

Notice of Liability: Medical Treatments/Procedures/Devices Union Executive/Rep/Shop Steward



<https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/liability-notice-union.pdf>

How to Serve the Notice of Liability

- Print two copies of the Notice of Liability.
- Fill in the name of the person you are serving it to in the space provided at the top of the first page - on both copies.
- Sign your name and fill in the date in the space provided on the last page - on both copies.
- Keep one copy of the Notice for your records.
- Give the second copy to the person you are serving it to. If they choose not to accept it, then leave it on the floor at their feet.
- If you are serving the Notice in person, be sure to video record yourself serving it (or audio record if video is not possible).
- **If sending by mail, you must use registered mail as that provides proof of delivery.**

Keep all information (eg. Liability Notice copy, video, mailing proof etc.) in a safe place for future use.

NOTE: You do not need a lawyer to serve a Notice of Liability and you do not need consent, or the signature of the person you are serving it to.

Disclaimer: Action4Canada accepts no responsibility or liability for any harms or losses that occur as result of serving a notice of liability. If you do not agree to these terms, then please do not use this notice. We do not make any representations or warranties about the potential consequences of serving a Notice of Liability. This information is not intended as legal or health advice.

Notice of Liability: Medical Treatments/Procedures/Devices Union Executive/Rep/Shop Steward

Attn:

Re: Mandated medical treatments, including COVID-19 injections, masks and tests, recommended or administered to employees

This is an official and personal Notice of Liability.

As the union representative you are unlawfully practicing medicine and are in serious breach of my employee collective agreement by prescribing, recommending, facilitating, advertising, mandating, incentivising, coercing, extorting or intimidating employees to submit to ANY vaccine, including the experimental gene therapy injections for COVID-19 commonly referred to as a “vaccine” and any updated version of them, and/or any other medical device (eg. masks), testing or treatment.

By endorsing the unlawful actions of my employer who is using threats, intimidation and coercion, you are at risk of vicarious liability due to a reckless disregard for my safety, violating my human rights and failing to exercise reasonable care to prevent a known danger. The COVID “vaccines” are causing extreme, permanent, adverse reactions and a high rate of death.

If the Federal Government had invoked the **Federal Emergencies Act for COVID-19**, which it has not, even that Emergencies Act states:

AND WHEREAS the Governor in Council, in taking such special temporary measures, would be subject to the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms and the Canadian Bill of Rights and must have regard to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, particularly with respect to those **fundamental rights that are not to be limited or abridged even in a national emergency.**

There are no provisions in any orders of any health minister, doctor, or provincial legislation, that can, nor pretend that any measures can, override Charter or other pre-Charter constitutional rights. All Statutes, Orders, By-laws, and Acts must be consistent with the Constitution...or they are of no force or effect.

Section 52(1) of **the Constitution Act**, 1982: The Constitution of Canada is the supreme law of Canada, and any law that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Constitution is, to the extent of the inconsistency, **of no force or effect.**

Employment is 100% guaranteed and protected under Section 7 of The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms:

“Everyone has the right to **life, liberty, and security** of the person and the right not to be deprived thereof except in accordance with the principles of fundamental justice.”

Whereas

The emergency measures were based on the claim that we were experiencing a “public health emergency” despite there being no evidence to substantiate this claim. In fact, the emerging evidence continues to indicate that we are experiencing a rate of infection consistent with a normal influenza season¹.

The purported increase in “cases” was a direct consequence of increased testing through the inappropriate use of the PCR instrument to diagnose so-called COVID-19. It has been well established that the PCR test was never designed or intended as a diagnostic tool and is not an acceptable instrument to measure this so-called pandemic. Its inventor, Kary Mullis, clearly indicated that the PCR testing device was never created to test for coronaviruses². Mullis warned that, “the PCR Test can be used to find almost anything, in anybody. If you can amplify one single molecule, then you can find it because that molecule is nearly in every single person”. An international consortium of life-science scientists also detected 10 major scientific flaws at the molecular and methodological level in a 3-peer review of the RTPCR test to detect SARS-CoV-2³.

