frederiksen, listing all the restrictions that the Danes came to live with throughout the spring.

However, it was impossible for other parties to get a direct answer as to which authorities had recommended it.

Therefore, a majority in the Folketing in June 2020 chose to set up an expert group led by Professor Emeritus Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen to investigate the background for the lockdown, including which authorities recommended it.

Investigation into the background for lockdown, and which authorities recommended it - The plan to shut down did not come from a 'broad group of authorities' as the Prime Minister claimed, but was essentially conceived in the Prime Minister's Office.

After reviewing an extensive material of notes, emails and minutes, the experts can not find a single authority that could have devised the plan to shut down Danish society - apart from the Prime Minister himself. The statement 'does not support the wording used by the Prime Minister at the press conference on 11 March 2020,' it reads.

At a hearing on Friday afternoon, Professor Emeritus Jørgen Grønnegård Christensen was asked to elaborate on the report's conclusions. "The way in which the Prime Minister communicates does not reflect the facts," he said of Mette Frederiksen's statements at the press conference.

The plan to shut down did not come from within the AC group, which is a staff of senior officials. Nor did it come from the National Operational Staff (NOST), which is a crisis staff across authorities coordinating efforts against corona. Nor from the health authorities, the report concludes: 'It is probable in this chapter that the basic sketch for the more far-reaching model for decommissioning will not be devised in the AC group, in NOST or in the National Board of Health. There is also much to suggest that it was not conceived by the Statens Serum Institut, 'the experts conclude.

Thus, there is only one option left: Mette Frederiksen and the Prime Minister: 'In combination with the close management and control of covid-19 handling, which the Prime Minister exercises from 27 February, the absence of alternative origins to the decommissioning plan indicates that the decommissioning plan, which will be announced at the press conference in the Prime Minister's Office on 11 March, is essentially conceived in the Prime Minister's Office. '

Key officials would like to wait to introduce corona measures, including the director of the National Board of Health

The experts also conclude that key officials would like to wait to introduce corona measures: 'It is also the impression of the investigation team that until 10 and 11 March, it will still be considered in the government and among the central officials as an opportunity to wait to implement the new measures and restrictions.'

These include the director of the National Board of Health, Søren Brostrøm. As revealed in BT , Søren Brostrøm was against a major shutdown: 'We can not, for health reasons, recommend such an initiative in the current situation,' Brostrøm wrote in an email in response to Mette Frederiksen's plans only seven hours before the press conference.

Barbara Bertelsen, the Prime Minister's Head of Department, sounds the alarm about the increase in infection

According to the report, the Prime Minister's Head of Department, Barbara Bertelsen, was very active in painting a very serious picture of the corona situation up to the press conference.

In several emails to other heads of department, she sounds the alarm about the increase in infection. It will take place on March 10 and March 11, 2020.

'The e-mail gives an insight into how she and thus per. presumption The Prime Minister's Office perceives the covid-19 situation at this time, 'the experts write about the email thread.

Barbara Bertelsen will send several emails with attached articles from the media to the department heads before writing her conclusion: See the reactions - was the same in TV Avisen. We do not have time to experiment. It must be shut down completely then. Then it also goes without saying that people can not come to work.

On the night of March 10, the head of department in the Prime Minister's Office sends an email to a circle of department heads with the subject statement 'The coming days'.

Barbara Bertelsen argues in the email that Denmark is where Italy was on 22 and 23 February, and a link is inserted to an article in BT, which is about several hospitals in northern Italy collapsing due to the many covid-19 patients, the report said.

The email contains, among other things, this invitation to the department head colleagues: "The next few days will be crucial in terms of being able to have the courage, agility and drive in time to without hesitation make the right decisions to reduce and delay the spread of infection as much as possible to avoid compromising the capacity of the hospitals," writes Mette Frederiksen's Head of Department, Barbara Bertelsen.

