DECREE: 1189/2022

By filed, deducting an action for amparo; and constituted the domicile.,

I NOTE THAT:

According to art. 6 inc. 1 of law nº 16.011, the judge can "at any time" order proceedings to better provide. Substantiating the process, moreover, in a single hearing. This, in analogy with the extraordinary process (art. 346 of the CGP), enables the preliminary processing that will already be available at this early stage of the evolution of the case. The one suggested by the defendant, and another provided by judicial inquisitive initiative (arts. 14 inc.1, 24 nº 4, 25.2 and 139.2 of the CGP). Then, it is necessary to have a maximum of factual elements of judgment to elaborate the relevant weighting to the object of the amparo. Which cannot be done with genuine validity, if it is not based on real facts, duly verified. First and foremost, the reality on which it is projected must be studied. Depth of analysis that is also justified little by the appreciation of the substance of the rights that may be in conflict. For this reason, the power of evidentiary initiative of the court will be used.

IT IS RESOLVED:

1) Submit a certified copy of each and every one of the purchase contracts (as well as any other related negotiation or agreement), of the so-called anti-Covid vaccines that you have signed, own or are simply within your reach. In full and unredacted versions.

2) Without prejudice to the foregoing, state whether these instruments have contained clauses of civil indemnity and/or criminal impunity of the suppliers; regarding the occurrence of possible adverse effects of the drugs purchased (all those intended for the fight against SarsCov-2, Covid 19 and variants, whether it is technically defined as a vaccine or not). Transcribing verbatim, if positive, the clauses in question.

3) Provide extensive detail about the biochemical composition of the so-called vaccines against SarsCov-2 (Covid 19); in supply to the national population. As for each of them (types and brands). Especially the one aimed at the population of minors.

4) Explain if the doses are distributed in batches or differential (different) items. And if so, clarify: for what reason, and based on what criteria, each would be provided to different population levels; whether the drugs in each batch are diverse by their content (or for whatever reason); and how and for whom they would be distinguishable. If it turns out to be the real existence of different lots, it is established that enough doses of each of them are requested for judicial expert examination.

Properly separated.

5) Specify if the so-called vaccines (or which of them) contain the substance called "messenger RNA". By explaining, if necessary, what it means. And, above all, what therapeutic or extratherapeutic consequences - adverse or not - can have for the person inoculated with it. It must be specified with regard to the latter, and in a negative hypothesis in terms of alleged damages, if there is indeed - with scientific rigor - the possible safety of the "messenger" RNA; or if there is simply a lack of information on the point.

6) In the same way as the above, and with the same detail of individual or collective biological implications, the possible presence of graphene oxide in the so-called vaccines available to the population shall be reported. Highlighting whether data are really available in this regard or not. Exactly the same way as what was questioned in relation to the "messenger" RNA.

7) In addition, very specifically and beyond what has been inquired, it is requested that it be said if it is known to you that those labeled as vaccines contain or may contain nanotechnological elements. Clarifying, if not, whether such a temperament would arise from an effective verification of its absence, or from mere ignorance of the components of the referred "vaccinal" substances.

8) Certify whether the substances contained in the so-called vaccines supplied in Uruguay are experimental or not. That is, explain in full and detail whether they are approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), or equivalent body, according to the usual protocols. Or if they have some other type of emergency permission. And in this case, granted by whom and with what guarantees. And based on what regulations. In short, you must also respond if you are aware that either the manufacturer and/or supplier, or any academic or governmental body (domestic or foreign), have admitted - in any way that may be - the experimental nature of the aforementioned "vaccines".

9) Present the information in your possession, complete and up-to-date, about what is scientifically known - and what is not known - about the effectiveness of those labeled as vaccines; and their possible subsequent effects in the short, medium and long term (including possible adverse effects).

10) Provide official figures that demonstrate the negative or positive incidence of so-called vaccination in the number of infections and deaths diagnosed with Covid. From the beginning of the campaign to date.

