

No. 25-963

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

CYNTHIA BRACCIA, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

NORTHWELL HEALTH SYSTEMS,
Respondent.

On Petition for a Writ of Certiorari to the United
States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

***Amici Curiae* Brief of America's Frontline
Doctors and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., in
Support of Petitioners for Reversal**

DR. SIMONE GOLD, M.D., J.D.

DAVID A. DALIA, Attorney at Law
Counsel of Record
700 Camp Street
New Orleans, LA 70130
(504) 524-5541
davidadalia@gmail.com

Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
A MATTER OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE.....	1
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i>	2
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	5
ARGUMENT.....	7
A. Fundamental constitutional rights of patients such as the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment, the right to refuse medical treatment under the Fourteenth Amendment, and federal laws such as Title VII take precedence over state and local laws to the contrary. The Supremacy Clause and good public policy require that the Constitution remains supreme. This is especially crucial when experimental mRNA injections with terrible safety profiles are mandated, and reasonable accommodations are prohibited through an unjustified “undue burden” rationale. This medical mandate is against public policy.....	7
B. It is undisputed that the mandated experimental mRNA injectable drugs were never approved by the FDA, despite erroneous media reports to the contrary, and have shockingly high fatality rates. The CDC’s own reporting	

system has documented millions of adverse reactions and a tragic 39,050 fatalities attributable to these experimental mRNA injections through February 27, 2026. Previously, a vaccine would have been pulled from the market after only a few deaths. VAERS has also documented millions of adverse reactions and hospitalizations..... 12

C. “Mandating” a dangerous experimental drug absent voluntary, coercion-free informed consent violates well-established constitutional principles, including the right to refuse medical treatment and of personal bodily integrity; violates civil and criminal federal and state laws prohibiting medical battery, negligent injuring, assault, and negligent homicide; and violates numerous federal regulations requiring voluntary informed consent and full disclosure, including 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, 21 C.F.R. § 50.20, 21 C.F.R. § 50.25, 45 C.F.R. § 46.116, and the Nuremberg Code. 20

CONCLUSION..... 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>CASES</u>	<u>PAGE(S)</u>
<i>Bridges v. Methodist Hospital</i> , 2024 WL 4354816 (S.D. Tex Sept. 30, 2024).....	4, 10, 23
<i>Canterbury v. Spence</i> , 464 F.2d 772 (1972).....	22
<i>Cobbs v. Grant</i> , 8 Cal.3d 229 (1972)	22
<i>Cooper v. Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center</i> , 196 N.Y.S.3d 325 (Sup. Ct. 2023)	6
<i>Cruzan v. Dir., Mo. Dep’t of Health</i> , 497 U.S. 261 (1990)	4, 22
<i>Doe #1 v. Rumsfeld</i> , 297 F. Supp. 2d 119 (D.D.C. 2003)	22
<i>Does v. Hochul</i> , 632 F. Supp. 3d 120 (E.D.N.Y. 2022).....	19
<i>Does 1-2 v. Hochul</i> , 2024 WL 5182675 (2d Cir. Dec. 20, 2024).....	11
<i>Downer v. Veilleux</i> , 322 A.2d 82 (Me. 1974)	22
<i>Georgia v. President of the United States</i> , 46 F.4th 1283 (11th Cir. 2022)	10

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

<i>Groff v. DeJoy</i> , 600 U.S. 447 (2023).....	11
<i>Guardianship of Roe</i> , 383 Mass. 415 (1981)	22
<i>Mahmoud v. Taylor</i> , 606 U.S. 522 (2025).....	2, 23
<i>Medical Professionals for Informed Consent v.</i> <i>Bassett</i> , 78 Misc. 3d 482 (Sup. Ct. Jan. 13, 2023)	10
<i>Miller v. McDonald</i> , 223 L. Ed. 2d 270 (2025).....	2, 5, 23
<i>Mills v. Rogers</i> , 457 U.S. 291 (1982).....	22
<i>Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. DOL, OSHA</i> , 595 U.S. 109 (2022).....	10
<i>Riggins v. Nevada</i> , 504 U.S. 127 (1992).....	22–23
<i>Russo v. Patchogue-Medford Sch. Dist.</i> , 129 F.4th 182, 186 (2d Cir. 2025).....	11
<i>Santosky v. Kramer</i> , 455 U.S. 745 (1982).....	4
<i>Schloendorff v Society of New York Hospital</i> . 211 N.Y. 125 (1914).....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

Sell v. United States,
539 U.S. 166 (2003) 23

Sweeney v. Univ. of Colorado Hosp. Auth.,
2024 WL 3713835 (D. Colo. July 12,
2024) 4, 10, 23, 24

Texas v. Becerra,
577 F. Supp.3d 527 (N.D. Tex. 2021)..... 10

Texas v. Becerra,
667 F.Supp.3d 252 (N.D.Tex. 2023)..... 10

*United KP Freedom Alliance v. Kaiser
Permanente*, No. 21-cv-07894-VC,
(N.D.Cal. Nov. 18, 2021) 23

Vacco v. Quill,
521 U.S. 793 (1997) 22

Washington v. Harper,
494 U.S. 210 (1990) 22

CONSTITUTION

First Amendment 5, 6, 7, 25

Fourteenth Amendment 5, 7

U.S. Const. Art. VI, Cl. 2 5, 6, 7, 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

STATUTES AND REGULATIONS

21 U.S.C. § 241 23

21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3 20, 21

21 C.F.R. § 50.20 20, 21, 22

21 C.F.R. § 50.25 20, 21, 22

45 C.F.R. § 46 22

45 C.F.R. § 46.116 20, 21

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964..... 5, 6, 25

RULES

Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 12(b)(6) 10

OTHER REFERENCES

“33 nurses ‘died suddenly’ in the US this past
week [No causes of death were listed],”
[https://markcrispinmiller.substack.com/p/
33-nurses-died-suddenly-in-the-us](https://markcrispinmiller.substack.com/p/33-nurses-died-suddenly-in-the-us)..... 6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

Luigi Cari, *et al.* “Differences in the expression levels of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein in cells treated with mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccines: A study on vaccines from the real world.” *Vaccines* (Basel) 11(4):879. Apr 21, 2023 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37112792>..... 19

Covid Pedia | America's Frontline Doctors - Vaccine Safety <https://aflids.org/covid-pedia/vaccine-safety> 13

