

BETWEEN:

DAVID EGAN AND SHARON BROWNE AND EMMANUEL LAVERY

Plaintiffs

-And-

MINISTER FOR HEALTH, AN TAOISEACH, AND HSE

Defendants

---

## **Book of Authorities for the Precautionary Principle in this court case**

**Full Hearing in Court. Court precedents from superior courts in Ireland and abroad and national and international laws.**

1. The evidence supplied to the High Court including sworn affidavits, exhibits and books of evidence.
2. We invoke the Precautionary Principle in our High Court case, as
  - (i) full and material information about covid19 vaccine injuries, illnesses, disabilities and deaths and risks was not given by Regulators and government authorities and state bodies to vaccine recipients and the general public. Full Informed Consent was not given. This breached laws governing both Informed Consent and the Precautionary Principle.
  - (ii) there was prima facie scientific and medical evidence of covid19 vaccine injuries, illnesses, disabilities and deaths and risks and new evidence continues to emerge about this. This was not and is not being communicated to the general public from January 2021 onwards when this first became known. They have kept repeating the mantra “safe and effective”.
  - (iii) the Precautionary Principle is of supreme importance in our High Court case when one factors in that informed consent for the covid19 vaccines was obtained by non disclosure, false pretences, fraudulent misrepresentation, deception and fraud, and this is documented in our evidence and in our Book of Authorities for Fraud. And this fraud placed many peoples lives in danger, and this has led to a high number of vaccine injuries, illnesses, disabilities and deaths and to the big rise in excess mortality in late 2021, all of 2022 and into 2023 in highly vaccinated countries, which has been reported in the

mainstream press and media in many countries.

**(iv)** measures were NOT put in place to protect Public Health and the general public from the negative, harmful and deadly effects of the covid19 vaccines. This was not done from Spring 2021 onwards when this became widely known to Regulators and government authorities and state bodies. The profit motive and economic interests of certain parties named above took precedence over Public Health and this was a direct breach of The Precautionary Principle and EU Law. And also a breach of the Irish Constitution at articles 40 to 44, encompassing the right to full informed consent, bodily integrity and the right to life.

**(v)** at least 21,000 Irish people have been injured, made ill, disabled or suffered death including “sudden deaths” as a result of the covid19 vaccinations according to the HPRA in Ireland. If full Informed Consent had been given and the Precautionary Principle applied, this number could have been much lower or possibly zero, thus the Precautionary Principle applies in this court case. The people who promoted these vaccines, including Regulators and government authorities and state bodies and the vaccine companies have not been made financially liable and legally liable for the damage they caused. The consequences of this breach of the **Precautionary Principle** has had far reaching consequences, as there is no state compensation program for those many thousands of Irish people injured, ill and disabled by the covid19 vaccines and the relatives of those people killed by the covid19 vaccines. Other countries have a state compensation program for this but NOT Ireland.

**(vi) weighing of risks and proportionality and risk trade-offs.** The scientific and medical evidence provided by some of our expert witnesses who are medical doctors and scientists and by our prima facie scientific evidence given to the High Court show that there were safe and effective medicines to treat and cure covid19 from June 2020 onwards. The Front Critical Care Doctors in the USA saved thousands of lives from covid19 in the USA, their web site is at <https://covid19criticalcare.com/> Other medical doctors such as Dr Peter McCullough, Dr. Zelenko, and Dr. Fareed and Dr. Tyson, cited in our sworn affidavits had similar successes treating and curing covid19. These safe and effective medicines were banned for covid19 treatment in Ireland and several other countries so as to create a demand for the new covid19 vaccines. The weighing of proportionality is important here in the sense that the courts must weigh up the difference between safe and effective medical drugs with a proven track record of treating and curing covid19 against new covid19 vaccines which have been proven to be unsafe and mostly ineffective. The general public, including vaccine recipients were not told about these safe and effective medical drugs and this was a clear breach of full Informed Consent and the Precautionary Principle.

Our court case deals with threats to human health from covid19 vaccine injuries, illnesses, disabilities and deaths and the lack of full and valid informed consent for these vaccines. And we have presented a large amount of prima facie evidence of this to the High Court. This comes within the remit of The Precautionary Principle as defined in EU laws, EU treaties, Irish laws and international laws, and in case law and precedents of the European courts and superior courts in Ireland, Britain, the USA and other countries.