¹ <https://www.bitchute.com/video/nQgq0BxXfZ4f>

² <https://rumble.com/vhu4rz-kary-mullis-inventor-of-the-pcr-test.html>

³ <https://cormandrostentreview.com/report/>

Despite this warning, the PCR test utilization, purposely set at higher amplifications, was and still is producing up to 97% false positives⁴. Therefore, any imposed emergency measures that are based on PCR testing are unwarranted, unscientific, and quite possibly fraudulent.

In November 2020, a Portuguese court ruled that PCR tests are unreliable⁵. On December 14, 2020, the WHO admitted the PCR Test has a 'problem' at high amplifications as it detects dead cells from old viruses, giving a false positive⁶. Feb 16, 2021, BC Health Officer Bonnie Henry, admitted PCR tests are unreliable⁷. On April 8, 2021, the Austrian court ruled the PCR was unsuited for COVID testing⁸. On April 8, 2021, a German Court ruled against PCR testing stating, "the test cannot provide any information on whether a person is infected with an active pathogen or not, because the test cannot distinguish between "dead" matter and living matter"⁹. On May 8, 2021, the Swedish Public Health Agency stopped PCR Testing for the same reason¹⁰. On May 10, 2021, Manitoba's Chief Microbiologist and Laboratory Specialist, Dr. Jared Bullard testified under cross-examination in a trial before the court of the Queen's Bench in Manitoba, that PCR test results do not verify infectiousness and were never intended to be used to diagnose respiratory illnesses¹¹.

As a workaround, the government then implemented/mandated Rapid Antigen Testing, which is classed as a medical treatment. In Canada, a doctrine of informed consent regarding any medical treatment has become part of Canadian Federal law. According to Supreme Court rulings, no Canadian citizen is required to take any medical treatment without informed consent, which includes the right to refuse such treatment¹². Therefore, no one has the right to force a medical treatment on anyone, as that would be in violation of their right to bodily autonomy, the Privacy Act, and the Criminal Code if extortion (s.346) or intimidation (s.423) are used. The tests also pose a health hazard to humans and pets, and have a negative impact on the environment¹³.

As for the experimental "vaccines", the Nuremberg Code¹⁴, to which Canada is a signatory, states that voluntary informed consent is essential before performing medical experiments on human beings. It also confirms that the person involved should have the legal capacity to give consent, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress, overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, to enable him/her to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This requires, before the acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experiment's subject, that there should be made known to him/her the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonable to be expected; and the effects upon his/her health or person which may possibly come from participation in the experiment.

The treatments marketed as COVID-19 "vaccines", were in Phase III clinical trials until 2023¹⁵, and hence a medical experiment. People taking these treatments were enrolled as test-subjects, and many were unaware that the injections are not actual vaccines as they do not contain a virus but instead an experimental gene therapy.

Vaccine development is generally a long, complex process, often lasting 10-15 years¹⁶. However, the COVID-19 injections were given to the public at the same time as the trial test subjects, hence there was no short or long-term safety data available and therefore fully informed consent was/is not possible.

Emergency Use Authorization of experimental vaccines can only occur if there are no existing safe and effective treatments available. However, treatments were available, such as ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine, but the government censored

⁴ <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciaa1491/5912603>

⁵ <https://unitynewsnetwork.co.uk/portuguese-court-rules-pcr-tests-unreliable-quarantines-unlawful-media-blackout/>

⁶ <https://principia-scientific.com/who-finally-admits-covid19-pcr-test-has-a-problem/>

⁷ <https://rumble.com/vhww4d-bc-health-officer-admits-pcr-test-is-unreliable.html>

⁸ <https://greatgameindia.com/austria-court-pcr-test/>

⁹ <https://2020news.de/sensationsurteil-aus-weimar-keine-masken-kein-abstand-keine-tests-mehr-fuer-schueler/>

¹⁰ <https://tapnewswire.com/2021/05/sweden-stops-pcr-tests-as-covid19-diagnosis/>

¹¹ <https://www.iccf.ca/Manitoba-chief-microbiologist-and-laboratory-specialist-56-of-positive-cases-are-not-infectious/>

¹² https://bottomlineresearch.ca/pdf/informed_consent.pdf

¹³ <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/COVID-19-Rapid-Antigen-Tests.pdf>

¹⁴ https://media.tghn.org/medialibrary/2011/04/BMJ_No_7070_Volume_313_The_Nuremberg_Code.pdf

¹⁵ <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728?term=NCT04368728&draw=2&rank=1>

¹⁶ <https://www.historyofvaccines.org/content/articles/vaccine-development-testing-and-regulation>

their efficacy and prohibited their use^{17 18}. The emergency authorization of the COVID-19 injections was political chicanery, it was the only way they could get such a highly dubious experimental injection “approved”.

