Attorney Renate Holzeisen: "Covid Vaccines Violate European Legislation"

Attorney Renate Holzeisen: "Covid Vaccines Violate European Legislation"

by **Senta Depuydt**, *Children's Health Defense Europe*
July 21, 2021

Senta Depuydt: [00:00:02] Hi everyone, I'm Senta Depuydt from CHD Europe, and today I'm with Renate Holzeisen, who I consider the number one lawyer litigating Covid vaccines issues at the level of the European institutions. Renate is with me for two very important legal actions against the European Commission, and we will ask people from all over Europe to participate. So Renate is a highly trained barrister in the field of economic and fiscal matters. She's also specialised in international and European law. And since the beginning of the pandemic, she has been on the front line to defend our fundamental rights. So she has filed an impressive number of cases related to Covid vaccines. She's from Sud Tyrol, the German speaking part of Italy so her main language is German, and she often collaborates with Austrian and German colleagues such as Reiner Fuellmich, for example. Finally, Renate is a member of the CHD Europe's advisory board. And we are very, very proud to have you with us.

Renate, thank you for joining us. I know your time is very precious. Before you explain what we want to do today. Can you first tell us a little bit about the different legal actions you already have taken at the European level? Thank you.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:01:32] Thank you. It's a pleasure to be with you today. So we have already filed 4 actions for annulment, according to Article 263 of the Treaty on Functioning of the European Union against the deliberations of the European Commission for the conditional authorisation of the four currently authorised so-called Covid-19 vaccines, which in fact are experimental gene therapeutic products. We found that the deliberations taken by the European Commission are fundamentally against European law of the conditional authorisation of medicines and vaccines, if they were vaccines, which we know are gene therapeutics products. They (the decisions) have to be taken according to European regulation 507 of 2006. And one of the conditions fixed by the European legislator is that the product has to guarantee a positive balance between benefits and risks.

So first of all, we have to explain that **these substances weren't studied and authorized for the prevention of the infection with the sars-cov-2 virus**. They were only studied and authorised for the prevention of the disease Covid-19. And already there, we see a lot, not only of misunderstanding, but in fact, of a real propaganda, disinforming propaganda by the institutions and by the European governments. And this is a very unacceptable circumstance. We see it now with the legislations which are announced in the different European countries like France and Italy regarding the so-called Green Pass…

Senta Depuydt: [00:04:48] Yes, I'm just going to come back on this because you say so many important things there. And I remember very clearly – we published an article on this fact that when the EMA, and there is still that interview, I believe – when the EMA released this conditional authorisation, they had a full interview with the experts and they said: "Oh, we don't know if the vaccine is going to prevent transmission. It's actually not been studied.. It's not provided in the data. We have no idea about this". On the

contrary, every evidence points to the fact that in all the countries where there was this huge vaccination campaigns, Israel, UK, etc. we see that there are new variants and it didn't it work on the transmission. So you're really pointing to the key element of the fraud. How does the European Union or how do the different countries continue (with this)? You know, do they provide false evidence, false data to suddenly say: "Oh, yeah, well, it does actually block the transmission". My question to you..

Renate Holzeisen: [00:06:22] Yes, we have to be very clear. We have the authorisation by the European Commission on the positive report of the EMA and from the official documentation of the European Commission, in which everybody can have a look entering in the website of the Human Medicines Register, where you can find on the top immediately the Covid-19 vaccines and clicking on the reports, you'll find then all the deliberations of the European Commission with the attached documents. And from these documents and the documents of the EMA, which you can find on the website of the EMA, you'll see that the European Commission and the EMA, are declaring that these substances are authorised for the prevention of the disease. **They never declared any authorization for the prevention of the infection because EMA itself is declaring that it is absolutely not proven that these substances are working for the prevention of the infection. Therefore, the European Commission, couldn't authorize these 4 substances which are Cominarty (Pfizer/BioNtech), Moderna now called Spikevax, AstraZeneca now called Vaxzevria and Janssen or Johnson & Johnson. They aren't authorized for the prevention of the infection with the virus, and that is legally binding.**

This is the basis, the legal basis we have to start from and therefore all these 'green passes' (covid pass) introduced, which are referring to the proof of the vaccination, with one of these four substances: they are illegal. They are not founded in facts. So this legislation already failed before

they were introduced. And we, lawyers, are now working on that, because it is clear that we would have an absolutely unconstitutional discrimination between people not treated with these experimental substances with regard to people vaccinated. And even the people who were treated with these substances, they weren't vaccinated in order to prevent the infection.