## **EU Law**

The Precautionary Principle is detailed in

### **Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union**

and is law and is legally binding in Ireland and throughout the European Union.

The European Union's official web site defines the Precautionary Principle as follows:

‘ The precautionary principle is an approach to risk management, where, if it is possible that a given policy or action might cause harm to the public or the environment and if there is still no scientific agreement on the issue, the policy or action in question should not be carried out. However, the policy or action may be reviewed when more scientific information becomes available. The principle is set out in Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU). ’

### **Article 191 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union**

#### **(ex Article 174 TEC)**

1. Union policy on the environment shall contribute to pursuit of the following objectives:

- preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment,
- protecting human health,
- prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources,
- promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmental problems, and in particular combating climate change.

2. Union policy on the environment shall aim at a high level of protection taking into account the diversity of situations in the various regions of the Union. It shall be based on the precautionary principle and on the principles that preventive action should be taken, that environmental damage should as a priority be rectified at source and that the polluter should pay.

## **Article 130r(1) of the European Community Treaty**

The Precautionary Principle is part of the original European Community Treaty. According to Article 130r(1) of the European Community Treaty, Community policy on the environment is to pursue the objective inter alia of protecting human health. Article 130r(2) provides that that policy is to aim at a high level of protection and is to be based in particular on the principles that preventive action should be taken and that environmental protection requirements must be integrated into the definition and implementation of other Community policies.

## **The Precautionary Principle is part of Article 174 of the European Community Treaty**

‘Article 174

Section 1. Community policy on the environment shall contribute to pursuit of the following objectives:

- preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment,
- protecting human health

Section 2. Community policy on the environment shall aim at a high level of protection taking into account the diversity of situations in the various regions of the Community. It shall be based on the precautionary principle and on the principles that preventive action should be taken, that environmental damage should as a priority be rectified at source’

## **And in Article 152 of the of the European Community Treaty**

‘Section 1. A high level of human health protection shall be ensured in the definition and implementation of all Community policies and activities.

Community action, which shall complement national policies, shall be directed towards improving public health, preventing human illness and diseases, and obviating sources of danger to human health. Such action shall cover the fight against the major health scourges, by promoting research into their causes, their transmission and their prevention, as well as health information and education.

The Community shall complement the Member States' action in reducing drugs-related health damage, including information and prevention.’

## **The European Commission**

‘ The issue of when and how to use the precautionary principle, both within the European Union and internationally, is giving rise to much debate, and to mixed, and sometimes contradictory views. Thus, decision-makers are constantly faced with the dilemma of balancing the freedom and rights of individuals, industry and organisations with the need to reduce the risk of adverse effects to the environment, human, animal or plant health. Therefore, finding the correct balance so that the

proportionate, non-discriminatory, transparent and coherent actions can be taken, requires a structured decision-making process with detailed scientific and other objective information.....’

Source: Commission of the European Communities. 2 February 2000,

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2000:0001:FIN:en:PDF>

This inverts the Burden of Proof. This is relevant in our court case. Pfizer has proven in its internal documents which it and the Regulators tried to conceal and hide forever that the covid19 vaccines are not safe. Only an order from a federal court in the USA forced the release of these documents to the general public. Yet Pfizer and the Regulators denied this important and material fact concerning lack of safety to the general public. This is clear proof that the covid19 vaccines are NOT safe and there has been a serious breach of Informed Consent and the Precautionary Principle.

### **Directive 2001/95/EC - Precautionary Principle**

This relates to Consumer protection and health and this includes consumers of vaccines.

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=celex%3A32001L0095>

This EU Directive titled ‘2001/95 EC - product safety’ uses the Precautionary Principle to ensure product safety in all EU countries including Ireland and that countries and people have a legal duty to report products which are deemed to be unsafe to the relevant authorities. Member states have a legal duty to suspend or ban products which have been found to be unsafe. This EU Directive and its use of the Precautionary Principle applies in our High Court case.

### **Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 258/97 of the European Parliament**

Protective measures should be enforced even though its not possible to carry our thorough risk assessments.

