

NICOLA LANG, DIRECTOR of PUBLIC HEALTH for LONDON BOROUGH OF HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM – FOI for their ‘public’ response to COVID-19 purification, ‘material evidence’ and November 2021 claims of an outbreak of a virus they have “no record” of.

THE SARS-CoV-2 FOI REQUESTS & THE RESPONSE OF “NO RECORD”

19 October 2021

Director Public Health
London Hammersmith and Fulham – Nicola Lang (acting/interim)

nicola.lang@bhf.gov.uk

This is my wish for access to records.

Description of Requested Records:

All studies and/or reports and/or records in the possession, custody or control of the addressed body corporate describing the **purification** (i.e. via filtration and ultra-centrifugation and chromatography) of any "**COVID-19 virus**" (aka "SARS-COV-2", including any alleged "variants" i.e. "B.1.1.7", "B.1.351", "P.1") directly from a sample taken from a diseased man, where the patient **sample was not first** combined with any other source of **genetic** material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum, liver cancer cells) and also studies and/or reports and/or records in the possession, custody or control of the addressed body corporate **proving a causal link** between Sars-Cov-2 and the suspected infectious disease Covid-19.

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to **purify** the suspected "virus" (separate the alleged "virus" from everything thing else in the patient sample) and instead:

- cultured an unpurified sample or other unpurified substance, and/or
- performed an amplification test (i.e. a PCR test) on the total RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture, or on genetic material from any unpurified substance, and/or
- fabricated a genome based on PCR-detected sequences in the total RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture or from any unpurified substance, and/or
- produced electron microscopy images of unpurified things in a cell culture.

Clarification of Request

For further clarity, please note I am already aware that according to virus theory a "virus" requires host cells in order to replicate, and I am **not** requesting records describing the **replication** of a "virus" without host cells.

Further, I am **not** requesting private patient information, or records that describe a suspected "virus" floating in a vacuum; I am simply requesting records that describe its **purification/separation** from everything else in the patient sample, as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other very small things).

Please note that my request includes any study/report matching the above description, for example (but not limited to) any published peer-reviewed study **authored by anyone, anywhere**. This includes your own **website** which claims to have the virus.

isolated ; given your body corporate/politick receives publick treasure, the worldwide 'interest' and that more than 100 institutions other have no virus isolate this is for publick record/evidence.

If any records match the above description of requested records and are currently available in the public domain, please provide enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty (i.e. title, author(s), date, journal, where the public may access it). Please provide URLs where possible.

Format:

Pdf documents sent to me via email; I do not wish for anything to be shipped to me.

Contact information:



All rights reserved

Assessment and care coordination

Hammersmith & Fulham Council
Town Hall, King Street
Hammersmith
London W6 9JU

Reference: 2076909
Email: icaseworkinformation@lbhf.gov.uk
Date: 26 October 2021

[REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

Freedom of Information Act 2000

This request is being handled under the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

I am writing to advise you that, following a search of our paper and electronic records, I have established that the information you requested is not held by London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham.

All studies and/or reports and/or records in the possession, custody or control of the addressed body corporate describing the purification (i.e. via filtration and ultra centrifugation and chromatography) of "Zika virus" directly from a sample taken from a diseased man, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of genetic material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum, liver cancer cells, lung cells from a lung cancer patient) and also studies and/or reports and/or records in the possession, custody or control of the addressed body corporate and proving a causation between the "virus" and the suspected infectious disease.

We do not have any records that relate to this query

Please quote the reference number 2076909 in any future communications.

If you aren't happy with the council's response, please contact H&F within 40 working days of us sending you our response, with details of why you're unhappy.

You can do this by:

- visiting H&F's website: <https://www.lbhf.gov.uk/councillors-and-democracy/complaints>
- emailing handfintouch@lbhf.gov.uk
- writing to the Resident Experience team, Hammersmith Town Hall, King Street, London, W6 9JU

Your concerns will be passed to H&F's Information Management Team to consider as an internal review. There's no charge for requesting an internal review.

If you are still dissatisfied with the Council's response after the internal review you have a right of appeal to the Information Commissioner by:

- Writing to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO), Wycliff House, Water Lane, Wilmslow, Cheshire, SK9 5AF
- Calling their helpline: 0303 123 1113
- Visiting the ICO's website www.ico.org.uk/concerns/

The ICO are the UK's independent authority set up to uphold information rights in the public interest.

I will now close your request as of this date.