“England Refuses to Offer COVID Shots to Kids Under 12, While US Cities Mandate Them. Who’s Right?” <https://fee.org/articles/england-refuses-to-offer-covid-shots-to-kids-under-12-while-us-cities-mandate-them-who-s-right/> 9

“Finland joins Sweden and Denmark in limiting Moderna COVID-19 vaccine,” <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/finland-pauses-use-moderna-covid-19-vaccine-young-men-2021-10-07/>..... 9

“Florida State Surgeon General Calls for Halt in the Use of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines.” <https://www.floridahealthgov/newsroom/2024/01/20240103-halt-use-covid19-mrna-vaccines.pr.html>..... 8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

- Global Preparedness Monitoring Board. “New risks raise pandemic threat on a global scale.” October 14, 2024. <https://www.gpmb.org/news/news/item/14-10-2024-new-risks-raise-pandemic-threat-on-a-global-scale>..... 10–11
- Simone Gold, M.D., J.D. “A White Paper on Hydroxychloroquine,” <https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/index/covid/hydroxychloroquine/white-paper/> 17–18
- Josh Guetzkow and Retsef Levi. “Effect of mRNA vaccine manufacturing processes on efficacy and safety still an open question” (letter to the Editor), *BMJ* 2022;378:o1731. July 12, 2022. <https://www.bmj.com/content/378/bmj.o1731/rr-2> 20
- Lee Harding. “Japanese researchers say side effects of COVID vaccines linked to 201 types of diseases,” *Western Standard*, January 15, 2024. <https://www.westernstandard.news/news/japanese-researchers-say-side-effects-of-covid-vaccines-linked-to-201-types-of-diseases/51661> 15
- Jesús Herмосilla, *et al.* “Analysing the in-use stability of mRNA-LNP COVID-19 vaccines Comirnaty™ (Pfizer) and Spikevax™ (Moderna): A comparative study of the particulate.” *Vaccines* (Basel) 11(11):1635. Oct 25, 2023. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38005967>..... 19–20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

Hong Jin Kim, et al. “Broad-Spectrum Adverse Events of Special Interests Based on Immune Response Following COVID-19 Vaccination: A Large-Scale Population-Based Cohort Study,” <i>J. Clin. Med.</i> 14(5) 1767, March 6, 2025. https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0383/14/5/1767	17
https://aflids.org/about-us/press-releases/america-frontline-doctors-supports-the-filing-of-a-petition-for-preliminary-injunction-to-prevent-kaiser-permanente-from-enforcing-their-vaccine-mandate	2
https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/about-us	1
https://www.fda.gov/media/151710/download	18–19
https://c19hcq.org/	18
https://c19ivm.org/	18
https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/index.html	22
https://openvaers.com/covid-data	12
https://x.com/ChildrensHD/status/1925355939369988144	14
https://x.com/drsimonegold/status/1892626222250639592	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

https://x.com/SecKennedy/status/19273684408 11008138	8, 17
https://www.history.com/news/the-infamous-40-year-tuskegee-study	24
Tomomi Koizumi and Masao Ono, “Cardiac Multiple Micro-Scars: An Autopsy Study,” <i>J Am Coll Cardiol Case Rep.</i> 30(5) 10383, March 2025. https://www.jacc.org/doi/10.1016/j.jaccas.2024.103083	15
Raphael Lataster, Ph.D. “European excess mortality correlates with COVID-19 vaccination into 2024.” <i>Bulgarian Medicine</i> 13:2 (2023) https://www.skirsch.com/covid/lataster.pdf	14
Retsef Levi, <i>et al.</i> , “Twelve-month all-cause mortality after initial COVID-19 vaccination with Pfizer-BioNTech or mRNA-1273 among adults living in Florida,” https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.04.25.25326460	14
“Louisiana health officials ‘shifting away’ from policy of promoting COVID, flu vaccinations.” https://www.nola.com/news/politics/vaccine-louisiana-policy-covid-flu/article_3e0521bc-c096-11ef-bfd3-fb389831770e.html	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

Vibeke Manniche, *et al.* “Rates of successful conceptions according to COVID-19 vaccination status: Data from the Czech Republic.” https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202504.2487/v1?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email 14

M. Nathaniel Mead, *et al.* “Myocarditis after SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 vaccination: Epidemiology, outcomes, and new perspectives,” *Intl J Cardiovascular Rsch & Innovation*, 3(1) 1-43, Jan-Mar 2025. <https://cardiovascular-research-and-innovation.reseaprojournals.com/Articles/myocarditis-after-sars-cov-2-infection-and-covid-19-vaccination-epidemiology-outcomes-and-new-perspectives>) 15

Art Moore. “CDC data signaling vaccine catastrophe: It took only 32 deaths to halt 1976 shot campaign.” *World Net Daily*, February 14, 2022. <https://www.wnd.com/2022/02/cdc-data-signaling-vaccine-catastrophe/> 13

Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D. “Slovak Government Report Calls for Ban of ‘Dangerous’ mRNA Vaccines,” *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*. <https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/slovak-government-report-calls-for-ban-of-dangerous-mrna-vaccines/> 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

E.O. Okoro, *et al.* “Paradoxical increase in global COVID-19 deaths with vaccination coverage: World Health Organization estimates (2020–2023).” *International Journal of Risk & Safety in Medicine*. 2025;0(0). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09246479251336610>..... 14

Nuremberg Code 20, 21, 22, 24

André Redert, Ph.D. “Causal effect of covid vaccination on mortality in Europe.” February 2023. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368777703_Causal_effect_of_covid_vaccination_on_mortality_in_Europe 14

Harold M. Schmeck, Jr. “Swine flu program is halted in 9 states as 3 die after shots,” *The New York Times*, October 13, 1976. <https://www.nytimes.com/1976/10/13/archives/swine-flu-program-is-halted-in-9-states-as-3-die-after-shots.html> 13

James A. Thorp, *et al.* “Are COVID-19 Vaccines in Pregnancy as Safe and Effective as the Medical Industrial Complex Claim? Part I,” *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*, 2/08/2025. <https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/are-covid-19-vaccines-in-pregnancy-as-safe-and-effective-as-the-medical-industrial-complex-claim-part-i/> 16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

(Continued)

Lizhou Zhang, *et al.* “Effect of mRNA-LNP components of two globally-marketed COVID-19 vaccines on efficacy and stability.” *NPJ Vaccines* 8(1):156 (2023).
<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37821446/>20

A MATTER OF GREAT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Coercively mandating dangerous and possibly fatal experimental drugs while at the same time violating fundamental constitutional rights of free exercise of religion and to refuse medical treatments cannot be countenanced, and causes great harm. This is about saving lives.

