Form 10
[Rule 3.25]

COURT FILE NUMBER	2306 00442
COURT	COURT OF KING'S BENCH OF ALBERTA
JUDICIAL CENTRE	LETHBRIDGE
PLAINTIFF	CARRIE SAKAMOTO
DEFENDANTS	ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CANADA and HIS MAJESTY KING IN THE RIGHT OF ALBERTA
DOCUMENT	**Brought under the *Class Proceedings Act* AMENDED AMENDED AMENDED STATEMENT OF CLAIM**

Clerk's Stamp

Clean Copy, Not Filed Copy

ADDRESS FOR SERVICE AND CONTACT INFORMATION OF PARTY FILING THIS DOCUMENT

RATH & COMPANY
Barristers and Solicitors
282050 Hwy 22 W
Foothills, AB T0L 1W2

P. 403 931 4047
F. 403 931 4048

NOTICE TO DEFENDANTS

You are being sued. You are a defendant.

Go to the end of this document to see what you can do and when you must do it.

I. Introduction

1. This is a proposed class action brought by the Plaintiff, Carrie Sakamoto, on her own behalf and on behalf of other members of the proposed class. The proposed class action arises from the risks and harms resulting from the Covid-19 vaccines (the "**Covid Vaccines**") and involves the Defendants' unlawful, negligent, inadequate, improper, unfair and deceptive practices and misrepresentation related to, inter alia, their warning, marketing, promotion

and distribution of the Covid Vaccines to the public and to those who suffered injury and damages as a result.

2. The Defendants misrepresented the Covid Vaccines, in breach of statutory duty, as “safe and effective” to the public when in fact the Covid Vaccines were neither “safe or effective” and, as a result, many Albertans inoculated with the Covid Vaccines have suffered serious, life-threatening and even fatal consequences.

3. Health Canada negligently approved the Covid Vaccines under an expedited process which allowed manufacturers to apply for authorization for the sale and distribution of Covid Vaccines without the completion of all long-term safety studies or commitment to review new evidence about the Covid Vaccine as it become available, much less demonstrate that the Covid Vaccines were “safe and effective” for the general population.

4. By contrast, the Defendants knew, or ought to have known, that Covid Vaccines were neither safe or effective. The Defendants knew of reports of injury and harms caused by the Covid Vaccines and had access to information from the vaccine manufacturers stating the Covid Vaccines were not warranted for safety. Information from the vaccine manufacturers demonstrated various harms and injuries expected from the Covid Vaccines, yet the Defendants:

    a. Never disclosed this information to the general public or to physicians, and censored and suppressed information relating to the adverse events and injuries from the public;

    b. Continued to market, promote and distribute the Covid Vaccines as a “safe and effective” vaccine for the SARS-CoV-2 virus or Covid-19 (“**Covid**”); and

    c. Coerced and incentivised the public to take the Covid Vaccines while deliberately withholding relevant safety information about the Covid

Vaccines which interfered with the public's ability to exercise their right to full and informed consent to medical treatment.

5. The Defendants held themselves out as public health experts, reporting on behalf of health experts and public health doctors thereby establishing a relationship of trust between themselves and the public during the Covid pandemic at a time when the public was vulnerable, and the Defendants knew or ought to have known that the public would be relying on their information for their health, safety and protection. In public appeals meant to be relied on, the Chief Medical Officer of Health of Alberta routinely referred to all Albertans as her "patients" and issued 113 public health orders known as Chief Medical Officer of Health Orders ("**CMOH Orders**") *ultra vires* to Section 29.(2.1) of the *Public Health Act*, RSA 2000, c P-37 (the "***Public Health Act***") which included restrictions to Albertans not vaccinated for Covid. On July 31, 2023, the Alberta Court of King's Bench determined that the CMOH Orders were *ultra vires* the *Public Health Act*.