### **Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety**

#### **Article1 OBJECTIVE**

In accordance with the precautionary approach contained in Principle 15 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development, the objective of this Protocol is to contribute to ensuring an adequate level of protection in the field of the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms resulting from modern biotechnology that may have adverse effects on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity, taking also into account risks to human health, and specifically focusing on transboundary movement

The mRNA vaccines once they enter the human body become a type of living modified organism resulting from modern biotechnology which have an adverse effect on human health.

### **Directive 2001/18/EC of the European Parliament**

This EU law deals directly with GMO's and has relevance to our court case as once the mRNA vaccines enter the human body they become a type of living modified organism resulting from modern biotechnology which have an adverse effect on human health. I cite one of the many sections of this EU law which reference the Precautionary Principle:

(8) The precautionary principle has been taken into account in the drafting of this Directive and must be taken into account when implementing it.

### **International Law and WTO**

The Precautionary Principle has a positive impact at international level, to ensure an appropriate level of environmental protection and health protection in international negotiations and treaties. It has been recognised by various international agreements, notably in the Sanitary and Phytosanitary Agreement (SPS) concluded in the framework of the World Trade Organisation (WTO). These WTO agreements are legally binding and affect Ireland and other European Union countries.

' In cases where relevant scientific evidence is insufficient, a Member may provisionally adopt sanitary or phytosanitary measures on the basis of available pertinent information [...]. In such circumstances, Members shall seek to obtain the additional information necessary for a more objective assessment of risk and review the sanitary or phytosanitary measure accordingly within a reasonable period of time.'

Article 5(7) of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures.

And decision from WTO Appellate Body report of 12 March 2001 on Dispute DS135, paragraphs 167, 168 and 178.

### **Wingspread Statement on the Precautionary Principle**

In 1998 Wingspread Statement on the Precautionary Principle was convened by the Science and Environmental Health Network and concluded with the following formulation,<sup>[\[17\]](#)</sup> described by Stewart Brand as "the clearest and most frequently cited":

' When an activity raises threats of harm to human health or the environment, precautionary measures should be taken even if some cause and effect relationships are not fully established scientifically. In this context the proponent of an activity, rather than the public, should bear the burden of proof. '

## Case Law and Precedents

In Case T-74/00 Artegoda, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62000TJ0074> the [General Court](#) (then Court of First Instance) was willing to extrapolate from the limited provision for the precautionary principle in [environmental policy](#) in article 191(2) [TFEU](#) to a general principle of EU law.

In Case T-74/00 Artegoda, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:62000TJ0074> it states

‘ **174** In the context of the grant and management of marketing authorisations of medicinal products, that principle requires, first, the taking account exclusively of considerations relating to the protection of public health; second, the re-evaluation of the benefit/risk balance of a medicinal product where new data give rise to doubts as to its efficacy or safety and, third, the application of rules of evidence in accordance with the precautionary principle, which is implicitly relied on by the Commission (see above, paragraph 165) and is, in particular, the corollary of the principle that the requirements of the protection of public health are to prevail over economic interests.

**182** As regards environmental matters, the precautionary principle is expressly enshrined in Article 174(2) EC, which establishes the binding nature of that principle. Furthermore, Article 174(1) includes protecting human health among the objectives of Community policy on the environment.

**183** Therefore, although the precautionary principle is mentioned in the Treaty only in connection with environmental policy, it is broader in scope. It is intended to be applied in order to ensure a high level of protection of health, consumer safety and the environment in all the Community's spheres of activity. In particular, Article 3(p) EC includes a contribution to the attainment of a high level of health protection' among the policies and activities of the Community. Similarly, Article 153 EC refers to a high level of consumer protection and Article 174(2) EC assigns a high level of protection to Community policy on the environment. Moreover, the requirements relating to that high level of protection of the environment and human health are expressly integrated into the definition and implementation of all Community policies and activities under Article 6 EC and Article 152(1) EC respectively.

**184** It follows that the precautionary principle can be defined as a general principle of Community law requiring the competent authorities to take appropriate measures to prevent specific potential risks to public health, safety and the environment, by giving precedence to the requirements related to the protection of those interests over economic interests. Since the Community institutions are responsible, in all their spheres of activity, for the protection of public health, safety and the environment, the precautionary principle can be regarded as an autonomous principle stemming

from the abovementioned Treaty provisions.

