## Letter of Conditional Acceptance re: SARS-CoV-2 Test

I will agree to comply with your requirement to submit to a SARS-CoV-2 swab **on strict condition** that:

- a. You answer in the affirmative each and every one of the questions below and
- b. You are prepared upon unlimited personal liability in your private capacity to accept responsibility to indemnify me or my estate for an amount not exceeding one million pounds for any financial loss, psychological or physical harm caused to me as a result of submitting to such a test in honest reliance upon your affirmative answers to said questions.

**Q1\***: Has SARS-CoV-2 ever been isolated from an infected person and examined under clinical laboratory conditions?

**Q2\***: Has SARS-CoV-2 met Koch's postulates which establish it as responsible for the disease named COVID-19, therefore posing a serious public health hazard?

**Q3\***: Were the World Health Organisation, the US Center for Disease Control and Public Health England all mistaken when they downgraded COVID-19 to an <u>infectious disease of non-high</u> <u>consequence</u> on March 19 2020, as posted on their respective web sites?

**Q4\***: Is the SARS-CoV-2 swab proven to be a safe procedure, or even necessary, when saliva from the oral cavity would produce equally reliable data regarding infection status?

**Q5**: Is the SARS-CoV-2 swab sampling via invasive nasal insertion considered to be a medical procedure, and as such comes within the ambit of the Universal Declaration of Bioethics and Human Rights 2005, therefore requiring fully informed consent pursuant Article 6 of said Declaration?

**Q6**: Do you agree that SARS-CoV-2 swabbing is a medical intervention which I am free to refuse, according to Nuremberg principles, without disadvantage?

**Q7\***: Is the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test 100% reliable so as to avoid false positive and false negative results in statistically significant numbers?

**Q8**\*: Was the inventor of said RT-PCR test Dr Kary Mullis (deceased 2019) mistaken when he said this test is not designed for or meant to be used as a diagnostic tool?

**Q9**: Are you satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that refusing access to services against a person who does not agree to the SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR test is not an act of discrimination pursuant Equality and Disability legislation, or an act of socio-economic and moral repression against natural common law principles of sovereignty in living men and women?

**Q10**: Are you satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that any consequences for failing to agree to be swabbed for SARS-CoV-2 shall not constitute infringement of my rights pursuant European Convention on Human Rights and/or the Human Rights Act 1998, or my rights to privacy pursuant General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)?

\*Q11: Are you prepared to set out your precise reasons upon independent evidence for your affirmative answers to Questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 7 and 8?

**Q12**: Do you understand that **concealment of data and blocking or wilful refusal to provide data or information relating to our personal data is a criminal offence** pursuant Data Protection Act 2018 section 173?

Kindly send me a reply autographed in wet ink as soon as possible and in any event within one calendar month in order to comply with Data Protection requirements (Article 12 GDPR) and answer my concerns in honour and lawful transparency.

By: Full Legal Name Autograph in Blue Beneficiary

1