On March 10 and the night of March 11, Barbara Bertelsen will send several emails with attached articles from the media to the department heads before writing her conclusion:

»See the reactions - was the same in TV Avisen. We do not have time to experiment. It must be shut down completely then. Then it also goes without saying that people can not come to work ... «

****It is now documented: Mette Frederiksen lied to the Danes and the Folketing****

With the expert group's report, it is now documented: Mette Frederiksen lied to the Danes and the Folketing when she pushed the authorities in front of her and claimed the recommended harsh closure of DK. Deeply frightening that a government in acute crisis is not just telling the truth #dkpol - Sophie Løhde (@sophielohde) January 29, 2021

LINKS

- TRANSLATED FROM ARTICLE IN BT - <https://www.bt.dk/politik/mette-f-vildledte-alle-myndigheder-anbefalede-ikke-stor-nedlukning-som-hun-paastod>
- FULL REPORT - The handling of covid-19 in the spring of 2020 - Report submitted by the study group set up by the Folketing's Committee on the Rules of Procedure regarding the handling of covid-19 - <https://www.ft.dk/-/media/sites/ft/pdf/publikationer/haandtering-af-covid19-foraar-2020.ashx>

4. Lawsuit against the Prime Ministers unconstitutional corona restrictions started in Copenhagen City Court

MAJOR LAWSUIT AGAINST DANISH PRIME MINISTER - RESTRICTION MEASURES ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL, THE COURT MUST DECIDE NOW

OOC - The Organization for Information about Corona - has started a lawsuit against Mette Frederiksen in Copenhagen City Court. OOC claims that lockdown, assembly ban, face masks, etc. are unconstitutional. The city court must then decide on this now.

At the first court hearing in 4 combined constitutional cases was yesterday, January 29, 2021 at 13.15 presented a 120-page report on the corona pandemic prepared by the German immunologist Professor Dr. With. Sucharit Bhakdi and doctor Søren Ventegodt. The report concludes that there is in fact no corona pandemic at all because the PCR test that has documented the pandemic's existence through detection of the SARS-CoV-2 virus shows incorrectly. The PCR test shows that 0.5-5% (depending on the chemical composition) of all tested positive for COVID-19, but research has shown that almost all of these positive tests are false positive (at 35 cycles 97%, at 38 cycles used in Denmark are about 99% false positive).

Similar lawsuits with the claim that the PCR test is invalid have already been won in Portugal and the Netherlands. On 21 January 2021, the WHO itself acknowledged that their recommendations were incorrect and that the PCR test is not valid as it is used today in Denmark. If the OOC wins the lawsuit against the prime minister, the entire corona pandemic falls to the ground as scientifically

undocumented. Thus, lockdowns, assembly bans, mask injunctions, etc. are unjustified and thus unconstitutional and therefore illegal, and this is the core of the 4 cases brought. In the same way that the pandemic does not exist, the corona vaccines (including the mRNA vaccines used in Denmark) are also not scientifically documented, and they can therefore not be used legally in Denmark.

It is the position of Professor Sucharit Bhakdi and Søren Ventegodt that Drosten's group, which has developed the PCR test for COVID-19 with financial support, among other things, by Bill Gates, has known that the PCR test for COVID-19 was scientifically fraudulent. In Germany, there is now a case brought by lawyer Fuellmich against Drosten with precisely this claim. Since the PCR test was recommended by the WHO even before it was published, Bhakdi and Ventegodt also believe that the WHO is part of the deception of the world. The WHO is also co-funded by Bill Gates, who has donated \$ 1 billion to the WHO.

Bhakdi and Ventegodt point out that the WHO has previously proven to be corrupt and controlled by the pharmaceutical industry, which is why there may also be a large pharmaceutical industry behind the WHO's misinformation of the world. The report suspects the pharmaceutical industry of participating in the fraud to promote their sales of tests, vaccines and medical devices.

The district court's preliminary ruling fell on January 29 and was that there is a basis for making so-called 'inspection and assessment' in the case. This means that the judicial system in Denmark must now decide whether Mette Frederiksen has committed a constitutional violation in the corona case and her punishment, if the court finds her guilty. The further process follows Chapter 19 of the Administration of Justice Act.

****Report of the OOC's Scientific Committee Scientific report on corona****

The report answers the question: Please give a qualitative and quantitative estimation of the coronavirus virus "SARS-CoV-2", the disease "COVID-19" it is said to cause, the coronavirus pandemic it is said to cause, and the relevance and rationale of the specific coronapolicy the prime minister in Denmark has carried out, with assembly ban, social distancing, face mask orders, and lockdowns etc.