Yours sincerely

Sarah O'Neill

26/11/2021

(2524) All mail

ref: 2076909 Director Public Health for Hammersmith and Fulham – Nicola Lang,

From: V [REDACTED] >

To: DIRECTOR of PUBLIC HEALTH Hammersmith and Fulham – Nicola Lang (acting/interim) <n...
icaseworkinformation@lbhf.gov.uk <icaseworkinformation@lbhf.gov.uk >

Date: Sunday, October 31st, 2021 at 15:09

Thank you for this, however I require a separate response letter for each request made that is dated and signed by whomever is responsible for the decision and the claims of 'virus' isolation/sickness causation, for the sake of clarity and transparency to the public. For further clarity would they please indicate what request is referred to as i have submitted more than 1 request to the Director Public Health for Hammersmith and Fulham – Nicola Lang, including SARS-CoV-2 'virus' purification/causation of sickness in living man, for HPV, INFLUENZA 'virus' and so forth in the last few weeks.

V [REDACTED]
Trustee of People's Union of Britain

All rights reserved under the Treaty of Universal Community Trust E & O E

Sent with [ProtonMail](#) Secure Email.

----- Original Message -----

On Tuesday, October 26th, 2021 at 15:20, London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham <icaseworkinformation@lbhf.gov.uk> wrote:

Information request
Our reference: 2076909

Dear M [REDACTED]

Thank you for your request for information received on 22 October 2021.

Please find attached our response to your request.

Yours sincerely

Sarah O'Neill
sarah.o'neill@lbhf.gov.uk

NOTE: Please do not edit the subject line when replying to this email.

DISCLAIMER

This email contains proprietary confidential information some or all of which may be legally privileged and/or subject to the provisions of privacy legislation. It is intended solely for the addressee. If you are not the intended recipient, an addressing or transmission error has misdirected this e-mail; you must not use, disclose, copy, print or disseminate the information contained within this e-mail. Please notify the author immediately by replying to

THE REQUEST for 'material evidence' – nothing forthcoming from Nicola Lang, Director of Public Health for Hammersmith & Fulham

The 19th November 2021 claims by Freddie Adu, Executive Headteacher of Queensmill school in the London borough of HAMMERSMITH & FULHAM that they have an 'outbreak' of Covid-19

The screenshot shows a web browser window with the URL 'queensmillschool.com'. The page header features the school's name 'Queensmill School' in a serif font. A white notification box is overlaid on the page, titled 'School Notifications'. Inside the box, the heading 'Covid Outbreak' is displayed in blue. The text reads: 'Dear Parents/Carers, Please see the letter attached concerning a recent Covid-19 Outbreak at the main site of Queensmill School.' Below the text is a blue button with a download icon and the text 'Outbreak Letter - November 2021'. The footer of the website includes navigation links: 'Contact us', 'Useful links', 'Accessibility', and 'Calendar'. At the bottom, there is a copyright notice: 'Copyright © Queensmill School | Cookie Policy' and a credit line: 'Websites for Schools By School Website Design Agency'.

queensmillschool.com


Queensmill School

School Notifications

Covid Outbreak

Dear Parents/Carers,


Please see the letter attached concerning a recent Covid-19 Outbreak at the main site of Queensmill School.

 **Outbreak Letter - November 2021**

Contact us ^ Useful links ^ Accessibility ^ Calendar ^

Copyright © Queensmill School | Cookie Policy

Websites for Schools By School Website Design Agency



Re: Covid outbreak

I would like to inform you that due to a number of confirmed positive cases of covid-19, Queensmill school main site is currently experiencing an outbreak. In special schools, two positive cases which may have mixed within a period of 10 days will be considered an outbreak. This number goes up to 5 cases in mainstream schools.

If your child has been identified as a close contact you will have been notified through a letter, a call or a message. If you have not been notified then your child is not a close contact of the confirmed positive cases.

Although the national guidance on self-isolation of double vaccinated adults and children under 18 has changed, this only applies for isolated confirmed cases. When in an outbreak, we must follow directives from the Local Authority and Public Health England.

When in an outbreak, all people (double vaccinated staff and children included) identified as close contact of positive cases will be asked to self-isolate, take a PCR test and only return to school if the test comes back negative. If a child does not tolerate a PCR test, he/she will have to self-isolate for 10 days. School staff will not perform PCR or any other test on your child, this will be your decision and responsibility.

When in an outbreak, additional restrictive measures must be implemented for two weeks. Those mitigating measures include: deep cleaning, staff wearing face covering at all times, bubbles to be reinstated and mixing reduced to a minimum (e.g. suspension of afterschool clubs, trips...). Those measures will remain in place until the 6th of December.