6. The Defendants misrepresented the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines and encouraged, and even implored, the public to trust the Defendants for their health, safety and protection. Further, the Defendants censored and suppressed information relating to the adverse events and injuries from the Covid Vaccines to influence public confidence in the Covid Vaccines and maintain trust in the public health authorities. The collective conduct of the Defendants to keep this information suppressed from the public in a manner which amounted to a conspiracy to commit assault and battery which deliberately interfered with the public's ability to exercise their right to informed consent to medical treatment.

7. The Defendants knew, or ought to have known, that the Covid Vaccines would cause damage to the public, including the Plaintiff, and the Defendants, conspired to commit assault and battery, and failed to take adequate measures, or any measures, to prevent harm to the public, including the

Plaintiff.

8. The Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants acted negligently, breached their public duty, or in the alternative made representations in furtherance of a conspiracy to commit assault and battery and committed malfeasance in public office in doing so.

II. Facts

THE PARTIES

The Plaintiff

9. The Plaintiff is an individual residing in the City of Lethbridge, in the Province of Alberta.

10. The Plaintiff claims on her behalf and on behalf of the Class and all Class Members for an order pursuant to the *Class Proceedings Act*, SA 2003, c C-16.5 (the "**CPA**") certifying this action as a Class proceeding and appointing her or other members of the Class as representative plaintiffs of the Class.

11. The Plaintiff was born November 7, 1975. At the time of filing this Statement of Claim, Carrie is 47 years old, and had no prior health conditions before being inoculated by the Covid Vaccines. After being inoculated by the Covid Vaccines she almost died. The Plaintiff was hospitalized for 17 days following experiencing stroke-like symptoms, ultimately losing her ability to walk, chew, talk and concentrate. The Plaintiff received no, or inadequate, warning from the Defendants about the severe injury and risks associated with the Covid Vaccines and was the subject of coercion and undue influence by the Defendants to take the Covid Vaccines absent her full and informed consent.

12. The Plaintiff is the proposed representative of a class of individuals from across Alberta who received an inoculation of the Covid Vaccines in the Province of Alberta, and who suffered injury and damages as a result of the Covid Vaccines.

The Class

13. The Plaintiff brings this action in her own right, and pursuant to the CPA on behalf of natural persons who:

    a. Received Covid Vaccines marketed or manufactured by Pfizer-BioNTech, AstraZeneca PLC, Moderna, Inc., Janssen Inc. and Novavax Inc. (the "**Vaccine Manufacturers**") in the Province of Alberta;

    b. Between December 9, 2020, and the date of certification of this action as a Class proceeding, or such other date determined to be appropriate by the Court (the "**Class Period**"); and

    c. Suffered injury, damage and losses as a result.

    (the "**Class**" or "**Class Members**")

The Defendants

14. The Defendant, the Attorney General of Canada, is named pursuant to the *Crown Liability and Proceedings Act* R.S.C., 1985, c. C-50 as the representative of the Minister of Health and the various federal agents and agencies represented by this Minister, including but not limited to the Chief Public Health Officer of Canada, Health Canada, the Public Health Agency of Canada, National Advisory Committee on Immunization, Dr. Teresa Tam, and Dr. Celia Lourenco (collectively hereafter referred to as the "**Federal Defendant**").

15. The Federal Defendant is vicariously liable for the actions of the federal Minister of Health and the various federal agents and agencies represented by this Minister.

16. The Federal Defendant oversaw the Department of Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada, key agencies coordinating the Canadian

government's response to the Covid pandemic and was responsible for discharging the operational role of regulatory approval, monitoring, and compliance of Covid Vaccines for use in Canada.

17. The Defendant, His Majesty the King in Right of Alberta ("**Alberta**"), is named in these proceedings pursuant to the *Proceedings Against the Crown Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c P-25 as the representative of the provincial Minister of Health (the "**Provincial Minister of Health**") and the various provincial agents and agencies represented by this minister, including but not limited to Dr. Deena Hinshaw, the Chief Medical Officer of Health ("**CMOH**"), and Alberta Health Services ("**AHS**") (collectively hereafter referred to as the "**Provincial Defendant**").