Amici Curiae or “AFLDS” are the Free Speech Foundation, d/b/a America’s Frontline Doctors, and Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., the founder and physician member with over twenty years’ experience as an emergency room physician in minority communities around the nation.^{1,2} *Amici Curiae* respectfully file this *amici curiae* brief in support of the Petitioners for reversal in *Cynthia Braccia, et al. v. Northwell Health Systems*, No. 25-963.

Amici Curiae have also filed briefs in recent cases affecting public health and medical freedom, such as *Chiles v. Salazar*, No. 24-539, *Does 1-2 v. Hochul*, No. 24-1015; *Kory v. Bonta*, No. 24-932; *Foote v. Ludlow School Committee*, No. 25-77; *Lee v. Poudre School District R-1*, No. 25-89; *Stockton v. Brown*, No. 25-606; *Mirabelli v. Bonta*, No. 25A810; *Lavigne v. Great Salt Bay Community School Board*, No. 25-759; and *International Partners for Ethical Care, Inc. v. Ferguson*, seven of which cases are under consideration at this time.

¹ It is hereby certified that no counsel or any party authored or prepared this brief in whole or in part, and no such counsel or party made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. The parties received notice of the filing of this *amici curiae* brief pursuant to Rule 37.2.

² <https://americasfrontlinedoctors.org/about-us>

AFLDS also filed briefs in cases recently decided by this Honorable Court, such as *Miller v. McDonald*, 223 L. Ed. 2d 270 (2025); *United States v. Skrmetti*, 605 U.S. 495 (2025); *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U.S. 522 (2025), and *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. OSHA*, 595 U.S. 109 (2022).

This *amici curiae* brief offers an important *medical and legal* perspective to this Court of great public importance, by conclusively demonstrating that the Respondent engaged in unconstitutional and unconscionable activity by “mandating” dangerous experimental mRNA personal medical treatments in violation of informed consent and the numerous clearly established laws and regulations enumerated herein.

Respondent’s blanket refusal to grant religious accommodations from its experimental vaccine mandate on the ground of undue burden violates fundamental constitutional rights found in the Free Exercise Clause of the First Amendment, violates Petitioners’ fundamental constitutional right to refuse medical treatment, and is medically very dangerous.

These unconstitutional, illegal and irrational coercive mandates should be rejected.

INTEREST OF *AMICI CURIAE*

Amici Curiae are a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization of thousands of member physicians from across the country, representing a range of medical disciplines and practical experience on the front lines of medicine, and its founder and expert physician and attorney member, Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D.

AFLDS’ programs focus on a number of critical issues, including:

- Providing Americans with science-based facts about COVID-19;
- Protecting physician independence from government overreach;
- Combating COVID-19 with evidence-based approaches without compromising constitutional freedoms;
- Fighting medical cancel culture and media censorship;
- Advancing healthcare policies that protect the physician-patient relationship;
- Expanding COVID-19 treatment options for all Americans who need them; and
- Strengthening the voices of frontline doctors in the national healthcare conversation.

Dr. Gold and AFLDS publicly supported the position, as early as October, 2020, that experimental mRNA injections are not “vaccines” *because they do not prevent infection or transmission, and they are neither “safe” nor “effective.”*³ They are personal medical treatments only. This view is now known to be correct and highly relevant to this case.

The proven lack of efficacy of experimental COVID-19 mRNA injections is an important point, as other rulings now on appeal, and which also relied upon the false assumption of efficacy, also found a

³ <https://afllds.org/about-us/press-releases/americas-frontline-doctors-supports-the-filing-of-a-petition-for-preliminary-injunction-to-prevent-kaiser-permanente-from-enforcing-their-vaccine-mandate>

“compelling” governmental interest in justifying a coercive medical mandate for a dangerous drug that does not protect other people.⁴

If the experimental mRNA drug does not protect other people, it is irrational to mandate it. Certainly such a mandate cannot survive the strict scrutiny for individual medical treatments demanded by *Cruzan v. Dir., Mo. Dep’t of Health*, 497 U.S. 261, 282 (1990): “This Court has mandated an intermediate standard of proof — ‘clear and convincing evidence’ — when the individual interests at stake in a state proceeding are both ‘particularly important’ and ‘more substantial than mere loss of money.’” (quoting *Santosky v. Kramer*, 455 U.S. 745, 756 (1982)).

“Informed consent” must be fully informed, never coerced, nor subjected to undue influence, nor distorted by censored and incomplete information.

It is *Amici Curiae’s* position that decisions to illegally “mandate” a dangerous experimental medical treatment *which does not prevent infection or transmission, and which also has severe side effects, including death, which are undisclosed to the patient*, while simultaneously violating numerous civil and

⁴ See, e.g., *Bridges v. Methodist Hospital*, 2024 WL 4354816 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 30, 2024), No. 23-cv-1699, Doc. 99, p. 16. (“Methodist implemented a mandatory COVID-19 immunization policy in an effort ‘to do their business of saving lives’ without spreading the COVID-19 virus and ‘to keep staff, patients, and their families safer.’ ... Those are legitimate interests, and the immunization policy is rationally related to them.”); *Sweeney v. Univ. of Colorado Hosp. Auth.*, 2024 WL 3713835 (D. Colo. July 12, 2024), No. 23-cv-02451, Doc. 58, p. 27 (Concluding stemming the spread of COVID-19 is a compelling interest and mandating vaccination is rationally related to that interest.) *Sweeney v. Univ. of Colorado Hosp. Auth.* is pending on petition for a writ of *certiorari* to this Court, No. 25-1055.

criminal laws, under the coercive threat of the loss of one’s employment, are irrational and against public policy.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Fundamental constitutional rights of patients such as the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment, the right to refuse medical treatment under the Fourteenth Amendment, and federal laws such as Title VII always take precedence over state and local laws to the contrary. The Supremacy Clause and good public policy require that the Constitution remains supreme.