**185** It is settled case-law that, in the field of public health, the precautionary principle implies that where there is uncertainty as to the existence or extent of risks to human health, the institutions may take precautionary measures without having to wait until the reality and seriousness of those risks become fully apparent (Case C-180/96 United Kingdom v Commission [1998] ECR I-2265, paragraph 99, and Case T-199/96 Bergaderm and Goupil v Commission [1998] ECR II-2805, paragraph 66). Prior to the enshrinement in case-law of the precautionary principle, on the basis of the Treaty provisions, that principle was implicitly applied in the review of proportionality (see, to that effect, order in Case C-180/96 R United Kingdom v Commission, paragraphs 73 to 78, and the order of the President of the Court of First Instance in Case T-76/96 R National Farmers' Union and Others v Commission [1996] ECR II-815, paragraphs 82 to 93, in particular paragraph 89).

**192** The precautionary principle requires the suspension or withdrawal of a marketing authorisation where new data give rise to serious doubts as to either the safety or the efficacy of the medicinal product in question and those doubts lead to an unfavourable assessment of the benefit/risk balance of that medicinal product (see above, paragraph 178). Against that background, the competent authority need do no more than provide, in accordance with the general rules of evidence, solid and convincing evidence which, while not resolving the scientific uncertainty, may reasonably raise doubts as to the safety and/or efficacy of the medicinal product. ‘

In Case C-180/96, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland v Commission of the European Communities, the following was stated about the Precautionary Principle

*‘ 99 Where there is uncertainty as to the existence or extent of risks to human health, the institutions may take protective measures without having to wait until the reality and seriousness of those risks become fully apparent.’*

The court precedent of Pfizer vs Council of the European Union, Case number T-13/99, judged on 11<sup>th</sup> September 2002 in the European Court of Justice is relevant and the court applied the Precautionary Principle against Pfizer so as to protect human health. According to the European Court judgment:

“in case of scientific uncertainty as to the existence of a risk to human health, the EC institutions as well as the Member States may invoke the precautionary principle in order to adopt protective measures, in spite of the fact that a proper risk assessment showing conclusive scientific evidence cannot be conducted.”



*When the precautionary principle is applied, the fact that there is scientific uncertainty and that it is impossible to carry out a full risk assessment in the time available does not prevent the competent public authority from taking preventive protective measures if such measures appear essential, regard being had to the level of risk to human health which the public authority has decided is the critical threshold above which it is necessary to take preventive measures in respect of the product ...*

*The Court held above that the Community institutions were not required, for the purpose of taking preventive action, to wait for the risk to become a reality and for any adverse effects to materialize ... If the Community institutions were unable to take any preventive protective measures until such research was completed, the precautionary principle, the aim of which is to prevent occurrence of any such adverse effects, would be rendered devoid of purpose.*

*(European Court of First Instance, 2002, p. 11)*

This case in 2002 involved antibiotic resistance in animals which could be transmitted to humans. Today we have covid19 vaccines which have proved to be ineffective after 4 months due to viral mutations and new resistant strains and in addition to this these same vaccines present a danger to human health. The precedent set in the European Court of Justice in the case of Pfizer vs Council of the European Union is highly relevant to our court case.

In Commission v Denmark, para 52; and Commission v The Netherlands, para 54., the following was stated in relation to the Precautionary Principle

‘ when it proves to be impossible to determine with certainty [after having undertaken the prescribed comprehensive risk assessment] to determine with certainty the existence or extent of the alleged risk because of the insufficiency, inconclusiveness or imprecision of the results of studies conducted, but the likelihood of real harm to public health persists should the risk materialise, the precautionary principle justifies the adoption of restrictive measures ‘

**Case law of the European Courts stating that the Precautionary Principle also involves the protection of human health and that precautionary measures must be put in place even if the science is not fully developed or fully conclusive or if there is uncertainty. This includes a removing a product from the market.**

C-157/96 - The Queen v Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and Commissioners of Customs & Excise, ex parte National Farmers' Union and Others, 1998  
C-236/01 - Monsanto Agricoltura Italia and Others, 2003  
T-13/99 - Pfizer Animal Health v Council, 2002  
T-70/99 - Alpharma v Council, 2002  
T-177/02 - Malagutti-Vezinhet v Commission, 2004  
C-41/02 - Commission v Netherlands 2004

In a 2009 judgment, the European Court of Human Rights held that, even though the applicants had been unable to establish a causal link between exposure to cyanide and asthma, Romania was under an obligation to take adequate precautions to protect the public from potential harm