18. The Provincial Defendant is vicariously liable for the actions of the Provincial Minister of Health and the various provincial agents and agencies represented by this Minister.

19. The Provincial Defendant is responsible for allocating health funding, administering provincial programs and overseeing public health surveillance, public health and disease control initiatives in Alberta during the Covid pandemic including all of the misinformation and withholding of relevant information by the Alberta CMOH alleged herein.

Derelict Approvals

20. The *Food and Drugs Act*, RSC 1985, c F-27, (the "***Food and Drugs Act***") exists to ensure all therapeutic products meet health, safety and quality requirements and must undergo rigorous testing prior to being approved for human use in Canada.

21. The Federal Defendant has a statutory and fiduciary duty to ensure that therapeutic products sold in Canada are safe and effective for their intended purpose and has the authority under section C08.002 of the *Food and Drug Regulations*, CRC, c. 870 (the "***Food and Drugs Regulations***"), to issue an

approval for a new therapeutic product in Canada.

22. Before manufacturers can market a therapeutic product in Canada, under the *Food and Drug Regulations*, they need to obtain a Drug Identification Number or a Notice of Compliance, or both. To get these, manufacturers must provide strong evidence of the product's quality, safety, and efficacy as required under Canada's *Food and Drugs Act* and *Food and Drug Regulations*.

23. Under the *Food and Drug Regulations* that were in force at the beginning of the Covid pandemic, it could take several years for a manufacturer to develop a therapeutic product and generate the information and evidence required to satisfy the regulatory requirements.

24. Section 30.1 of the *Food and Drugs Act* authorizes the Minister of Health to make an interim order if the Minister of Health believes that immediate action is required to deal with a significant risk, direct or indirect, to health or safety.

25. On September 16, 2020, the Minister of Health made an interim order under s. 30.1 of the *Food and Drugs Act* to create an approval process that applied only to COVID-19 drugs (which includes vaccines) and was approved by the Governor in Council on September 25, 2020 (see P.C. 2020-682, Canada Gazette Part I, Vol. 154, No. 40 p. 2587 (the "**Interim Order**")). The Interim Order lowered the usual approval criteria for therapeutic drugs in Canada.

26. In and around that same time, the Minister of Health, approved several Covid vaccines designated to protect against Covid from the Vaccine Manufacturers. The Covid Vaccines were approved after the Minister of Health concluded that the benefit of the Covid Vaccines outweighed the risks and was not based on the usual safety and efficacy standard. The Minister of Health signed supply contracts with the Vaccine Manufacturers that forced the Canadian government to keep the agreements confidential and to indemnify the Vaccine Manufacturers for negligence and against any financial liability in the event of vaccine related harm. The Defendants signed supply

contracts with the Vaccines Manufacturers which stated that the Covid Vaccines were **not** warranted for safety due to being rushed to market without sufficient testing and long-term safety data.

27. Moderna submitted their application for approval on October 12, 2020, and the Moderna vaccine was approved by the Minister of Health on December 23, 2020 (the "**Moderna Vaccine**").

28. Jassen Inc. submitted their application for approval on November 30, 2020, and the Jassen Inc. vaccine was approved by the Minister of Health on November 30, 2020 (the "**Jassen Vaccine**") and the authorization was cancelled on June 30, 2023, in Canada. The Jassen Vaccine approval was revoked in the United States on June 1, 2023.

29. Pfizer-BioNTech submitted their application for approval on October 9, 2020, and the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine was approved by the Minister of Health on December 9, 2020 (the "**Pfizer Vaccine**").

30. AstraZeneca submitted their application for approval on September 9, 2020, and the AstraZeneca vaccine was approved by the Minister of Health on February 26, 2021 (the "**AstraZeneca Vaccine**").

31. Novavax Inc. submitted their application for approval on January 29, 2021, and the Novavax Inc. vaccine was approved by the Minister of Health on February 17, 2022 (the "**Novavax Vaccine**").