Senta Depuydt: [00:09:54] Yes and that's how they justified all these measures.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:09:57] Yes, it is clear that we have from the start on an absolutely not legal discrimination. And I think if we are bringing this evidence with the documentation, legal documentation of the European Commission and the EMA to the courts, the Green (Covid) pass law has to fall immediately. And also the mandatory vaccination. We have this mandatory vaccination already in Italy for the health workers. And I'm now going to file starting tomorrow, hundreds of legal actions in order to ask the annulment of the suspension already disposed by the South Tyrolean Health Authority with which hundreds of health workers were suspended from their work without wages. They have no earnings at the moment and this is obviously an absolutely unacceptable situation.

Senta Depuydt: [00:11:37] And unfortunately, we see that these kind of situations like in Italy, which is the forerunner, are coming to France. I'm sure you heard of it. And I'm sure other countries will follow.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:11:49] Yes. And it is all based on the manipulation by the governments of the facts, even off the official documents of the European Commission and the EMA, because that is the reality. Our governments are declaring the false. They are declaring that these substances are to prevent infection with the virus where these substances aren't authorized for that.

Senta Depuydt: [00:12:27] I have a question because you and I certainly realize that the role of the European Union is really key in this. They are the ones who pushed this Accelerator Act to change all the legislation and get a waiver for the approval of gene technology. They negotiated all those bad deals for the vaccines, no transparency, no guarantees. They did this approval with almost no data, created a huge debt for citizens, etc, the Covid safety pass. And then they play the good cop, bad cop. And they are also the ones, every five minutes, every day, to change the colour codes of every country with the ECDC. "Oh, you can go Wow it's green. Fantastic. Stop now, it's red!"

You know, they're just playing with the European citizens and European member states. But I'm not aware, except for you, if there are more lawyers litigating directly against the European Commission or institutions or the EMA or the European CDC. Can you tell me more about that. Are there others, other actions? And why would you go directly? Well, most would say no, no, we need to litigate at the national level.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:14:00] We have to do both, obviously. We know that, because of the jurisdiction of the European Court of Justice, it reduced a lot, absolutely too much in my opinion, in violation of the European charter of fundamental rights, the active legitimation of the citizens to file actions for annulment before the European courts… (going) against what the European legislator wanted. So we have, in my opinion, the need of a change in that jurisdiction.

And I remember the words of the advocate general Jacobs, who made a very, very important intervention regarding that. He said: "If they are going in that direction, there will be no real rights of defense (left) for the European citizen. And we are in this situation. So our actions for annulment, to fight against this condition, the authorizations of these experimental substances will be crucial in showing if the European court will base its' decisions on the law and on the

Charter of the fundamental rights, or if we European citizens, at the end are left alone. I found it a very crucial point. And reading what General Advocate Jakobs said years ago, our situation now is exactly what he meant. He said “Attention! The developments you are taking as a court is to deprive the citizens from a real defense in courts”.

Senta Depuydt: [00:16:54] This is well, this is a…

Renate Holzeisen: [00:16:56] Very interesting situation.

Senta Depuydt: [00:16:59] Can I come back on the actions you are filing now? So if I may sum it up, you have filed annulment cases for the four different vaccines that got a conditional approval. So you started some actions we (CHD Europe) already helped promote and find intervenors for.