**Source:** Judgment in the case of Tătar v. Romania of 27 January 2009, (Application No 67021/01) paragraphs 106 and 107 (not available in English)

### **Proportionality and View of Risks and Uncertainty**

The European Courts of Justice and of Human Rights have favoured Proportionality when it comes to the Precautionary Principle. In Ireland no children died from covid19 and this CSO evidence was presented as prima facie evidence to the High Court. By contrast, the covid19 vaccines caused a high number of injuries, illnesses, including Myocarditis and disabilities and even “sudden deaths” to children in countries worldwide. This is an unacceptable risk. The risks from covid19 vaccination for children are disproportionate when one considers that no child in Ireland died of covid19. Proportionality as defined and found by the European Courts of Justice and of Human Rights are relevant in our court case and support our claims and our request for an Injunction.

Case C-157/96, National Farmers’ Union [1998] ECR I-2211 and case C-180/96, United Kingdom v. Commission, [1996] ECR 390

The European Court of Justice applied the Precautionary Principle in these famous BSE cases. BSE also known as “mad cow disease” was deadly to humans and caused CJD and measures had to be put in place to stop it and contain it. The risks and dangers from BSE were much greater in proportional terms than any alleged benefits from ignoring it and doing nothing.

The above court precedent of United Kingdom vs EU Commission heard in the European Court of Justice in May 1998 applied the Precautionary Principle and defined it quite succinctly :

“Where there is uncertainty as to the existence or extent of risks to human health, the institutions may take protective measures without having to wait until the reality and seriousness of those risks become fully apparent.”

The court precedent of Kingdom of Sweden v Commission of the European Communities heard in the European Court of Justice in 2007, used the Precautionary Principle to ban Paraquat in the European Union. In the court precedent of Gowan Comércio Internacional e Serviços Lda v Ministero della Salute, in 2010 the European Court of Justice used the Precautionary Principle to ban a substance which could be dangerous to health. The dangers and risks to health in terms of illness(es), disabilities and premature deaths need to be weighed against the alleged benefits of ignoring it and doing nothing.

In the court precedent of Alpharma Inc. v Council of the European Union heard in the European Court of Justice in 2002, the Precautionary Principle to protect human health was applied by the court. And in the court precedent of Artega GmbH v Commission of the European Communities, the European Court forcefully applied the Precautionary Principle to safeguard human health. The precedent of Monsanto vs Italy in 2003 was decided on the Precautionary Principle. The precedent set in Industrias Químicas del Vallés, SA v Commission of the European Communities in 2005 in the European court was significant in that it applied the Precautionary Principle to protect human health and stated that the protection of human health took precedence over economic interests.

In the Lirussi and Bizzaro judgment:

Joined cases C-175/98 and C-177/98, Paolo Lirussi and Francesco Bizzaro [1999] ECR 5291

the ECJ mentioned the Precautionary Principle together with the principle of preventive action, in relation with Article 4 of Directive 75/442/EEC of July 15 1975, on waste, in conjunction with Article 130r of the Treaty. The principle was then invoked by Greenpeace France to contest the functioning of Council Directive 90/220/EEC of 23 April 1990, on the deliberate release into the environment of genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The adverse effects on human health being the primary considerations in these judgments.

In reliance on the safeguard clause provided for in article 11 of Directive 70/524, the Kingdom of Denmark, adopted a ban on the use in its territory of virginiamycin in feeding stuffs. In doing so, it relied on a report from the National Veterinary Laboratory. Tests and analysis by the European agency SCAN was inconclusive. Both the EU Commission and the EU Council supported the Danish government's action after having evaluated and weighted the same uncertainty information different than SCAN. The Precautionary Principle was the deciding factor.

Also the European Court has found that in the domain of human health, the existence of solid evidence which, while not resolving scientific uncertainty may reasonably raise doubts as to the safety of a substance justifies, in principle, [the refusal to include that substance...]. The precautionary principle is designed to prevent potential risks. Court cases listed below

- T-141/00, para 192

- C-236/01, para 113;
- T-392/02, para 129;
- T-326/07, para 166;
- T-334/07, para 180;
- C-280/02, Commission v. France 2004 - “probable causality”.