This report is made by Professor Dr. Med. Sucharit Bhakdi (first author) and doctor Søren Ventegodt MMedSci, EU-MSc-CAM (deposited medical authorization) (second author).

This report is based on the book by Karina Reiss Ph.D. and Sucharit Bhakdi MD: "Corona, false alarm? Facts and figures". The report is updated with the research made by the international scientific society until 26 January 2021.

Corona virus is a group of cold viruses that makes up about 15% of all known cold viruses. These viruses cannot be cultured in such a way that the viruses can be propagated, purified and crystallized, so their genetic material (mRNA) cannot be determined with certainty; we therefore do not know for sure the genetic code for the virus which has been called "SARS-CoV-2".

Since we do not have access to corona viruses in pure form, experiments with human corona infections cannot be carried out either, which is why we do not know whether the cold disease COVID-19, which is clinically described by cough, fever and breathing problems, actually comes from the SARS-CoV-2 virus.

There is only one test for SARS-CoV-2 (COVID-19) and that is the RT-PCR test. Unfortunately, this test gives so many false positive answers (97% of all answers at 35 cycles) that it cannot be used for a general test of the population for COVID-19, as it currently happens. The statistics on patients who died of or with COVID-19 are therefore incorrect and misleading.

Since we cannot test for SARS-CoV-2, we also do not know if there is a corona pandemic caused by SARS-CoV-2. Any political action based on the incorrect statistics and the assumptions these statistics lead to about an existing corona pandemic must therefore be considered professionally unfounded (they are carried out without available scientific evidence).

There are warnings from the scientific side that assembly bans, social distancing, mandatory mask wearing and lockdowns etc. all are irrational measures without scientific evidence that seriously harm individuals as well as society.

We find that the World Health Organization WHO works too closely with the pharmaceutical industry and as it receives most of its funding from it, it is influenced by this industry regarding the information and recommendations WHO provides to world's governments.

LINKS

- Full Report in English - <https://usercontent.one/wp/www.ooc.one/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/259-Scientific-report-from-OOC-Jan-2021-English-version.pdf>
- Doctor Søren Ventegodt, Organization for information on corona - <https://www.ooc.one/>

DK RESOURCES AND INFORMATION

- Corona Whistleblower - <https://coronawhistleblower.org/> - many languages
- Dr Sørensen, Organization for information on corona - <https://www.ooc.one/>
- Dr Vibeke Manniche - <https://vibekemanniche.dk/>

Initiatives

- Denmark Awakening - <https://danmarkvaagner.dk/>
- The Pro Human Freedom Project - <https://greennews.dk/>
- Interviews and documentaries - <https://www.dkdox.tv/>

- Freedom Movements Council - <https://www.fbf.one/>
- Mads Palsvig, JFK Party, and member of World Freedom Alliance - <https://jfk21.com/> -- <https://worldfreedomalliance.org/>
- Per Braendgaard - Peoples Party - <https://perbraendgaard.dk/>
- More freedom less control - <https://www.facebook.com/morefreesomlesscontrol/>

Signature support for stopping corona restrictions, and for bringing Prime Minister to court for misuse of authority

- Borgerforslag om rigsretssag mod Mette - <https://www.borgerforslag.dk/se-og-stoet-forslag/?Id=FT-06220>
- Omgående ophævelse af Covid-lovene - https://www.skrivunder.net/omgaende_ophavelse_af_covid-lovene

EVIDENCE OF PANDEMIC FRAUD FOR SKEPTICS

- * 1- The case against the promoters of the corona panic - <https://docdro.id/1B939tB>
- * 2- Documentation and references - <https://docdro.id/K5XO8ao>
- * 3- List of Doctors and Experts for Truth about covid - <https://docdro.id/P1Wf4oj>

Legal cases against the promoters of the corona panic

- * Bernician suing MPs for pandemic fraud, treason, and genocide - <https://docdro.id/vSRX6sC>
- * Dolan against lockdown - <https://docdro.id/1wfLouc>
- * Corbett against the corona law - <https://docdro.id/IK0drvm>