

"Dad said no" - but 6-year old injected with COVID-19 vaccine

Child injected...and 'clinic worker' protected!



ELIZABETH HART

AUG 06, 2024



50



21



8

Share



This is a case about a 6-year old child in the U.S. who was injected with a COVID-19 vaccine against parental wishes, in a school vaccine clinic.



This article provides details: [State Supreme Court Gives Big Win to School That Administered COVID Vaccine Without Parental Consent](#)

The article reports:

"A school district cannot be sued for administering a COVID-19 vaccine to a young child despite the parents' explicit instructions against it." (The child is identified as 'L.P.')

The article notes:

"According to WPMI-TV, prior to the clinic the 6-year old's parents informed the school that their child was not to be vaccinated.

An official at the school allegedly understood and acknowledged the parents' orders.

After the discussion, L.P. was given a nametag with another student's name on it. The student whose name was on the tag had already received a dose earlier in the day."

So there has been an error, with the child L.P. being given a nametag with another student's name on it.

The article continues: "L.P. protested and told the adults in charge that *"Dad said no".*"

And then... *"Despite this, clinic workers administered the dose."*

The COVID-19 vaccine was administered to the child without valid consent.



And why is it noted that 'clinic workers' plural administered the dose?

Surely only one clinic worker is responsible for administering the dose, against the child's protestations?

It's the specific clinic worker who administered the dose who is responsible.

Why would this clinic worker (a nurse?) go ahead and vaccinate the child, when the 6-year old child specifically said *"Dad said no"*?

The article reports:

“Plaintiffs sued various named and unnamed state and school defendants,” the court’s ruling reads. “We conclude that defendants are immune from suit under the Federal Public Readiness and Emergency Preparedness Act (PREP Act).”

Justices decided that all defendants in this case are protected from litigation under this law. “We conclude that the PREP Act immunizes every defendant in this case and this fact alone is enough to dismiss the case,” the court’s ruling continues.

How can the US PREP Act ignore that *vaccinators have an obligation to obtain voluntary informed consent for vaccination?*

I challenge any law that facilitates a health professional interfering with an individual's body against their wishes, and against a parent’s wishes for their child.

A society which would allow such an assault is a tyranny - is this what we're living in now? With the collaboration of the medical 'profession' and the legal system?



Meryl Dorey shared this story on the Informed Choice substack: [Another shocking decision by a US Court - Schools can administer vaccines to children against parental wishes.](#)



50 Likes · 8 Restacks

Discussion about this post

Comments

Restacks



Write a comment...



Sheila Dempsey, PhD  Violet Lights 6 Aug 2024

...

 Liked by Elizabeth Hart

"L.P. was given a nametag with another student's name on it. The student whose name was on the tag had already received a dose earlier in the day." So if L.P. HAD been that other student he would have been given 2 doses on the same day? I'm running out of words to express outrage.

 LIKED (20)  REPLY

 SHARE

2 replies by Elizabeth Hart and others



Patricia P Tursi, PhD Patricia's Substack 6 Aug 2024

...

 Liked by Elizabeth Hart

This is pure tarrany . You may disagree with the parent's beliefs on vaccines, but when our nation ignores a parent's directive and the courts uphold, YOU have lost some of YOUR rights and you are on the slippery slope of losng more. Can't tell you how angry I am about this. As retired psychologist, I believe in the sanctity of parental rights as long as there is no abuse.

 LIKED (15)  REPLY

 SHARE

1 reply

19 more comments...