In other European Court cases, it was clear that such an assessment of the risk could reveal that scientific uncertainty persists as regards the existence or extent of real risks to human health. In such circumstances, it must be accepted that a Member State may, in accordance with the precautionary principle, take protective measures without having to wait until the reality and seriousness of those risks are fully demonstrated. Cases include:

- Commission of the European Communities vs Kingdom of the Netherlands, case C-41/02, para 52;
- Queisser Pharma GmbH & Co. KG v Bundesrepublik Deutschland case C-282/15, para 60;
- Solgar Vitamin's France and Others v Ministre de l'Économie, des Finances et de l'Emploi and Others. case C-446/08, para 67;
- European Commission v French Republic. Case C-333/08, para 91.

In other European Court cases, where it proves to be impossible to determine with certainty the existence or extent of the alleged risk because of the insufficiency, inconclusiveness or imprecision of the results of studies conducted, but the likelihood of real harm to public health persists should the risk materialise, the precautionary principle justifies the adoption of restrictive measures. Listing of European Court cases below and paragraphs referencing the precautionary principle.

- C-343/09, para 61;
- C-77/09, para 76;
- T-429/13, para 119;
- C-192/01, para 52;
- C-95/01, para 48;
- C-41/02, para 54;
- C-333/08, para 93;
- C-446/08, para 70;
- T-31/07, para 142;
- C-269/13P, para 58;
- C-157/14, para 82;
- T-817/14, para 51;
- C-477/14, para 47;
- C-78/16, para 47;

C-78/16, para 47;  
C-282/15, para 57;  
T-584/13, para 68;  
C-151/17, para 38;  
C-489/17, para 58;  
T-108/17, para 282.

The European Court of Justice has been consistent over the last 30 years in applying and enforcing the Precautionary Principle in court cases. European Court applied and will continue to apply the Precautionary Principle in its judgments in cases where there is some scientific evidence or scientific uncertainty or conflicting scientific findings or risks or where scientific research is likely to find dangers to human health. It is very precautionary and protective in its approach and judgments where there is a significant danger or potential danger to the lived environment and to human health.

### **The Weighing of Proportionality and Risk Trade-offs**

The European courts's use of **Proportionality** to decide and judge cases faces new challenges.

The scientific and medical evidence provided by some of our expert witnesses who are medical doctors and scientists and by our prima facie scientific evidence given to the High Court show that there were safe and effective medicines to treat and cure covid19 from June 2020 onwards. The Front Critical Care Doctors in the USA saved thousands of lives from covid19 in the USA, their web site is at <https://covid19criticalcare.com/>

Other medical doctors such as Dr Peter McCullough, Dr. Zelenko, and Dr. Fareed and Dr. Tyson, cited in our sworn affidavits had similar successes treating and curing covid19. These safe and effective medicines were banned for covid19 treatment in Ireland and several other countries so as to create a demand for the new covid19 vaccines. The weighing of proportionality is important here in the sense that the courts must weigh up the difference between safe and effective medical drugs with a proven track record of treating and curing covid19 against new covid19 vaccines which have been proven to be unsafe and mostly ineffective. And also weigh up the role of conflicts of interest which influenced political decisions and government decisions and medical and professional body decisions to ignore these important medical and scientific facts and evidence. Do conflicts of interest have the legal right to damage Public Health and place the general public in danger ? ; do profit motives override Public Health ?

The superior courts in Ireland and other European countries and the European Courts have applied and enforced the Precautionary Principle in cases where was an existing danger or possible danger to the health and/or lives of the general public. The evidence we have provided to the High Court clearly show significant dangers from the covid19 vaccines.

The Precautionary Principle aims at ensuring a high level of environmental protection through preventative decision-taking in the case of risk. However, in practice, the scope of this principle is far wider and also covers consumer policy, and European Union (EU) legislation concerning food and human, animal and plant health. Human health is at risk in this High Court case.

In 2022 and into 2023 in response to reports about rare blood clots and other illnesses seen in people vaccinated with the Astra-Zeneca COVID-19 vaccine, over 20 nations have suspended the use of this vaccine, quoting the "precautionary principle". This vaccine causes the human body to mass produce spike proteins which have been found to be toxic and dangerous to humans, yet the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines also do this and are not banned. To be consistent on an international level, all covid19 vaccines should be banned under the Precautionary Principle.