Can you explain (this one)? So you need to file your litigation, one case per vaccine. You already did it for Pfizer, Moderna and AstraZeneca. And for these, we have no opportunity anymore, let’s say, to intervene. But for the last one, the Johnson & Johnson, we can all participate as intervenors from other countries.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:17:52] Yes, you’re right.

Senta Depuydt: [00:17:54] Give us the details. What do we need to do to join you?

Renate Holzeisen: [00:17:58] So, citizens from all over the European Union and, first of all, belonging to the categories which now are facing a mandatory vaccination, the health workers, but also others. I think about teachers, pilots and workers in a public transport system, they can intervene as sustainers of the Italian actors (plaintiffs). **I brought the action for annulment against the authorisation of Janssen or Johnson & Johnson’s for Italian health workers. So now, French health workers, Belgian, German, Austrian health workers and other European citizens can intervene with their lawyers in**

order to sustain the action of the Italian health workers. This is one (action).

Then, next week, **I will also file a specific action for annulment regarding the deliberation of the European Commission for the condition of the Authorization of Cominarty Pfizer/BioNtech for children from twelve years on**. It is, it was a criminal act in our eyes and we have to ask judges to annul this authorization. But because what is done already with children all over the European Union is incredible. We have this experimental substance as well. We know that the balance between benefits and risks, especially for children, could never be positive. It is really negative because children have no problem with this virus SARS-COV-2 as the facts are showing, but they are incurring incredible risks by this experimental gene therapeutics pulled out. So that is a real crime to now inoculate the children these substances. And we have to stop it.

Senta Depuydt: [00:20:58] Well, I have two questions. The first one is, that we, as Children's Health Defense, our main organization is in the United States, we really follow everything that's happening with the FDA, the CDC, because it's really like the United States is pushing those policies. And as soon as something is approved by the FDA, it gets approved, more or less automatically, by the EMA. I can now see that the trend is moving very fast in the United States. Last I heard, they want to vaccinate babies from six months old and they even speak about vaccinating (kids) without parental consent or even without parental information. So you would not even know that your child, if you know he comes from school and something happens, you wouldn't even know that he's vaccinated. So do you think that this policy is really, let's say, pushed by the US? Because I know that the European CDC is also taking a lot of their information, their science, if we can say so. Is it pushed by the United States? What do you think about it, if you look at it?

Renate Holzeisen: [00:22:30] Yes, I see that this authorization authorities EMA and (others)… They are in the hands of the pharmaceutical lobby or more precisely the lobby are the members of these authorities. So we are in a very critical situation, and therefore, we adults we have to defend the children. We have to defend them… We adults have to block it. They depend absolutely on the help we have to provide. And I can only say that **on the basis of Article 24 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, the needs and the rights of the children are at the top and stand before everything else**. And that we, now, even in the European Union, are using children as guinea pigs, it's an incredible scandal and I ask every parent, every grandmother, every grandfather, every oncle and aunt to think about what we are doing with the children. We don't know the effects on the long term of these substances. They weren't studied. We know the effects these substances have in a very short term. We have thousands, 11000 deaths only in Europe. And we have hundreds of thousands of very severe damages caused by these substances. And we know this is only a little part of the reality because we haven't an active pharmacovigilance. And this is one of the breaches of the European law. It is absolutely unlawful to inoculate an experimental substance even without an active pharmacovigilance. It is crazy. But they know this and they don't want any extra pharmacovigilance, because if there was a real pharmacovigilance, we would have figures at least ten times more, at least.

Senta Depuydt: [00:25:37] Yes, I'm absolutely aware of that. Renate, so how can we join? Let me try to explain what we can do with our friends at Children's Health Defense and then you correct me if I'm wrong. So what people can do in every country.

You're filing in German. The people will need to file in German as well. So we will need to translate the action and then, the form, because you have forms for people to join as

intervenors. And somebody in each country will need to find a lawyer, at least one lawyer per language.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:26:32] Yes. I would say that's the easiest way. It is not very tricky because we are providing the translation of the action that have already filed. Actions are already translated in English, in Italian and I think even in French. And the form for the intervenors, I prepared in the original German language, because they have to be filed in German, because the proceeding is in the German language. But we have it all translated. So the lawyer who brings in the intervenors they have it all prepared by me.