It is of critical importance to note, that no other coronavirus vaccine (i.e., MERS, SARS-1) **has ever been approved for market** due to antibody-dependent enhancement, which resulted in severe illness and death in the animal models¹⁹ they were tested on.

At the onset, numerous doctors, scientists, and medical experts issued dire warnings about the short and long-term effects of COVID-19 injections on both adults and children, including but not limited to: death; vaccine-associated enhanced respiratory disease; blood clots; infertility; miscarriages; Bell’s Palsy; cancer; inflammatory conditions; autoimmune disease; early-onset dementia; convulsions; anaphylaxis; inflammation of the heart²⁰; weakened immunity; and antibody-dependent enhancement leading to death. Time has proven those warnings to be accurate²¹.

Dr. Byram Bridle, a pro-vaccine Associate Professor of Viral Immunology at the University of Guelph, gave a terrifying warning of the harms of the experimental treatments in a peer reviewed scientifically published research study²² on COVID-19 shots. The spike proteins, induced by the “vaccine”, get into the blood and circulate throughout the body. They then accumulate in tissues such as the spleen, bone marrow, liver, adrenal glands, testes, and the ovaries. Dr. Bridle notes that they “have known for a long time that the spike protein is a pathogenic protein, it is a toxin, and can cause damage if it gets into blood circulation”. In April 2022, it was revealed through the Pfizer FOI data release that they were fully aware and monitoring nine pages worth of adverse events during the time period 1 December 2020 through 28 February 2021²³.

There is also a high concentration of the spike protein getting into breast milk, and subsequent reports of suckling infants developing bleeding disorders in the gastrointestinal tract. There are further warnings that this injection will render children infertile, and that people who have been vaccinated should NOT donate blood.

As reported to the Vaccine Adverse Events Reporting System (VAERS) in the United States, there were more deaths from the COVID-19 injections in the first five months of 2021 (Dec. 2020 – May 2021) than deaths recorded in the last 23 years from all vaccines combined²⁴. It is further reported that only one percent of vaccine injuries are reported to VAERS²⁵, and that is compounded by there being a several month’s delay in uploading the adverse events to the VAERS database.

On October 28th 2022, VAERS data release for the period December 2020 to October 21st 2022, showed **1,447,520 adverse event** reports following COVID-19 injections, including 31,696 deaths and 263,462 serious injuries. Of that total, 5,027 reports were of miscarriage or premature birth; 16,555 reported cases of Bell’s Palsy; 43,699 reports of blood-clotting disorders; 10,100 reports of anaphylaxis; and 24,438 cases of myocarditis and pericarditis²⁶.

Canada’s equivalent to VAERS, the Adverse Events Following Immunization (AEFI), is a passive reporting system that is not widely promoted to the public. It is extremely time-consuming for physicians to use and hence, many adverse events are going unreported there. The College of Physicians and health officials are also discouraging physicians from using this system by threatening revocation of their medical licence²⁷.

Early on, Dr. McCullough, a highly cited internist, cardiologist, and epidemiologist, came to the shocking conclusion that the government was “...scrubbing unprecedented numbers of injection-related-deaths”. He further added, “...with a typical new drug at about five deaths, unexplained deaths, we get a black-box warning, your listeners would see it on TV, saying it may cause death. And then at about 50 deaths it’s pulled off the market”²⁸.

¹⁷ <https://www.washingtonexaminer.com/news/study-finds-84-fewer-hospitalizations-for-patients-treated-with-controversial-drug-hydroxychloroquine>

¹⁸ <https://alethoneews.com/2021/05/26/five-recently-published-randomized-controlled-trials-confirm-major-statistically-significant-benefits-of-ivermectin-against-covid-19/>

¹⁹ <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/21645515.2016.1177688>

²⁰ <https://www.nbcconnecticut.com/news/coronavirus/connecticut-confirms-at-least-18-cases-of-apparent-heart-problems-in-young-people-after-covid-19-vaccination/2494534/>

²¹ <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/cdc-errors-kids-covid-vaccine-injuries-vaers/>