This is especially crucial when dangerous experimental mRNA injections with terrible safety profiles are mandated, and reasonable accommodations are prohibited through an unjustified “undue burden” rationale.

It is not an “undue burden” on Respondent to simply respect its patient/employees free exercise of religion, and to stop forcing experimental injections upon them against their will, violating their informed consent. This Court’s holding in *Miller v. McDonald*, 223 L. Ed. 2d 270 (2025) (No. 25-133) makes this clear.

Overwhelming evidence shows that these experimental COVID-19 mRNA injections are not “safe” or “effective.” Any decision to illegally “mandate” a dangerous experimental medical treatment which does *not* prevent infection or transmission, and which also has undisclosed severe side effects, including *death* at unacceptable levels, is completely irrational. Simultaneously violating the

patient’s fundamental constitutional rights and federal laws such as Title VII via such “mandate,” under the coercive threat of the loss of one’s employment, is also completely irrational and against public policy. *See, e.g., Cooper v. Roswell Park Comprehensive Cancer Center*, 196 N.Y.S.3d 325, 332 (Sup. Ct. 2023), finding that an arbitrator’s finding favoring a medical centers’ decision to terminate a nurse because of her refusal to take a COVID-19 injection was “irrational.”⁵

It is not an “undue burden” on Respondent to simply respect its employees’ religious beliefs and not force them to take unwanted and dangerous injections. At this juncture, any doubt should be resolved in favor of voluntary patient freedom of choice and against coercing unwanted and dangerous experimental medical treatments upon anyone. This is good public policy.

Further, there can be no debate that state law can never preempt Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the First Amendment, or the Supremacy Clause of the Constitution itself. The conflict between Circuits which do *not* follow this basic rule of law and the numerous Circuits which *do* follow it should be resolved by this Honorable Court.

The rulings below should be reversed.

⁵ *See also*, “33 nurses ‘died suddenly’ in the US this past week [No causes of death were listed],” <https://markcrispinmiller.substack.com/p/33-nurses-died-suddenly-in-the-us>

ARGUMENT

- A. Fundamental constitutional rights of patients such as the free exercise of religion under the First Amendment, the right to refuse medical treatment under the Fourteenth Amendment, and federal laws such as Title VII take precedence over state and local laws to the contrary. The Supremacy Clause and good public policy require that the Constitution remains supreme. This is especially crucial when experimental mRNA injections with terrible safety profiles are mandated, and reasonable accommodations are prohibited through an unjustified “undue burden” rationale. This medical mandate is against public policy.**

It is now becoming widely known that the experimental mRNA injections introduced to treat COVID-19 are neither “safe,” on account of their terrible safety profiles, nor “effective” because they do not stop transmission of the virus. *See* Section B and accompanying footnotes. Therefore, these experimental drugs *offer no protection for other people*. They are personal medical treatments only.

In response to the true facts of lack of safety and efficacy, government policies and recommendations have changed.

HHS Secretary Kennedy announced on May 27, 2025 that the COVID vaccine for healthy children and healthy pregnant women was removed from the

CDC’s recommended immunization schedule, changing previous CDC recommendations.⁶

Florida state Surgeon General Dr. Joseph A. Ladapo called for a complete halt in the use of COVID-19 mRNA “vaccines,” citing contamination concerns.⁷

Louisiana health officials shifted away from the policy of promoting COVID-19 and flu vaccinations, citing concerns about the efficacy and safety of these vaccines.⁸ The Louisiana Health Department stated that medicine is not “one size fits all.” All patients are different, with different medical needs. Therefore, it is inappropriate and possibly medical malpractice to issue blanket medical treatment recommendations or requirements to broad categories of patients, without first assessing and examining each patient individually, and without

⁶ <https://x.com/SecKennedy/status/1927368440811008138>

⁷ “The Surgeon General outlined concerns regarding nucleic acid contaminants in the approved Pfizer and Moderna COVID-19 mRNA vaccines, particularly in the presence of lipid nanoparticle complexes, and Simian Virus 40 (SV40) promoter/enhancer DNA.” “Florida State Surgeon General Calls for Halt in the Use of COVID-19 mRNA Vaccines.” <https://www.floridahealthgov/newsroom/2024/01/20240103-halt-use-covid19-mrna-vaccines.pr.html>

⁸ “Citing concerns about the efficacy and safety of vaccines, state officials will instead encourage residents to consult their doctor about vaccination, Louisiana Department of Health spokesperson Emma Herrock said in a statement. ‘In general, the department is shifting away from one-size-fits-all paternalistic guidance to a more informative approach aimed at enabling individuals, in consultation with their doctor, to make better decisions for themselves,’ the statement said.” “Louisiana health officials ‘shifting away’ from policy of promoting COVID, flu vaccinations.” https://www.nola.com/news/politics/vaccine-louisiana-policy-covid-flu/article_3e0521bc-c096-11ef-bfd3-fb389

diagnosing their unique medical conditions by a qualified medical professional.

Many bills have been introduced in state legislatures recently, including Iowa, Kentucky, Montana, Minnesota, Idaho and others, which seek to limit or ban entirely the administration of these experimental mRNA injections, or gene therapy, due to the terrible safety profiles of these experimental drugs.⁹

If these experimental injections were really safe and effective, why would states be seeking to ban them?

Many European countries, including Finland, Sweden, Denmark, the United Kingdom and Slovakia have taken similar actions in limiting or eliminating their previous blanket mRNA injection recommendations.^{10,11}

⁹ See, e.g., Iowa House File 712, Bill SF360; Kentucky House Bill 469; Montana House Bill 371; Idaho Senate Bill 1036; Minnesota HF 3152, HF 3219.

¹⁰ “Finland joins Sweden and Denmark in limiting Moderna COVID-19 vaccine,” <https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/finland-pauses-use-moderna-covid-19-vaccine-young-men-2021-10-07/>

“England Refuses to Offer COVID Shots to Kids Under 12, While US Cities Mandate Them. Who’s Right?”: “... the UKHSA’s decision puts England in line with several other European countries—including Sweden, Finland, Norway, and Denmark—that do not offer or recommend mRNA vaccines to healthy young children.” <https://fee.org/articles/england-refuses-to-offer-covid-shots-to-kids-under-12-while-us-cities-mandate-them-who-s-right/>

¹¹ Michael Nevradakis, Ph.D. “Slovak Government Report Calls for Ban of ‘Dangerous’ mRNA Vaccines,” *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*. <https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/slovak-government-report-calls-for-ban-of-dangerous-mrna-vaccines/>

Unfortunately, many courts have embraced the now-disproved “safe and effective” narrative in upholding forced experimental mRNA injection mandates; several of these decisions are still on appeal.¹² These disputed and controversial issues are inappropriate for dismissal under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).