32. The Minister of Health authorized the Covid Vaccines relying on guidance from external regulatory agencies and Vaccine Manufacturers with the knowledge that domestic independent evaluation had not been undertaken to determine that the Covid Vaccines were fit for their purpose and had an adequate safety profile.

33. The Defendants knew or should have known that the Covid Vaccines' trial data indicated that the Covid Vaccines created a risk of adverse events and

death far beyond any previously approved vaccine in Canada, or that when such data became available the Defendants, collectively or individually, should have taken steps to withdraw the Covid Vaccines from public use or advise the public of the risk of injury and death associated with these products.

34. As of March 16, 2021, thirteen countries in the European Union suspended the authorization of the AstraZeneca Vaccine. At the time the applicable health authorities in the United States had not authorized the use of the AstraZeneca Vaccine.

35. The Vaccine Manufacturers engaged in "expedited" research to obtain regulatory approvals and launch the distribution of the Covid Vaccines worldwide as quickly as possible. The Vaccine Manufacturers manipulated data, or presented misleading data, and misled regulatory authorities to secure approvals. The Minister of Health did nothing to ensure this was not the case by not requiring a proper and rigorous review of the information presented by the Vaccine Manufacturers.

36. The Vaccine Manufacturers have an inherent conflict of interest in representing their products for regulatory approval as "safe and effective," and have in the past been known to manipulate data to make the drugs seem safer and more efficacious than they really are. The only safety and quality safeguards come from national regulatory authorities, such as Health Canada and the Food and Drugs Administration in the United States which were entirely ignored or set aside in regard to the Covid Vaccines.

37. The Pfizer and Moderna Vaccines utilized a gene therapy (mRNA) technology which had never been successfully, or fully, tested for long-term efficacy and safety in humans (the "**mRNA Covid Vaccines**"). When the mRNA technology had been used, prior to the Covid pandemic, there were severe side effects observed, prompting the need for more safety related clinical research. Neurological complications, like Bell's Palsy, were indicated as a

serious side-effect of the mRNA technology. To date, the Vaccine Manufacturers have not produced a successful coronavirus vaccine using gene therapy technology.

38. The Center for Disease Control and Prevention database Vaccine Adverse Reporting System in the United States reveals that the severe adverse events and deaths from the Covid Vaccines in 2021 and 2022 were significantly higher than all other vaccines combined from 2011 to 2020. Data from Canada and around the world shows a concerning trend in excess deaths following the rollout of the Covid Vaccines that has not been researched or adequately explained by the public health authorities. The leading cause of death in Alberta was “unknown” following the rollout of the Covid Vaccines to the public and public health authorities and regulatory bodies in Canada or Alberta respectively have not been able to explain this increase in “unknown” deaths.

39. If the Minister of Health believes that a product presents a serious or imminent risk of injury to health, the Minister of Health has a duty to recall the product and, in addition, may disclose confidential business information about a product without notification if the purpose of the disclosure is related to the protection or promotion of human health or the safety of the public. The Federal Defendant’s lack of action in not recalling, or pausing, the Covid Vaccines or releasing the Covid Vaccine supply contracts where the manufacturers expressly stated that the products were not warranted for safety was negligence and in bad faith given the Federal Defendant acknowledged Covid Vaccine injury, and the patterns of excess unknown deaths and Covid Vaccine injury emerging in Canada and around the world.

40. As of January 5, 2024, the Federal Defendant reported 488 deaths occurring after being vaccinated with a Covid Vaccine. The Federal Defendant also reported a total of 58,712 adverse events following being vaccinated with a Covid Vaccine, 11,702 being listed as a serious adverse event.

Notwithstanding the significant number of deaths and adverse events, the Federal Defendant has not paused, recalled, or taken any compliance or enforcement action against the Vaccine Manufacturers and the Provincial Defendants are still administering the Covid Vaccines to the public while not warning the public of the risk of injury and death associated with these products.

