Outline of Some Lawsuit Options for COVID-19 Vaccine Mandate Objectors

1 - There appears to be at least eight "conventional" grounds to sue concerning the COVID-19 vaccine mandate. For simplification, the following assumes that the State is the source of the mandate. So, some traditional options are to sue the State:

a) for violating state or federal Labor Laws;

b) for not allowing the federal Religious Exemptions (e.g., here);

c) for violating federal Constitutional Rights [*e.g., 14th Amendment*] (e.g., here);

d) for violating federal Civil Rights *[1983 statute]* (e.g., here);

e) that federal law prohibits a mandate for an EUA vaccine (e.g., here);

f) that the vaccine is experimental (e.g., here);

g) that the vaccine risks outweigh the benefits (e.g., here); *and*

h) that citizens with acquired immunity should be exempted (e.g., here).

Note 1: See this simplified *National Law Review* preliminary discussion on such lawsuits.

Note 2: The State is not entirely at fault here, as they are following the lead of the FDA.

Benefit of any of the above lawsuits being successful:

a) Employees can work, without being forced to have a vaccine.

---

2 - There appears to be at least one major "non-conventional" basis to sue concerning the COVID-19 vaccine mandate:

Sue the key FDA drug approval Co-Chairs for violating federal Civil Rights (e.g., a Bivens Claim and this). Watch this short video for an explanation as to why such a lawsuit is appropriate, *and* for specifically who should be sued.*

Note 1: One major benefit of this approach is that the sued individuals (by federal statute) can not be legally represented by the FDA or the government. They are obligated to hire and pay for their own legal counsel.

Note 2: A second major benefit of this approach is that if the case is successful, the defendants (key FDA people) would be *personally liable* for all damages.

Note 3: A third major benefit of this approach is that it would be extremely easy to identify substantial damages for the FDA's negligence regarding COVID-19.

Note 4: A fourth major benefit of this approach is that it that due to the foregoing three items, it is very likely that the FDA parties will want to settle, prior to a verdict being rendered. This is powerful leverage, and the only acceptable settlement would be that the FDA panel immediately approve all COVID-19 therapies that have at least as much scientific evidence as does the approved Remdesivir.

Benefits of a successful targeted FDA Bivens Claim [1983] lawsuit:

    a) Employees can work, without being forced to have a vaccine.
       (In other words, this is the same result that would be achieved by any of the eight conventional lawsuits listed above.)

    b) All Federal and State COVID-19 policies would be re-reviewed in light of real Science, and the major FDA change that the successful lawsuit resulted in (legitimate approved therapies).
       (This would be extremely beneficial as some current COVID-19 policies have been enacted on the basis of political science, not real Science.)

    c) State and federal bureaucratic leaders would be sent a message that they have personal responsibility for their actions and inactions.
       (This would be also be very beneficial as some bureaucracy leaders act as if they are above the law. Winning this case would likely lead to better behavior on their part — which would translate to more protections of ALL citizens' rights)

    d) The FDA drug approval process would be fixed so that Science-based COVID-19 therapies (e.g., Ivermectin), can be prescribed by physicians and fulfilled by pharmacies.
       (This would be incalculably beneficial — likely resulting in saving the lives of some 100,000 Americans [i.e., not dying from COVID-19] going forward!)

*For more details in support of this lawsuit, see these key Reports: here and here.

> *Note: I'm a scientist, not an attorney. Nothing is this document should be misconstrued as giving legal advice. For any legal matters please consult with a licensed attorney.*

9-26-21