The rulings below failed to follow the lead of *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. DOL, OSHA*, 595 U.S. 109 (2022), in which this Court stayed the OSHA nationwide employee vaccine mandate, and *Georgia v. President of the United States*, 46 F.4th 1283 (11th Cir. 2022), which upheld the nationwide injunction pausing the federal contractor vaccine mandate. *See also Texas v. Becerra*, 577 F.Supp.3d 527 (N.D. Tex. 2021) and 667 F.Supp.3d 252 (N.D. Tex. 2023) (HHS lacked authority to mandate any specific type of medical treatments, specifically a vaccine for Head Start staff, contractors and volunteers; court vacated the federal rule entirely.)

In *Medical Professionals for Informed Consent v Bassett*, 78 Misc. 3d 482 (Sup Ct. Jan. 13, 2023), the court granted a declaratory judgment to a group of doctors and nurses, holding that the hospital and “covered entities” vaccine mandate ordered by the New York State Department of Health (DOH) was null, void, and of no effect. The vaccine mandate was then dropped by DOH, and the appeal was declared moot.¹³

¹² *See, e.g., Sweeney, supra*, at n.4.

¹³ Regarding mootness, these issues are extremely likely to recur, yet are evading review. Threats of new pandemics are coming in from many quarters. Further, numerous anti-mandate cases like this one have flooded American courts. This is likely to continuously recur if not corrected now. *See* “New risks raise pandemic threat on a global scale,” <https://>

In this case, the lower courts justified a denial of religious freedom by ruling that Respondent would suffer “undue burden” in respecting its employees religious beliefs simply because it might violate state law if it accommodated Petitioners in the manner requested. In *Does 1-2 v. Hochul*, 2024 WL 5182675, *4 (2d Cir. Dec. 20, 2024)¹⁴ the Second Circuit similarly opined that the “heightened standard for undue hardship recently set forth in *Groff* [*v. DeJoy*, 600 U.S. 447 (2023)]” still justified its own precedent,¹⁵ to wit, that “an accommodation that would require an employer to violate the [state] law imposes an undue hardship.” *Russo v. Patchogue-Medford Sch. Dist.*, 129 F.4th 182, 186 (2d Cir. 2025) (per curiam).¹⁶

It is not an “undue burden” on Respondent to simply respect its employees’ religious beliefs and not force them to take unwanted and dangerous injections. The undue burden rationale advanced by Respondent and the lower courts does not meet the substantial burden standard of *Groff*, and the ruling should be reversed.

In all good conscience, how can anyone coercively “mandate” any drug that might kill a patient, without voluntary, coercion-free consent, and without being fully informed of the risks?

www.gpmb.org/news/news/item/14-10-2024-new-risks-raise-pandemic-threat-on-a-global-scale

¹⁴ Petition pending at *Does 1-2 v. Hochul*, No. 24-1015.

¹⁵ See *Braccia v. Northwell Health Systems*, Appendix B, App. 8a.

¹⁶ See *id.*, App. 7a.

B. It is undisputed that the mandated experimental mRNA injectable drugs were never approved by the FDA, despite erroneous media reports to the contrary, and have shockingly high fatality rates. The CDC's own reporting system has documented millions of adverse reactions and a tragic 39,050 fatalities attributable to these experimental mRNA injections through February 27, 2026. Previously, a vaccine would have been pulled from the market after only a few deaths. VAERS has also documented millions of adverse reactions and hospitalizations.

The CDC's Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) data show that as of February 27, 2026, there have been **39,050 deaths in America alone**, which thousands of medical professionals have independently attributed to fatal adverse reactions to the mandated experimental mRNA injections, a.k.a. "vaccines."¹⁷ This cannot reasonably be considered "safe" or "effective." Additionally, VAERS recorded 74,578 permanently disabled persons, 222,446 hospitalizations, 157,782 urgent care visits, 250,089 doctor visits, 18,008 cases of Bell's Palsy, 5,216 miscarriages, 22,486 heart attacks, 29,188 Myocarditis/Pericarditis cases, and 11,253 cases of Anaphylaxis.

The reported American death toll has now risen to an astonishing *39,050 deaths*. This shocks the conscience. Even if only a certain percentage of these

¹⁷ <https://openvaers.com/covid-data>

COVID-19 mRNA injection adverse reaction reports are accurate, the death toll and the accompanying risks remain unacceptable. *How can anyone mandate anything that might kill you?*

Thus, even apart from the specific religious objections presented by Petitioners in this case, these high adverse reaction statistics obviously form a reasonable *and moral* basis for some patients to avoid risky experimental mRNA injections in favor of safer alternatives, in the exercise of voluntary consent, free of coercion, and after the required full disclosure of these medical risks.

In stark contrast, in 1976, after only 32 deaths were attributable to the swine flu vaccine, the United States government halted the mass vaccination campaign.¹⁸ The New York Times reported on October 13, 1976 that the swine flu program was halted in nine states after only three deaths were attributed to the vaccine shots.¹⁹

Amici Curiae have compiled an extensive database on the lack of safety and efficacy of the COVID-19 mRNA injections.²⁰

At least five more recent and reliable medical studies further explode the “safe and effective”

¹⁸ Art Moore. “CDC data signaling vaccine catastrophe: It took only 32 deaths to halt 1976 shot campaign.” *World Net Daily*, February 14, 2022. <https://www.wnd.com/2022/02/cdc-data-signaling-vaccine-catastrophe/>

¹⁹ Harold M. Schmeck, Jr. “Swine flu program is halted in 9 states as 3 die after shots,” *The New York Times*, October 13, 1976.

