

THE FLU CASE

Eyewitness account of the special hearing on Monday 4 January 2010 before the Tribunal de Grande Instance (Central Court) in Paris against Roselyne Bachelot-Narquin, Minister of Health, with a view to putting an end as soon as possible to the campaign of vaccination against H1N1 flu in France.

PARIS Wednesday, 06 January 2010

Following charges by Maîtres Malika Ouarti (Barreau de Paris) and Jean-Pierre Joseph (Barreau de Grenoble), Mrs. Roselyne Bachelot, Minister of Health was represented by her lawyer at a hearing before the Tribunal de Grande Instance of Paris on Monday, January 4, 2010 at 9 am, the aim of the assignation being for putting an end as soon as possible to the campaign of vaccinations against influenza H1N1".

This litigation was initiated before the "imminent danger" faced by the people, by the Association "Cri-Vie" (Coordination of Research and Independent Information regarding Health), chaired by Dr. Marc Vercoûtère (Pau-Pyrenees Atlantiques) and "Politique de Vie", a political party from the extreme centre, chaired by the psychologist Christian Cotten (St-Aubin, Essonne).

A "provincial grandmother" reports:

Having driven through New Year Monday morning traffic to Paris I did not have a professional reporter's card so had to join the security check queue at the public entry door to the Tribunal de Grande Instance de Paris, where supporters of the cause, people from all walks of life, simple citizens with woolly hats and mittens, met each other for the first time in the bitter cold and after an unexplained standstill of about 15 minutes, we moved on to find the allotted room for the hearing.

However, having climbed the huge steps to the Palais de Justice and traversed the immense "Salle des Pas Perdus", we were informed that the room for the hearing had been changed and that everyone had just disappeared round the bend of the corridor to some other room. Burly policemen prevented us (a sensible group of about 25 polite and peaceable people) from following them down this corridor, saying they did not even know which room had finally been chosen for the hearing and that we should leave the court to carry on its work in peace, I quote: "il faut les laisser travailler en paix".

The actual location of the hearing having been identified 10 minutes later, the same three burly policemen then barred the way through another door from the "Salle des Pas Perdus" to yet another corridor separating us from the hearing, saying that there were no more seats left and that two people were standing up, which was not strictly allowed. Once a room was full they could not allow anyone else to even approach the door, for security reasons (meaning fire etc). Several people among us insisted that the doors had to remain open to the hearing and that we could legally go up to these OPEN doors, but the policemen were adamant and said it was not their problem, they were only doing their "duty".

A passing lawyer agreed to go through the doors and down to the end of the corridor to check for us, then reported that there were indeed about 40 people present at the hearing and that the room was really full. But Maître Ouarti (Christian Cotten's lawyer) said afterwards that we should have banged on the doors because they are supposed to be left open and that this failure to render the hearing open to the public could be used to nullify the court's decision.

In the meantime, obediently doubting our rights, our little band of docile dwarfs gathered at the foot of the imposing columns of the Court of Justice to exchange email addresses and discuss the case with a lone reporter (from the monthly magazine TOP ALERTE) near the reception kiosk topped by a glass pyramid..

At about 10h30, Christian Cotten and Marc Vercoûtère emerged from the "out of bounds" corridor with their lawyers, Maître Malika Ouarti and Maître Jean-Pierre Joseph. Surrounded by friendly supporters filming with their cam recorders, Christian Cotten was clearly dismayed to announce to his anxious listeners that the aim of putting an end to the vaccination campaign had not been achieved, and that it would therefore continue in France because the judge was esteemed to be "incompetent" to deal with the particular nature of the accusations.

He added that the court's decision would be on 25th January, so if people did not heed the warnings he and others have already tried to communicate, there would be casualties in the coming weeks, which he could do nothing to prevent. Absolutely exasperated by these typical bureaucratic tactics of playing for time, in this urgent situation where every day may damage the health of the public and even cost lives, he exclaimed in his usual spontaneous style:

"Tant pis pour eux, ces hauts fonctionnaires qui ont beaucoup de pouvoir ! Que les hauts fonctionnaires stupides se fassent vacciner ! Ca écoulera les doses !" (Too bad for the bureaucrats wielding power at the top! Let the stupid high ranking officials (civil servants) go and be vaccinated themselves! That will get rid of the doses!)

After this angry explosion belied by his visible distress at the idea of even the "high ranking bureaucrats" having to be vaccinated, making a considerable effort to look on the positive side of things, he admitted that:

"The two lawyers did a very good job. Marc said everything he had to say very well. I presented the evidence (since this is a penal procedure), a very clear and simple text, to the interim president [of the Tribunal de Grande Instance] highlighting his moral, political (I do not know if I added "spiritual" but I could have done), and legal responsibility. He has a real responsibility; he is challenged on behalf of public health, in the name of preserving the integrity of the population and our bodies. That is a fundamental freedom, the bodily integrity of each one of us.

He is challenged on an issue that is a criminal case. We are dealing with a criminal case: multiple procedures of lengthy duration before magistrates in Grenoble , Nantes , Paris , Evry, Pau , Créteil .. (I can no longer keep up with them all, which is just great!) These lengthy procedures are now launched and will continue, that is to say, work will be engaged in the long term, five years, ten years, but they will keep this issue alive. Most probably one day there will be a trial in the correctional Assize Court of Justice of the Republic. For after registration, there will necessarily be a trial.

We are in a criminal case because we are witnessing an international operation using the Republic's institutions for private organizations who have implemented a plan that is organized crime, by an organized gang: attempted poisoning, damage to integrity and distribution of highly toxic products.