Each case will need to be treated carefully and on an individual basis considering the needs and wellbeing of your child but all decisions are made following the guidance above and under the direction of the Local Authority.

If you have any question, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes,

Aymeline Bel

Head of School



Healthy Schools



Principles of Wellbeing

Principles of Wellbeing



AUTISM

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

ACCREDITATION

FRAUD UNRAVELS EVERYTHING

No judgment of a Court, no Order of a Minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud, fraud unravels everything.

https://vlex.co.uk/vid/lazarus-estates-ltd-v-793262385

Lazarus Estates Ltd v Beasley

Judgment

Cited authorities 12

Cited in 108

Precedent Map

Related Vincent

Jurisdiction	England & Wales
Court	Court of Appeal
Judge	LORD JUSTICE DENNING, LORD JUSTICE MORRIS, LORD JUSTICE PARKER
Judgment Date	24 Jan 1956

- 8 We are In this case concerned only with this points Can the declaration be challenged on the ground that it was false and fraudulent? It can clearly be challenged in the Criminal Courts. The landlord can be taken before the Magistrate and fined £30: see Second Schedule (paragraph 6), or he can be prosecuted on indictment, and (If he is an individual) sent to prison: see [section 5 of the Perjury Act, 1911](#). But the landlords argued before us that the declaration cannot be challenged in the Civil Courts at all even though it was false and fraudulent; and that the landlords can recover and keep the increased rent even though it was obtained by fraud. If this argument is correct, the landlords would profit greatly from their fraud. The increase in rent would pay the fine many times over. I cannot accede to this argument for a moment. No Court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. **No judgment of a Court, no Order of a Minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud, fraud unravels everything. The Court is careful not to find fraud unless it is distinctly pleaded and proved; but once it is proved it vitiates judgments, contracts and all transactions** *Whatsoever*: See as to deeds *Collins v. Blantern* (1767) 1 Smith's Leading Cases, page 406, as to judgments, *The Duchess of Kingston's*, case (1776) 2 Smith's Leading Cases, pages 646, 651, and as to contracts *Master v. Miller* (1791) 1 Smith's Leading Cases, pages 780, 799. So here I am of opinion that if this declaration is proved to have been false and fraudulent it is a nullity and void and the landlords cannot recover any increase of rent by virtue of it.

The court said in *Union Pacific Railway Co. v. Botsford* (1891), " No right is held more sacred, or is more carefully guarded by the common law, than the right of every individual to the possession and control of his own person, free from all restraint or interference of others." The court implied it is unassailable because "the right to one's person may be said to be a right of complete immunity; to be let alone."

https://vlex.co.uk/vid/lazarus-estates-ltd-v-793262385

Lazarus Estates Ltd v Beasley

Judgment

Cited authorities 12

Cited in 108

Precedent Map

Related Vincent

Jurisdiction	England & Wales
Court	Court of Appeal
Judge	LORD JUSTICE DENNING, LORD JUSTICE MORRIS, LORD JUSTICE PARKER
Judgment Date	24 Jan 1956

- 8 We are In this case concerned only with this points Can the declaration be challenged on the ground that it was false and fraudulent? It can clearly be challenged in the Criminal Courts. The landlord can be taken before the Magistrate and fined £30: see Second Schedule (paragraph 6), or he can be prosecuted on indictment, and (if he is an individual) sent to prison: see [section 5 of the Perjury Act, 1911](#). But the landlords argued before us that the declaration cannot be challenged in the Civil Courts at all even though it was false and fraudulent; and that the landlords can recover and keep the increased rent even though it was obtained by fraud. If this argument is correct, the landlords would profit greatly from their fraud. The increase in rent would pay the fine many times over. I cannot accede to this argument for a moment. No Court in this land will allow a person to keep an advantage which he has obtained by fraud. **No judgment of a Court, no Order of a Minister, can be allowed to stand if it has been obtained by fraud, fraud unravels everything. The Court is careful not to find fraud unless it is distinctly pleaded and proved; but once it is proved it vitiates judgments, contracts and all transactions**Whatsoever: See as to deeds *Collins v. Blantern* (1767) 1 Smith's Leading Cases, page 406, as to judgments, *The Duchess of Kingston's*, case (1776) 2 Smith's Leading Cases, pages 646, 651, and as to contracts *Master v. Miller* (1791) 1 Smith's Leading Cases, pages 780, 799. So here I am of opinion that if this declaration is proved to have been false and fraudulent it is a nullity and void and the landlords cannot recover any increase of rent by virtue of it.