²⁰ See Covid Pedia | America's Frontline Doctors - Vaccine Safety. <https://afls.org/covid-pedia/vaccine-safety>

narrative.²¹

In dynamic testimony before Congress on May 21, 2025, followed by rousing applause, renowned expert cardiologist Dr. Peter A. McCullough, M.D. explained exactly why the experimental mRNA injections were neither safe nor effective, and were dangerous.²²

²¹ Five recent papers show vaccine COVID vaccine harms outweigh any benefits:

The Pfizer injection increases your all cause mortality by greater than 36%. Retsef Levi, *et al.* “Twelve-month all-cause mortality after initial COVID-19 vaccination with Pfizer-BioNTech or mRNA-1273 among adults living in Florida,” <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.04.25.25326460>

Women who got the shot were 30 to 50 percent less likely to give birth, *see* Vibeke Manniche, *et al.* “Rates of successful conceptions according to COVID-19 vaccination status: Data from the Czech Republic.” https://www.preprints.org/manuscript/202504.2487/v1?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

One paper shows a high correlation (.5, highly statistically significant) between vaccination and death. E.O. Okoro, *et al.* “Paradoxical increase in global COVID-19 deaths with vaccination coverage: World Health Organization estimates (2020–2023).” *International Journal of Risk & Safety in Medicine*. 2025;0(0). <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/09246479251336610>

There is a strong correlation between the uptake of the vaccine and excess all-cause mortality. *See* Raphael Lataster, Ph.D. “European excess mortality correlates with COVID-19 vaccination into 2024.” *Bulgarian Medicine* 13:2 (2023). <https://www.skirsch.com/covid/lataster.pdf>

A vaccine dose fatality rate of 0.35% in Europe is greater than the infection fatality rate of 0.1% for COVID. *See* André Redert, Ph.D. “Causal effect of covid vaccination on mortality in Europe.” February 2023. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/368777703_Causal_effect_of_covid_vaccination_on_mortality_in_Europe

²² “TRUTH BOMB: Peter McCullough Doesn’t Hold Back — ‘IT WAS NOT SAFE BY DESIGN,’” <https://x.com/ChildrensHD/status/1925355939369988144>

Japanese researchers linked these experimental mRNA injection side effects to 201 types of diseases.²³ In another recent Japanese study, researchers found on autopsy multiple micro-scars in the hearts of mRNA-vaccinated patients who died suddenly of unexplained cardiac arrest, thus raising the question of a link between the experimental mRNA injections and sudden cardiac arrest.²⁴

Further, an alarming Yale study shows that COVID vaccines may cause T-cell exhaustion, leading to an acquired immune deficiency. Could this be “...a vaccine that weakens immunity instead of strengthening it?”²⁵

An authoritative new study examining the link between the COVID-19 vaccine and Myocarditis concluded: “*We urge governments to remove the COVID-19 mRNA products from the market due to the well-documented risk of myocardial damage.*”²⁶

Another recent study highlighted that Pfizer's post-marketing surveillance analysis showed a

²³ Lee Harding, “Japanese researchers say side effects of COVID vaccines linked to 201 types of diseases,” *Western Standard*, January 15, 2024. <https://www.westernstandard.news/news/japanese-researchers-say-side-effects-of-covid-vaccines-linked-to-201-types-of-diseases/51661>

²⁴ Tomomi Koizumi and Masao Ono, “Cardiac Multiple Micro-Scars: An Autopsy Study,” *J Am Coll Cardiol Case Rep.* 30(5) 10383, March 2025. <https://www.jacc.org/doi/10.1016/j.jaccas.2024.103083>

²⁵ <https://x.com/drsimonegold/status/1892626222250639592>

²⁶ M. Nathaniel Mead, *et al.* “Myocarditis after SARS-CoV-2 infection and COVID-19 vaccination: Epidemiology, outcomes, and new perspectives,” *Intl J Cardiovascular Rsch & Innovation*, 3(1) 1–43, Jan–Mar 2025. <https://cardiovascular-research-and-innovation.reseaprojournals.com/Articles/myocarditis-after-sars-cov-2-infection-and-covid-19-vaccination-epidemiology-outcomes-and-new-perspectives>)

miscarriage rate of 81%, a 5-fold increase in stillbirths, an 8-fold increase in neonatal deaths, and a 13% incidence of breastfeeding complications in newborns whose mothers received the COVID shots:²⁷

Results: The CDC/FDA’s safety signals were breached for all 37 AEs following COVID-19 vaccination in pregnancy including miscarriage, chromosomal abnormalities, fetal malformations, cervical insufficiency, fetal arrhythmia, hemorrhage in pregnancy, premature labor/delivery, preeclampsia, preterm rupture of membranes, placental abnormalities, fetal growth restriction, stillbirth, newborn asphyxia and newborn death. Conclusions: We found unacceptably high breaches in safety signals for 37 AEs after COVID-19 vaccination in pregnant women. *An immediate global moratorium on COVID-19 vaccination during pregnancy is warranted.* (emphasis added)

On May 27, 2025, HHS Secretary Kennedy announced that the COVID vaccine for healthy children and healthy pregnant women was removed

²⁷ James A. Thorp, et al. “Are COVID-19 Vaccines in Pregnancy as Safe and Effective as the Medical Industrial Complex Claim? Part I,” *Science, Public Health Policy and the Law*, 2/08/2025. <https://publichealthpolicyjournal.com/are-covid-19-vaccines-in-pregnancy-as-safe-and-effective-as-the-medical-industrial-complex-claim-part-i/>

from the CDC’s recommended immunization schedule.²⁸

Further, a massive study released in March, 2025 found that among 1.7 million people, COVID-19 “vaccination” increased the risk of “Inner Ear Disorders by 237%, Menstrual Disorders by 216%, Glaucoma by 186%, and Endometriosis by 150%, along with many other negative side effects.”²⁹

It is unconscionable to coercively mandate such a dangerous experimental drug which does not protect others.

Amici Curiae maintain, supported by voluminous scientific research, that early COVID-19 treatments with hydroxychloroquine (“HCQ”) and Nobel prize-winning Ivermectin are quite safe and effective, contrary to the incessant government narratives against such treatment options.^{30,31,32} These are

²⁸ HHS announces COVID-19 vaccine removed from CDC’s recommended immunization schedule: <https://x.com/SecKenedy/status/1927368440811008138>

²⁹ Hong Jin Kim, et al. “Broad-Spectrum Adverse Events of Special Interests Based on Immune Response Following COVID-19 Vaccination: A Large-Scale Population-Based Cohort Study,” *J. Clin. Med.* 14(5) 1767, March 6, 2025. <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-0383/14/5/1767>

³⁰ A white paper draws the reader’s attention to the indisputable safety of hydroxychloroquine (“HCQ”), an analog of the same quinine found in tree barks that George Washington used to protect his troops. “A White Paper on Hydroxychloroquine,” by Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D., is the culmination of months-long research from all sources. It explains how Americans have come to be in the grip of fear. All the myths and all the misconceptions about a safe, generic drug that has been FDA approved for 65 years, given to pregnant women, breast-feeding women, children, the elderly, and the immune-compromised for years and decades without complication, are finally put to rest. <https://americasfront>

reasonable alternatives to more dangerous experimental mRNA injections, as determined within each protected doctor/patient relationship.