²² <https://podcasts.apple.com/ca/podcast/new-peer-reviewed-study-on-covid-19-vaccines-suggests/id1318830191?i=1000523346577>

²³ <https://phmppt.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/5.3.6-postmarketing-experience.pdf>

²⁴ <https://vaccineimpact.com/2021/cdc-death-toll-following-experimental-covid-injections-now-at-4863-more-than-23-previous-years-of-recorded-vaccine-deaths-according-to-vaers/>

²⁵ https://www.lewrockwell.com/2019/10/no_author/harvard-medical-school-professors-uncover-a-hard-to-swallow-truth-about-vaccines/

²⁶ <https://childrenshealthdefense.org/defender/deaths-adverse-events-updated-covid-booster-shots-vaers/>

²⁷ <https://action4canada.com/bc-doctors-open-letter-regarding-vaccine-adverse-reactions/>

²⁸ <https://leohohmann.com/2021/04/30/highly-cited-covid-doctor-comes-to-stunning-conclusion-govt-scrubbing-unprecedented-numbers-of-injection-related-deaths/>

In 2021 it was already being reported that people under the age of 30 were at a very low risk of contracting or transmitting COVID-19. Risk of death for the age group 15-24 was 1 in 218,399 according to David Spiegelhalter of the University of Cambridge and Office of National Statistics (ONS) UK, referenced on Page 8 of "An Assessment of Covid-19"²⁹. Per the American Council on Science and Health, as well as the National Institutes of Health (NIH), "the estimated age-specific Infection Fatality Rate (IFR) was, and remains, very low for children and younger adults (e.g., 0.002% at age 10 and 0.01% at age 25) which translates to a survivability rate of 99.99% to 99.998%, whereas the IFR is 0.4% at age 55 and 1.4% at 65 translating to a survivability rate of 99.6% to 98.6% respectively"^{30 31}. Minors are at nearly zero percent risk of contracting or transmitting respiratory illnesses and are, instead, buffers which help others build their immune system. Despite these facts, the government continues to mandate the now proven harmful COVID-19 injections, and the updated version of them, to this age group.

Not only are the COVID-19 injections causing severe injury and death, they are also proving to be ineffective against all variants.

As far back as May 2021, Health Canada's Summary Basis of Decision³², revealed that the trials did not prevent infection or transmission. In addition, the Summary reported that both Moderna and Pfizer identified six areas of missing (limited/no clinical data) information: "use in paediatric (age 0-18)", "use in pregnant and breastfeeding women", "long-term safety", "long-term efficacy" including "real-world use", "safety and immunogenicity in subjects with immune-suppression", and "concomitant administration of non-COVID vaccines".

This did not stop the Canadian Government from enthusiastically recommending it to pregnant and breastfeeding mothers, with devastating results.

Under the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act of Canada*³³, a crime against humanity means, among other things, murder, any other inhumane act or omission that is committed against any civilian population or any identifiable group and that, at the time and in the place of its commission, constitutes a crime against humanity according to customary international law, conventional international law, or by virtue of its being criminal according to the general principles of law are recognized by the community of nations, whether or not it constitutes a contravention of the law in force at the time and in the place of its commission. The Act also confirms that every person who conspires or attempts to commit, **is an accessory after the fact**, in relation to, or counsels in relation to, a crime against humanity, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for life.

Under sections 265 and 266 of the *Criminal Code of Canada*³⁴, a person commits an assault when, without the consent of another person, he applies force intentionally to that other person, directly or indirectly. Everyone who commits an assault is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or an offence punishable on summary conviction.

You cannot lawfully compel me to be criminally assaulted as a condition of my employment, or ongoing employment.

Based on the *Genetic Non-Discrimination Act, Bill S-201*³⁵, it is an indictable offence to force anyone to take a DNA/RNA test or deny any service, employment, or education opportunity to anyone who refuses to take such a test. The punishment is a fine not exceeding \$1,000,000 or imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, or both³⁶.

In 1986, the Supreme Court of Canada ruled in *E. (Mrs.) v. Eve*, 1986 CanLII 36 (SCC), [1986] 2 S.C.R. 388³⁷, that forced medical testing violates the inviolability of the body and is unlawful. The Court upheld this ruling in *Engel v. Salyn* 1993 CanLII 152 (SCC), [1993] 1 SCR 306³⁸.