11) State if studies have been carried out to explain the noticeable increase in deaths for Covid 19

since March 2021 (commend to the previous year). Or if information is in your possession - with sufficient scientific support and evidence - about it.

12) Detail, in relation to the total number of deaths in Uruguay diagnosed with Covid 19 since the quarrel of the so-called pandemic, the global average age; and, in addition, how many were "for" Covid 19 (in an exclusive causal relationship), and how many were "with" Covid 19 (that is, with the presence of the virus, but not absolute or central determinant, the main, of death).

13) Demonstrate scientifically (with evidence of national or international studies that have been done), whether the status of non-vaccinated poses a health hazard to the entire population (for third parties, understanding correctly, not for themselves). Or if that's not the case. If it is the case, two other things will be required: the determination and demonstration of the degree of danger, and the reason that explains why, if this were eventually the case, vaccination would not have been ordered mandatorily. Adding whether both the vaccinated and the uninoculated infect equally, or not. And if you consider that they do it differently, let it be explained, what this would be like and in what proportions. All duly accompanied by elements that prove what is stated.

14) Clarify well-founded the reasons for the lack of preview informed consent, in relation to the act components of what the government itself presents as a "vaccination campaign."

15) Detail, with first and last names, the identity of the professional technicians who have directed and direct the aforementioned campaign. Or else they have provided advice at any level. Also providing the relevant data for their location for their judicial interrogation (citation). Adding to the required information, data about whether any of them are part of any foreign governmental or paragovernmental organization. Or they have worked for one of them in any way. Or, where appropriate, manage in a multinational company with a health care turn (or work for their benefit in any way). Detailing, if necessary, the personal names and organizations or companies involved.

16) Explain if alternative anti-Covid 19 therapies have been studied (for any of its variants). If not, clarify why those were not explored. If positive, give the research results; giving an account of whether those were used in Uruguay or not. And for the latter option, provide the reasons that would have been taken to discard them. Adding whether or not you know that they have been used in other countries successfully, still relative, or not.

In addition, to those required are specified that:

a) All requests for information must be fulfilled cumulatively. This is, completely, integrally; and completely independent of the responses of the others. That is, the global intimation that is made

means that it cannot be understood that the satisfaction of one of its commandments nullifies any other. It cannot be assumed that the answer of one may contain that of another.

b) In case of difficulties in the preparation of the relevant answers, it is already requested that they could be specified in the same term. With wide detail. This is in order to judicially evaluate them. Asking, if necessary, for the chronological prognosis of a possible effective response. It is recorded here, even if this results from all obviousness, the swiftness that the very high structure of amparo imposes on the decision maker; and the duties of rigorous collaboration - particular and state - with Justice.

c) In the case of a directly negative response, the corresponding factual and legal basis are required.

This information will be required, all jointly, and by identical injunction to the PRESIDENCY OF THE REPUBLIC, MINISTRY OF PUBLIC HEALTH and PFIZER LABORATORY.

Otherwise, indicate as requested in the lawsuit.

All inquiries must be answered within 48 hours or, where appropriate, before the hearing that is set. Which is scheduled for Wednesday, July 6 at 9 a.m. Special hours are enabled.

And cite it to the witnesses proposed in the lawsuit. And, on judicial initiative, to Gustavo Alberto Giacheto or Giaccheto, domiciled in Pza. Cagancha 1322, apt. 802. As well as responsible personnel (at the management and scientific level), of Laboratorio Pfizer in Uruguay.

In particular, PFIZER will be urged to state within 48 hours - with the provision of documentary data if applicable - whether the company has admitted, in any area, internal or external to it and its partners, the verification of adverse effects of vaccines against the so-called Covid-19. In general, and also in detail regarding the child population.

Everything that is committed.

And to the rest, is kept in mind.

Translated by the translation team of La Quinta Columna. Link to the original document in spanish:

Original decree @ http://www.expedientes.poderjudicial.gub.uy/VerDecreto.php?DecId=1189/2022&iue=20220345390002