Amici Curiae maintain, supported by voluminous scientific research, that experimental mRNA injections are neither “safe” nor “effective.”

The mandated experimental injections were always only offered under emergency use authorization (“EUA”), and were never approved by the FDA.³³ For example, the controversial approval

linedoctors.org/index/covid/hydroxychloroquine/white-paper/

³¹ As of February 13, 2025, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 419 Hydroxychloroquine (“HCQ”) COVID-19 studies, from 8,646 scientists and 591,536 patients in 59 countries, 406 studies are peer reviewed, with 402 comparing treatment and control groups. The studies indicate a statistically significant improvement for mortality, hospitalization, recovery, cases, and viral clearance, and there is 72 percent less death in 16 early treatment trials. See <https://c19hcq.org/>

³² As of February 13, 2025, a global, real-time meta-analysis includes 105 Ivermectin COVID-19 studies. The studies indicate Ivermectin reduces risk for COVID-19 with very high confidence for mortality, ventilation, ICU admission, hospitalization, recovery, cases and viral clearance. (No treatment, vaccine, or intervention is 100 percent effective and available.) Thus all practical, effective, and safe means should be used based on risk/benefit analysis. Over 20 countries adopted Ivermectin for COVID-19. Ivermectin may now be purchased over the counter in the states of Tennessee, Arkansas, and others. <https://c19ivm.org/>

³³ On August 23, 2021, the FDA approved a COVID-19 drug called “Comirnaty,” with a long list of *required future safety studies*; however, Comirnaty was not in use in the United States. *On the same day*, the FDA extended the EUA for the experimental mRNA COVID-19 drugs which were actually in use in America. This created a great deal of confusion. It was erroneously reported that the mRNA injections actually in use had now been approved by the FDA. However, this was not true. The EUA for these experimental mRNA injections was

of “Comirnaty,” a legally distinct drug from Pfizer BioNTech COVID-19 vaccine, with somewhat differing formulations, different manufacturing oversight, and differing adverse reactions, did not change the experimental EUA nature of the various COVID-19 gene therapy injections in use in the United States, still under EUA. Many lower courts have erroneously concluded that Pfizer’s COVID-19 injection was approved by the FDA,³⁴ but in fact, it was the Pfizer drug Comirnaty that was approved (yet never distributed to the public). The Pfizer COVID-19 injection was *never approved* by the F.D.A.; the EUA for the COVID-19 vaccine was merely extended. Both actions were taken on the same day, August 23, 2021, causing much confusion.

Recent studies have demonstrated differences between Comirnaty and the mandated EUA COVID-19 injections. The mandated EUA COVID-19 injections have been found to have higher rates of Myocarditis, which can be fatal.^{35,36} The approval of

only extended. Therefore, all of the laws and regulations applicable to experimental drugs discussed herein were still in full force and effect at the time of the mandate. See <https://www.fda.gov/media/151710/download>

³⁴ See, e.g., *Does v. Hochul*, 632 F. Supp. 3d 120, 131, 138 (E.D.N.Y. 2022).

³⁵ A paper authored by Luigi Cari and others shows that Spikevax-Moderna mRNA induces higher spike protein expression per dose than Comirnaty, and this higher dose correlates with increased myocarditis risk compared to Comirnaty. See Luigi Cari, et al. “Differences in the expression levels of SARS-CoV-2 Spike Protein in cells treated with mRNA-based COVID-19 vaccines: A study on vaccines from the real world.” *Vaccines* (Basel) 11(4):879. Apr 21, 2023 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37112792/>

Jesús Hermosilla, *et al.* “Analysing the in-use stability of mRNA-LNP COVID-19 vaccines Comirnaty™ (Pfizer) and Spikevax™ (Moderna): A comparative study of the particulate.”

Comirnaty did not nullify the applicability of 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, the informed consent regulations, or the constitutional and statutory provisions.

Because Respondent mandated an experimental drug, the informed consent and full disclosure regulations were mandatory. These detailed regulations mirror the Nuremberg Code. *See especially* 21 C.F.R. § 50.25(a)(1)–(8).

C. “Mandating” a dangerous experimental drug absent voluntary, coercion-free informed consent violates well-established constitutional principles, including the right to refuse medical treatment and of personal bodily integrity; violates civil and criminal federal and state laws prohibiting medical battery, negligent injuring, assault, and negligent homicide; and violates numerous federal regulations requiring voluntary informed consent and full disclosure, including 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, 21 C.F.R. § 50.20, 21 C.F.R. § 50.25, 45 C.F.R. § 46.116, and the Nuremberg Code.

Vaccines (Basel) 11(11):1635. Oct 25, 2023. <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/38005967/>

Lizhou Zhang, *et al.* “Effect of mRNA-LNP components of two globally-marketed COVID-19 vaccines on efficacy and stability.” *NPJ Vaccines* 8(1):156 (2023). <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37821446/>

³⁶ Josh Guetzkow and Retsef Levi. “Effect of mRNA vaccine manufacturing processes on efficacy and safety still an open question” (letter to the Editor), *BMJ* 2022;378:o1731. July 12, 2022. <https://www.bmj.com/content/378/bmj.o1731/rr-2>

Respondent did not comply with well-established regulations governing informed and voluntary patient consent, free from coercion and undue influence, and with full disclosure of the risks. *See* 21 C.F.R. § 50.20, 21 C.F.R. § 50.25, and 45 C.F.R. § 46.116, entitled “Protection of Human Subjects,” also known as the longstanding and well-established “Common Rule.”³⁷

These federal regulations are mandatory for both public and private actors, embody most of the Nuremberg principles, and apply to all experimental drugs issued under an EUA, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3.