Senta Depuydt: [00:27:45] Who needs to sign the form? So the lawyer will fill in the details of the people who need to say, "OK, I want to participate. This is my name, these are my details, my ID".

Renate Holzeisen: [00:27:58] Every lawyer needs obviously the power given by his clients.

Senta Depuydt: [00:28:09] And they (lawyers) need to be registered at e-Curia (online EU bar). But that's quite simple to do if I understand.

One question that people want to know: are any costs involved to join or any financial risks?

Renate Holzeisen: [00:28:28] So I first of all, the intervenors do only sustain the position of the (actors = plaintiffs) and don't bring in their own arguments. So they don't amplify the needs of defense of the counterpart, which is the European Commission, and could also be the pharmaceutical producer. So the costs are zero, as they don't amplify the arguments brought to the court, there should be no financial risks. This is one argument.

I would also say another very important thing in order that people can understand the basis of this action for annulment.

First of all, as I said, we have no positive balance of risk and benefits. And **another very important argument is that there is no real gap of care (absence of treatment) of Covid-19**.

And there we can see another time the very bad role played by the EMA. This is one of the conditions foreseen by the European legislator in order to give authorisation to pharmaceutical products not studied in all their aspects. We have to know that for these experimental substances there weren't, even pre-clinical studies. Studies on animals weren't made, which are part of fundamental studies.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:30:56] So this is only possible, according to European Union regulation 507 of 2006, if there is a real gap in (an absence of) the therapy of a disease. We know that especially in the European Union, but also in the United States, that they are blocking very good therapies based on products like Ivermectin for example. And we know that especially Ivermectin works very, very well. And we saw that **the EMA two months ago, again, blocked the use of Ivermectin in the European Union**. That's the bad game they are playing. And this is one of a fundamental arguments we bring in with this action for annulment. We say "we can't see the benefits of these substances. The risks are enormous, enormous. You can't even calculate the balance, because you don't know all the risks. We know that there are very high risks in the short term and all the rest we don't even know. So we aren't in the condition even to make a balance. So these authorisations have to be annulled immediately".

Senta Depuydt: [00:32:58] Let me stop you there, because you mentioned many very important things. We have some **legal case in Belgium** exactly on this reason, you know, against the authorization of the vaccines, because there are treatments available.

And also we just did an interview a couple of days ago

with **Dr. Tess Lawrie for Ivermectin Day**, because there's so many doctors also who want to have the right to prescribe. So you're really touching a very, very important element here.

I wanted to say, do you know who is actually responsible for those recommendations at EMA level? Do we know if they follow the advice of the United States, some studies, flawed studies or of the WHO? Can we find individual liability at some point and say: "OK, this individual here is really responsible for manipulating the data or withholding the data?"

I heard on Ivermectin that the first report was very good and then that at the last minute, in France for example, some key people just came in and added little sentences like "Well, it's still not conclusive. We cannot authorize. There is a lack of data" or something like that. Can we do anything more about it. Can we sue those people?

Renate Holzeisen: [00:34:42] Absolutely! I think we have to do the same thing as the **Indian Chamber of Lawyers**. **After filing this fifth action for annulment regarding the specific situation of our poor children, we have also to think about a specific action for damages**. We have to bring in this, according to Article 265, before the European general court against the European Commission and EMA, because (for) blocking the use of these very effective and useful medicines like Ivermectin. I think we have now enough facts in order to bring it in this way before the European General Courts. Because this is the only way they are able to go on with the application of these high risk experimental substances on all of the population. And we see the consequences. We are now in no longer democratic systems with governments introducing mandatory so-called vaccination with these 'gene therapy experimental' products. So we have also to take now the European organs (=organisations or agencies) before the court asking them for damages. And damages are enormous, not only the direct damages regarding life and health of the people, but in direct connection with the economic huge damages. So we

have to work also on that now.

