FoI to UK cabinet Office

Bartholomeus Lakeman 18 June 2021

Delivered

Dear Cabinet Office,

[extraneous material removed] please provide

a) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the existence of SARS-CoV-2 virus as by its isolated form in a culture or by a photograph;

b) the named person, department or organisation being responsible for proving the validity of the Covid-19 tests;

c) the named person, department or organisation who can order an inquiry with subpoena power to obtain above requested proofs.

[extraneous material removed]

Yours faithfully,

Bartholomeus Lakeman

==========

Our ref: FOI2021/13240

Dear Bartholomeus Lakeman,

Thank you for your request for information which was received on 18th

June. Your request is being handled under the terms of the Freedom of

Information Act 2000 ('the Act').

The Act requires that a response must be given promptly, and in any event

within 20 working days. We will therefore aim to reply at the latest by

19th July.

FOI2021 13240 REPLY.pdf

124K Download View as HTML

Dear Bartholomeus Lakeman,

Please find attached our response to your recent Freedom of Information

request (reference FOI2021/13240).

Yours sincerely,

Freedom of Information Team

Cabinet Office

==========

Bartholomeus Lakeman 7 July 2021

Delivered

Dear Cabinet Office,

Please pass this on to the person who conducts Freedom of Information reviews.

I am writing to request an internal review of Cabinet Office's handling of my FOI request 'Who has to provide the proof of SARS CoV-2?'.

With regard to question a (existence of the virus) the Cabinet stated “PHE published guidance ‘here’ [does not function], stating that 'On 31 Dec. 2019, the WHO was ‘informed’ of a cluster of cases of pneumonia of unknown cause detected in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China. On 12 Jan 2020, it was ‘announced’ that a novel coronavirus had been ‘identified’ in samples obtained from cases and that initial analysis of virus genetic sequences ‘suggested’ that this was the cause of the outbreak. This virus is referred to as SARS-CoV-2, and the associated disease as COVID-19.” However, using the words ‘informed’, ‘announced’, ‘identified’ and ‘referred’ indicate that the Cabinet knows that SARS-CoV-2 virus is hypothetical and that there is no proof of the existence of said virus. On 27 Oct PHE, in reply to FOI (21/08/ld/1079) ‘Evidence to prove SARS-COV-2 virus’, it failed to provide proof of the existence of said virus by its research document “Duration of infectiousness and correlation with RT-PCR cycle threshold values in cases of COVID-19”. Further, there is no vaccine made with the genomes of SARS-CoV-2. Which concludes that either the Cabinet does not know who has the proof (by its isolated form in a culture or by a

photograph) of the existence of SARS-CoV-2 or the Cabinet eschews to state that it has no proof.

With regard to question b (validity of the Covid-19 tests) the Cabinet stated ”MHRA has published guidance ‘here’ [does not work] that provides a guide to COVID-19 tests and testing kits, including information on how COVID-19 testing is regulated in the UK”. MHRA claims that the Covid-tests have a specificity of ±90%. However, the answers to FOI #DOH 2021 0009, #29/06/21/kl/643, #764176 email, #2021-000630 and #28/05/21/kl/392 show that the Covid tests' sensitivity is not higher than 50% as these tests have significant biases. E.g., during 2020, 80 different labs used different PCR tests and with different Cycle thresholds (Ct) which values have been accepted up to 45 (without the clinical context of the individual tested) in order to classify asymptomatic (healthy) people as Covid-cases. Despite that the scientific community has clearly stated that a Ct above 28 cannot be classified as positive. Many of the used PCR tests have used less than 3 gene targets herewith failing to discern a current- from a post- infection. Which has increased the false positive rate up to 90%. Prior implementing the LFDs to detect asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 in a larger asymptomatic cohort: no study was done with adequate statistical power that robustly validates such LFDs use. And some 'lighthouse labs’ were run by the same companies making a covid-vaccine: a conflict of interest. This corroborates with that many of the Covid test kits were without competition purchased (> £37bn) as part of a 'VIP stakeholder engagement' with associates of Ministers. N.B, without the PCR test there would be no Covid-pandemic. Moreover, the Covid-19 test kits and its results are insufficiently validated by the MHRA, PHE, NHS, private labs and Cabinet.

Question c (subpoena power to obtain above requested proofs) was left unanswered. Which raises the question for what motive did the Cabinet do so.

In replying to said questions by copying and pasting general information; the Cabinet failed to consider the questions’ background information supplied as 1 – 8 in this FOI, in particular the info in 1. Herewith raises the Cabinet the suspect that it is unable to provide the Prima facie evidence of its Corona Act 2020 and the cause of all its injuries, e.g., the people being deprived of their rights under the ECHR; which in order to be retrieved did coerced the people into the ‘vaccination program’ and there is a loss of British GDP for about £126 billion which will coerce the people to accept the Great Reset. Said injuries, it being a public interest, do obliged the Cabinet to provide of the Corona Act its Prima facie evidence: by answering this FOI (without exceptions) fully, concrete and genuinely.