The threat of job loss totally nullified voluntary employee/patient consent, free from threat and undue influence as required by 21 C.F.R. § 50.25(a)(8). No attempt was made to advise the employee/patients of the substantial known risks of these experimental drugs as required by 21 C.F.R. § 50.25(a)(2), (4), and (6).

Federal law, incorporating most of the Nuremberg Code, guarantees that experimental drugs must only be offered on a voluntary basis after full disclosure of risks, and with voluntary informed consent free from coercion. 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, 21 C.F.R. § 50.20, 21 C.F.R. § 50.25, and 45 C.F.R. §46.116. Consent can never be coerced.

It is well-established that federal law mandates that the administration of experimental biological agents are strictly voluntary, requiring informed consent and after the full disclosure of risks.

³⁷ <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/index.html>

Indeed, the Nuremberg Code, an international code of ethical principles adopted in the aftermath of war crimes committed by the German Nazis during WWII, was expressly intended to prohibit involuntary medical experimentation upon humans. See 21 C.F.R. § 50.20, 21 C.F.R. § 50.25, and 45 C.F.R. 46.³⁸ Respondent violated these mandatory federal regulations.

The constitutional principles guaranteeing every individual the right to refuse medical treatment and the right of personal bodily integrity are similarly well-established, and were also ignored by the Respondent. See, e.g., *Cruzan v. Dir., Mo. Dep't. of Health*, 497 U.S. 261 (1990), *Washington v. Harper*, 494 U.S. 210 (1990), *Schloendorff v. Society of New York Hospital*, 211 N.Y. 125 (1914), and *Canterbury v. Spence*, 464 F.2d 772 (1972), See also *Doe #1 v. Rumsfeld*, 297 F. Supp. 2d 119, 134-35 (D.D.C. 2003) (“United States cannot demand that members of the armed forces also serve as *guinea pigs for experimental drugs*” (emphasis added)), *Downer v. Veilleux*, 322 A.2d 82 (Me. 1974), and *Cobbs v. Grant*, 8 Cal.3d 229 (1972).

In *Vacco v. Quill*, 521 U.S. 793 (1997), this Court stated, “*Everyone*, regardless of physical condition, is entitled, if competent, to refuse unwanted lifesaving medical treatment.” (emphasis added).

Courts have consistently upheld a patient’s well-established right to refuse unwanted medical treatments on constitutional grounds for decades. See *Mills v. Rogers*, 457 U.S. 291 (1982) *Guardianship of Roe*, 383 Mass. 415 (1981), *Riggins v. Nevada*, 504

³⁸ <https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/regulations-and-policy/regulations/common-rule/index.html>

U.S. 127 (1992), and *Sell v. United States*, 539 U.S. 166 (2003).

This Court has also recently upheld the right to refuse vaccination as a free exercise of religious principle via its holding in *Miller v. McDonald*, 223 L. Ed. 2d 270 (2025), reversing and instructing the Second Circuit to uphold the right of Amish parents to refuse vaccination for their children as an exercise of their religious beliefs in light of *Mahmoud v. Taylor*, 606 U.S. 522 (2025).

New York’s criminal laws prohibiting assault, medical battery, and negligent homicide are implicated. Federal criminal laws prohibiting the violation of constitutional rights are implicated. See 18 U.S.C. § 241.

Preservation of the absolute right of voluntary, informed patient consent and medical freedom, free from coercion, and the constitutional right to refuse medical treatment are paramount considerations here. These constitutional principles, and federal and state laws, are fully binding upon Respondent. The Respondent could not “mandate” *any* involuntary medical treatment for the Petitioner employees, even if the treatment wasn’t experimental, and even if the refusal wasn’t religious.

The trial courts in *Bridges* and *Sweeney*, *supra*, relied upon the same false “safe and effective” narrative made in *United KP Freedom Alliance v. Kaiser Permanente*, No. 21-cv-07894-VC (N.D.Cal. Nov. 18, 2021).

Amici Curiae supported the position, as early as October, 2020 and in *Kaiser Permanente*, that experimental mRNA injections are not “vaccines,”

because they do not prevent infection or transmission, and are personal medical treatments only.

In a three-page opinion, the *Kaiser* trial judge erroneously accepted the false “narrative” that the experimental mRNA injections prevented infection and transmission. The three-page dismissive opinion in *Kaiser* can now be seen as clearly wrong, as it relied upon incorrect assumptions.³⁹

It is undisputed that forced or coerced experimentation upon human beings against their will is reprehensible and should never be allowed by any court, as the lessons of Nuremberg and the Tuskegee experiment⁴⁰ teach. Fortunately, the many legal protections discussed above preclude the enforcement of an involuntary experimental medical mandate promoted by Respondents herein, which are against public policy.

CONCLUSION

Amici Curiae maintain, supported by voluminous scientific research, that these dangerous experimental mRNA injections neither stop infection nor transmission. They are personal medical treatments only. There is no compelling governmental interest in mandating or coercing them.

Any decision to illegally “mandate” a dangerous experimental personal medical treatment — under

³⁹ Unfortunately, the lower courts in *Sweeney*, still on appeal, made virtually the same mistake by relying upon the false “safe and effective” narrative as the trial judges made in *Kaiser Permanente*.

⁴⁰ <https://www.history.com/news/the-infamous-40-year-tuskegee-study>

the coercive threat of the loss of one's employment — is irrational, immoral, and against good public policy. To escape liability via an unjustified “undue burden” claim is likewise irrational and against good public policy. This is particularly true where the experimental treatment (a) does not prevent infection or transmission, (b) has severe side effects including death, (c) is administered while the severe side effects are *not* disclosed to the employee/patients, and the mandate (a) clearly violates the numerous well-established laws enumerated herein, and (b) attempts to preempt Title VII, the Free Exercise Clause, and the Supremacy Clause.

This harmfully mandated monstrous experiment is sadly analogous to the infamous Tuskegee experiment, and must never be allowed to be repeated.

The petition for *certiorari* should be granted and the ruling below should be reversed.

– 26 –

Respectfully submitted,

DR. SIMONE GOLD, M. D., J.D.

DAVID A. DALIA
Counsel of Record
Attorney at Law
700 Camp Street
New Orleans, LA 70130
(504) 524-5541
davidadalia@gmail.com

*Counsel for Amici Curiae,
America's Frontline Doctors and
Dr. Simone Gold, M.D., J.D.*

March 19, 2026