Senta Depuydt: [00:37:15] I'm very happy you say that. And I like to remind everyone – and perhaps you want to comment – on the fact that some people, for example, the Doctors For Covid Ethics or other doctors or experts have sent notices of liability to the people of the EMA, to different health agencies or to the members of the European Parliament. We know that perhaps it's not going to have an immediate effect, but they can't say "we didn't know". I remember very well in December 2019, I was at the WHO summit, the Vaccine Safety Summit, and then we had one of the Filipino health agency's, Dr. Kenneth Hartigan-Go, who really explained the whole narrative during the dengue crisis. It's a bit of a similar situation in a way. So they did an emergency approval because it was a pandemic (epidemic), and then it turned into a mandate of the vaccine and then they had a lot of casualties.

Senta Depuydt: [00:38:44] And so first the doctors kept silent because they were afraid to speak. And then they started to see the death cases. People got out on the streets and they stopped the campaign. It all ended up with thirty two people in criminal court, himself included, people from Sanofi, people from the agencies who had approved (the vaccine), you know, the Filipino FDA etc. So of course, they could say "we didn't know about the risks involved".

And especially, because you have specific risks of introducing a vaccine during a pandemic that were already raised before they started the vaccines. You remember a year ago everybody said "Oh a Covid vaccine can be dangerous because there can be aggravation of the disease, etc." So after that, they quickly signed all these contracts exempting the pharmaceutical industry of any responsibility, because the risk was so big and then they've obviously forgotten that argument. So when we send notices of liability, would that be of any use in this (case) so that people can't say "We didn't know".

Renate Holzeisen: [00:40:08] Absolutely. Absolutely. I personally sent a notice on December 20th, just one day before the European Commission authorized the first of these four substances Cominarty Pfizer/BioNtech always on behalf of a group of Italian health workers… to the European Commission, to the president, to the commissioner of Health and a lot of other representatives of European nations, but also of the World Health Organization. So they can't say they didn't know what they did.

And then obviously, the notices sent by the Doctors For Covid Ethics, which are very precise regarding the scientific basis, and they put very clear questions to the EMA. And EMA didn't give any answer to that. So it's absolutely clear that the workers, the persons responsible for EMA took personal responsibility for all (future damage) costs by these authorisations and the continuing in the authorization of these substances. The legal principle is very clear.

Senta Depuydt: [00:42:02] So let's hope it works. And last thing, you mentioned the economics, and especially since it's also part of your expertise. On our advisory board, we also work with **Catherine Austin-Fitts. And she just did a report called "The "Going Direct Reset" where she really shows how the whole pandemic response from the financial point of view was really already in place to move ahead with an agenda**, because we were in the economic crisis and collapse before the pandemic.

Now we can blame everything on the pandemic, of course. I really recommend that everybody reads that (report). She starts also to identify a few of the key players. So I really hope that you and Catherine (Austin-Fitts) and Reiner (Fuellmich) and Bobby Kennedy and everyone takes action, because those are really international actions. I know that one action has now been filed at the international tribunal in The Hague from French lawyers and organizations to really show also individual responsibilites, at the WHO with Tedros

(Adhanom) for example, and President Macron. France has also a big role in this. So, you know, I really look forward to spread the message, to participate. And you're really one of my heroes.

Renate Holzeisen: [00:43:52] I think the real heroes are the single citizens who are facing the situation on the front, opponing what happens. This for me are the real heroes. I say to every doctor, to every health worker who is coming to me, asking my help and thanking me, I always express my deep thanks to them because without them, we, lawyers won't be able to bring this very, very important, and for our future fundamental questions, to the courts.

Senta Depuydt: [00:44:45] Thank you so much, Renate, and we'll see you soon. Wish you a lot of success for all of this. Thank you very much. Bye bye.

Connect with Children's Health Defense Europe