It is very clear, the vaccines are highly toxic, especially due to the preservatives, due to the adjuvants and due to the way of using pieces of viruses, which are said to have been attenuated, except that they recombine with other pieces of virus and after a while they become anything but attenuated viruses.

It is now clearly exposed by scientists and science journalists that all the studies provided by Roche Laboratory were fully rigged from start to finish by the Marketing Department and external PR companies paid to make studies demonstrating Tamiflu's pseudo effectiveness. Tamiflu is not only ineffective (and competent doctors demonstrate that very well), but it is also highly toxic. We can presume that a large number of deaths hitherto attributed to H1N1 influenza, particularly those of children, should actually be attributed to Tamiflu, which is used in a completely delusional manner.

If it weren't for the victims - because there are victims of vaccines today, there are victims of Tamiflu - personally I would find it laughable because we're in a situation where organized international gangsters use senior WHO officials and remunerate them. It's very clear today. An investigation will be launched by the Parliament of the Council of Europe. This is not the European Parliament, contrary to what some journalists say, it is the Council of Europe, which brings together 47 countries.

At the head of the Commission, 61 particularly competent German doctors, who say things quite clearly. They speak very clearly of links of interest and of the corruption of the WHO in this operation: vaccines and Tamiflu. These people use the WHO and institutions of the French Republic, diverting public service to earn money. I shall refrain to go further as to the reason behind this whole operation, but at the very minimum, it is to earn lots of money.

And so we're not in a state of law from the moment there is a misuse of the State and that is why the interim President of this Court is challenged today, it is on that precise point.

So what will be his decision? I am under no illusion about that. At the same time a miracle can happen, at the start of the New Year."

Mr Cotten and Mr Vercoutère left the Court around 11h15 with their lawyers and several supporters to gather in a nearby café around a warm drink before an interview for FR3 TV channel which was diffused the same evening in the Aquitaine region (Pau, Toulouse and Bordeaux), because the Association "Cri-Vie", chaired by Marc Vercoutère is based in Pau.

Maître Malika Ouarti and Maître Jean-Pierre Joseph agreed to let me interview them with my camrecorder for people in my provincial bourgeois home town (where people refused to believe that a real court hearing would be held today even though I showed them the press release).

Maître Ouarti said that the two associations had assigned Madame Bachelot to request:

- via Article 809 of the new Code of Civil Procedure, that the vaccinations should cease;
- that a committee of experts be appointed to examine the side effects of Tamiflu;
- possibilities for curative and preventive, natural and allopathic remedies against influenza A.

Me Ouarti noted that the lawyer who represented Roselyne Bachelot "did not address the case in depth and simply repeated that the judge had no jurisdiction, that they should contact the Administrative Tribunal, because he said there is no infringement of freedom, and that the judge is competent only when there is an assault, that is to say an attack on fundamental freedoms, or a detachment from the Minister's function in the exercise of his normal power.

We argued that on the contrary, freedom is threatened because, as you know, there is no real freedom of information, no transparency. We have proved that certain lies were indicated in the press via the Ministry. There is, moreover a taboo today as the national press is not here today, at an important audience. The prosecutor asserted that freedom of information was not a fundamental liberty (!!!) There is some collusion between the prosecutor and counsel for Ms. Bachelot. Of course, Ms Bachelot, via her lawyer, reiterated two things: 1) that the vaccines were ANM and 2) that the vaccinations were voluntary.

The problem does not lie there for us. It is obvious that a choice must be free and informed consent. The choice to be vaccinated is not informed because of inconsistencies in the number of vaccinations to be done, in the content of vaccines, in how the vaccine is made, the requisitioning of premises and of persons who are not competent to vaccinate, all of which have indicated to the two associations Cri-Vie and Life Policy that fundamental freedoms are an issue. That is the first point.

As for Tamiflu, the danger is real, because the side effects of Tamiflu are becoming more difficult to treat. Dr. Marc Vercoutère, who heads the association Cri-Vie, has established a notice in which he indicates that Tamiflu is toxic, downright toxic, and therefore there is a real problem now because Tamiflu is prescribed by doctors, without even testing for influenza A, because this test is expensive (200 €) and Tamiflu is sold over the counter by chemists. So when there are flu-like symptoms, doctors now prescribe Tamiflu relatively easily. At the hospital they also prescribe Tamiflu and Dr. Vercoutère believes that side effects will unfortunately be significant in the medium and short term.

The decision will be published on January 25. We shall see then how the associations face this decision. We have argued that this judge (juge judiciaire) was the judge of freedom so we hope that justice will follow us in this area because it is really an important issue."

Maître Jean-Pierre Joseph, author of "Vaccins on nous aurait menti?" regrets that everyone is speaking at cross purposes.

"People who favour the vaccine say that we are in a religion, which is extraordinary because it was discovered after several years that vaccines in general were problematic, and yet we are the ones who are accused of being in a religion. All that because in this country there are dogmas and certainties no-one ever goes back on, and people recite religious litanies that are never checked anyway, unfortunately. The message I'm trying to convey is that I have discovered through my files and personal experience, my travels and extensive scientific reading that all vaccines in general are totally ineffective. There are dozens of publications which are very clear and very precise. Just look at the curves of the Ministry of Health of any epidemic outbreaks worldwide since the early 20th century, without exception and you'll see that vaccines are useless, it's very clear. If you do not understand that, in fifty years we'll have made no progress. Whether with or without adjuvant, is a false debate, vaccines are simply useless."

blind eye on this hearing, preferring to announce the cancellation of the orders for 50 million doses of swine flu vaccine, as well as the permission for GPs to vaccinate in their surgeries, and that vaccinations could begin within firms, such as Michelin.



[- click -](#)



[click](#)