A full history of my FOI request and all correspondence is available on the Internet at this

address:

https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/who_has_to_provide_the_proof_of

Yours faithfully,

Bartholomeus Lakeman

==========

Cabinet Office FOI Team, 9 July 2021

Dear Bartholomeus Lakeman,

Thank you for your request for an internal review (reference

IR2021/14567), which was prompted by our response to your request for

information under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

We shall endeavour to complete the internal review and respond to you

within 20 working days.

==========

Bartholomeus Lakeman 20 July 2021

Delivered

Dear Cabinet Office,

PHE stating that "On 31 Dec. 2019, the WHO was 'informed' of a cluster of cases of pneumonia of unknown cause detected in Wuhan City, Hubei Province, China. On 12 Jan 2020, it was 'announced' that a novel coronavirus had been 'identified' in samples obtained from cases and that initial analysis of virus genetic sequences 'suggested' that this was the cause of the outbreak. This virus is referred to as SARS-CoV-2, and the associated disease as COVID-19."

However, what was found in said first Wuhan Covid patient's bronchial lavage as a cause for his illness is the genome sequence CGG CGG. This double CGG does not appear in any of all the other (1000+) corona viruses and various researches e.g., "The SARS-CoV-2 Spike protein has a broad tropism for mammalian ACE2 proteins" (https://journals.plos.org/plosbiology/ar...) show that this double CGG does hardly of not replicate in a bat, rat, mice, chevet, pangolin, etc; but it replicates in a primate and best in a human. Thanks to the spike's specific genome sequence that needs the human ACE2 Receptor as its gateway (binding protein).

And the viral spike with the double CGG genome can be replicated in a 'humanist mouse' (genetically modified mouse having human lung tissue) as they did in Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) which is 1 mile from where said first Covid19 patient was found, and on that day, Dr Zing-ly Shi wondered whether this was caused by her lab. In 2018 Dr Zing-ly Shi published that her lab succeeded in producing a coronavirus spike protein that could bind to the human ACE2 receptor by means of this double CGG; it was 99.5% optimized.

This double CGG genome is the same as that of the spike protein which is to be produced by the Covid vaccines. To note is that Covid vaccine mRNA-1273 – the experimental vaccine developed by Moderna for COVID-19 –. Patent (US)10,702,600 ('600) which is relating to, "a messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) comprising an open reading frame encoding a beta-coronavirus (BetaCoV) S protein or S protein subunit formulated in a lipid nanoparticle." The specific claims addressing the pivot to the SARS Coronavirus were patented on March 28, 2019 – 9 months before the SARS CoV-2 outbreak!

Raising the suspect that the first Covid patient was the first victim of a clinical trial of a combination influenza/SARS-CoV-2 vaccine; and/or an accidental release of said Spike protein into Wuhan occurred.

In 2016 The National Institute for Health (NIH) file patent application WO 2018081318A1 "Prefusion Coronavirus Spike Proteins and their Use" disclosing mRNA technology that overlaps (and is used in tandem with) Moderna's technology. https://patents.google.com/patent/WO2018... Lead Inventor Barney Scott Graham was well known to Moderna as he's the person at NIH that Moderna "e-mailed" to get the sequence for SARS CoV-2 according to Moderna's report here ("In January 2020, once it was discovered that the infection in Wuhan was caused by a novel coronavirus, Bancel quickly emailed Dr. Barney Graham, deputy director of the Vaccine Research Center at the National Institutes of Health, asking him to send the genetic sequence for the virus.") https://www.wsws.org/en/articles/2020/05... In addition, co-inventor Jason McLellan worked with Graham on a vaccine patent jointly owned with the Chinese government filed in Australia in 2013 https://patents.google.com/patent/AU2014....

The abovementioned facts contradict the content in PHE stating "…. On 12 Jan 2020, it was 'announced' that a novel coronavirus had been 'identified' in samples obtained from cases and that initial analysis of virus genetic sequences 'suggested' that this was the cause of the outbreak. This virus is referred to as SARS-CoV-2, and the associated disease as COVID-19." The abovementioned facts contradict that SARS-CoV-2 is found as the virus being isolated and the cause of Covid-19. Moreover, all what can be stated is that Covid-19 is caused by a spike with the double CGG genome; either from the WIV lab or from a trail vaccine.

The onus of the Prima facie evidence for the UK Corona Act 2020 and its resulting public injuries; lays on the Cabinet.

Yours faithfully,

Bartholomeus Lakeman

==========

awaiting the reply as of 13aug21