²⁹ <https://ghorganisation.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/GHO-updated-pdf.pdf>

³⁰ <https://www.acsh.org/news/2020/11/18/covid-infection-fatality-rates-sex-and-age-15163>

³¹ <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04368728?term=NCT04368728&draw=2&rank=1>

³² <https://action4canada.com/wp-content/uploads/Summary-Basis-of-Decision-COVID-19-Vaccine-Moderna-Health-Canada.pdf>

³³ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-45.9/page-1.html>

³⁴ <https://www.laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/section-265.html>

³⁵ <https://www.parl.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/bill/S-201/royal-assent>

³⁶ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/G-2.5/index.html>

³⁷ <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1986/1986canlii36/1986canlii36.html?searchUrlHash=AAAAQAWRS4gKE1ycy4pIHuYUeV2ZSwgMTk4NgAAAAAB&resultIndex=1>

³⁸ <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1993/1993canlii152/1993canlii152.html?searchUrlHash=AAAAQARYm9keSAvcyBpbmZpb2xhdGUAAAAAQ&resultIndex=1>

It is a further violation of the *Canadian Criminal Code*³⁹, to endanger the life of another person. Sections 216, 217, 217.1 and 221.

Duty of persons undertaking acts dangerous to life

Sec. 216: Everyone who undertakes to administer surgical or medical treatment to another person or to do any other lawful act that may endanger the life of another person is, except in cases of necessity, under a legal duty to have and to use reasonable knowledge, skill and care in so doing. R.S., c. C-34, s. 198

Duty of persons undertaking acts

Sec. 217: Everyone who undertakes to do an act is under a legal duty to do it if an omission to do the act is or may be dangerous to life.

Duty of persons directing work

Sec. 217.1: Everyone who undertakes, or has the authority, to direct how another person does work or performs a task is under a legal duty to take reasonable steps to prevent bodily harm to that person, or any other person, arising from that work or task.

Causing bodily harm by criminal negligence

Sec. 221: Every person who by criminal negligence causes bodily harm to another person is guilty of
(a) an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term of not more than 10 years; or,
(b) an offence punishable on summary conviction.

Domestically, in the seminal decision of *Hopp v Lepp*, [1980] 2 SCR 192⁴⁰, the Supreme Court of Canada determined that cases of non-disclosure of risks and medical information fall under the law of negligence. Hopp also clarified the standard of informed consent and held that, even if a certain risk is only a slight possibility which ordinarily would not be disclosed, but which carries serious consequences, such as paralysis or death, the material risk must be revealed to the patient.

The duty of disclosure for informed consent is rooted in an individual's right to bodily autonomy. In other words, a person has the right to understand the consequences of medical treatment regardless of whether those consequences are deemed improbable, and have determined that, although medical opinion can be divided as to the level of disclosure required, the standard is simple, "A Reasonable Person Would Want to Know the Serious Risks, Even if Remote." *Hopp v Lepp*, supra; *Bryan v Hicks*, 1995 CanLII 172 (BCCA); *British Columbia Women's Hospital Center*, 2013 SCC 30⁴¹.

Vaccination is voluntary in Canada⁴². According to the Public Health Agency of Canada, Canadian National Report on Immunization, 1996:

"Vaccines are not mandatory in Canada; and they cannot be made mandatory because of the Canadian Constitution."

Therefore, any government mandates or enforcement of vaccines are moot. Employers who are attempting to impose ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injections on employees are in violation of the Constitution, Criminal Code and human rights, and are putting themselves personally at risk of potential imprisonment and a civil lawsuit for damages. Canadian law has long recognized that individuals have the right to control what happens to their bodies, this would include testing and mask wearing. In point of fact, there is no law in Canada legislating mask wearing, because no one has the authority to interfere with an individual's right to breathe freely.

In summary, the citizens of Canada are protected under the medical and legal ethics of express informed consent, and are entitled to the full protections guaranteed under:

- **Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms**⁴³ (1982) Section 2a, 2b, 6, 7, 8, 9, 15.
- **Bill of Rights**
- **Canadian Criminal Code**
- **Universal Declaration on Bioethics and Human Rights**⁴⁴ (2005)

³⁹ <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/c-46/FullText.html>

⁴⁰ <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2553/index.do>

⁴¹ <https://www.canlii.org/en/ca/scc/doc/1980/1980canlii14/1980canlii14.html>

⁴² https://web.archive.org/web/20080414131846/http://www.phac-aspc.gc.ca/publicat/ccdr-rmtc/97vol23/23s4/23s4b_e.html

⁴³ <https://www.canada.ca/en/canadian-heritage/services/how-rights-protected/guide-canadian-charter-rights-freedoms.html>

⁴⁴ <https://en.unesco.org/themes/ethics-science-and-technology/bioethics-and-human-rights>

- **Nuremberg Code⁴⁵ (1947)**
- **Helsinki Declaration⁴⁶ (1964, Revised 2013) Article 25, 26**

According to top constitutional lawyer, Rocco Galati, *“both government and private businesses cannot impose mandatory vaccinations...mandatory vaccination in all employment context would be unconstitutional and/or illegal and unenforceable.”*⁴⁷

There is no legislation that allows an employer to terminate an employee for not getting a COVID-19 shot. If an employer does so, they are inviting a wrongful dismissal claim, as well as a claim for a human rights code violation⁴⁸. For those employees who are influenced, pressured or coerced by their employer to have the COVID-19 shot, and suffer any adverse consequences as a result of the injection, the employer, and its directors, officers, and those in positions carrying out these measures on behalf of the employer, will be opening themselves up to personal civil liability, and potential personal criminal liability, under the Nuremberg Code, the Criminal Code of Canada, and the *Crimes Against Humanity and War Crimes Act of Canada*, all referenced above.

Employers are unlawfully placing employees on unpaid leave and are also threatening to prohibit them from accessing their banked sick time, vacation, or overtime, if they choose to not get vaccinated. Unpaid leave may result in employees losing their benefits, and in some cases, having to pay them back. This amounts to a breach of contract.

The unions are deceiving and misinforming their members by instructing them that they must comply with their employer's requirements to vaccinate or face consequences. Demanding vaccination, or proof of vaccination status, as a requirement for ongoing employment is an egregious violation of individual human rights, the Privacy Act, the Canadian Criminal Code, Supreme Court rulings, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, and International Agreements.

The Union's responsibility and obligation is towards the employment security, health and welfare of its individual and collective membership, including myself.

Extortion; committing tort; privacy violations; malicious or willful misconduct; gross negligence; assault and battery; and acting in bad faith are serious indictable criminal code offences.

In the workplace, employers have a duty to protect employees from injury, including mental injury caused by acts of harassment. Tort law allows employees to sue for damages⁴⁹.

Union Executive/Rep/Shop Stewards who are attempting to support or enforce ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injections, or interfering with someone's guaranteed rights (eg gainful employment or essential and non-essential services) are in violation of the Constitution, Criminal Code and human rights, and are personally not protected under any Act, Order or Statute that is in violation of them.

If you persist in recommending, encouraging, advertising, mandating, facilitating, incentivising, coercing, ANY vaccine including the COVID-19 injection, testing, masking or any other medical treatment, under threat of losing my employment or being suspended without pay, I will hold you personally, civilly, and/or criminally liable for any financial injury and/or loss of my personal income and my ability to provide food and shelter for my family as well as any damages or injury I suffer as a result of your actions.

It is the duty of every Canadian citizen, no matter their position or title, to uphold the law and respect the Constitution and Charter Rights. Should you choose to not desist, this NOL may be used as evidence against you in future actions. You have been duly warned.

To avoid legal action, you must cease and desist, and take further steps to remedy your unlawful actions and non-defense of myself as a paying Union Member, by immediately writing a statement to my employer emphasizing your support of my right to refuse any medical intervention, including vaccination.

Name: _____

Date: _____

Signature: _____

⁴⁵ <http://www.cirp.org/library/ethics/nuremberg/>

⁴⁶ <https://www.wma.net/what-we-do/medical-ethics/declaration-of-helsinki/>

⁴⁷ <https://www.constitutionalrightscentre.ca/employee-rights-the-covid-19-vaccine/>

⁴⁸ <https://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/en/about-human-rights/what-discrimination>

⁴⁹ <http://hrprofessionalnow.ca/legal-words/468-new-tort-of-harassment-allows-employees-to-sue-for-damages>