41. The Defendants, individually and collectively, reassured the public that messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA), the molecule that provides cells with instructions for making proteins, never enters the central part (nucleus) of the cell, which is where our DNA (genetic material) is found with the mRNA Vaccines. As early as October 2020 a study indicated that the mRNA spike protein can interact with tumor suppressor proteins in the body, suggesting the possibility of increased cancers and the resurgence of aggressive cancers in persons who took the mRNA Covid Vaccines.

42. As early as 2022 research found the presence of mRNA spike protein from the mRNA Vaccines within the cell's nucleus along with elevated production of the enzyme "reverse transcriptase," facilitating the conversion of mRNA to DNA.

43. Recently multiple independent laboratories identified DNA fragment contamination in the mRNA Covid Vaccines. To scale up production for billions of mRNA Vaccines DNA was cloned into a bacterial plasmid vector for amplification with E. Coli bacteria. Health Canada confirmed the presence of E. Coli DNA contamination in the Pfizer Vaccine.

44. As early as December 14, 2023, Health Canada officials warned about a “high level of impurity” and contamination in the mRNA Covid Vaccines. They found that the mRNA Covid Vaccines could instruct cells to produce unintended, or “frameshifted proteins”, potentially triggering immune responses and leading to increase in autoimmune conditions, diseases and even death.

45. On February 23, 2024, the most comprehensive global study analyzing the vaccination records of over 99 million individuals who had received Covid Vaccines was published. The study identified significant increases in the occurrence of neurological, blood, and heart-related conditions. The following, higher-than-expected cases of "adverse events of special interest" were observed but are not limited to:

a. myocarditis (inflammation of the heart muscle);

b. Guillain-Barre syndrome (a debilitating neurological condition);

c. transverse myelitis (inflammation of the spinal cord);

d. acute disseminated encephalomyelitis (inflammation and swelling in the brain and spinal cord);

e. pericarditis (inflammation of the lining around the heart); and

f. cerebral venous sinus thrombosis (a rare form of stroke).

46. Despite known concerns and warnings, the Federal Defendant has not paused, recalled, or taken any compliance or enforcement action against the Vaccine Manufacturers and the Provincial Defendants have continued to administer the mRNA Covid Vaccines despite the identified issues with contamination and potential risks associated with the contaminated mRNA Covid Vaccines.

47. The Defendants knew or ought to have known by February 2021 that the Covid Vaccines were the cause of substantial increased serious adverse events and deaths yet continued to advertise the Covid Vaccines as “safe” and “effective” when they knew or ought to have known otherwise. Instead, the Defendants disregarded expert opinion and scientific evidence demonstrating increased and concerning adverse events and death from the Covid Vaccine. When foreign authorities suspended their Covid Vaccines’ approvals, in light of the risks known, the Federal Defendant did not, and the

Defendants continued to promote the Covid Vaccine to the Plaintiff and Class Members despite the known risk and dangers.

Coordinated Vaccine Campaigns

48. The *Food and Drugs Act* prohibits advertising any therapeutic product in a manner that is false, misleading, or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding the character, value, composition, merit or safety of the therapeutic product. Any person that promotes the sale of therapeutic product is subject to the *Food and Drugs Act*.

49. One of the roles of Health Canada is to provide health information to the public to make informed decisions about their health care. One of the roles of the Provincial Defendant through AHS is to deliver safe, high-quality health care in Alberta. One of the obligations on medical professionals is to obtain consent and ensure the patient is fully informed and understands a medical procedure or treatment before it takes place.

50. The Defendants, in a coordinated and strategic manner, launched a comprehensive false, misleading and deceptive misinformation campaign that created an erroneous impression regarding the character, value, composition, merit and safety of the Covid vaccines to entice and coerce the public to take the Covid Vaccines (the "**Vaccine Campaigns**").

51. The Defendants, individually and collectively, engaged in negligent, false, misleading, and deceptive Vaccine Campaigns designed to censor, entice, shame, cause fear and coerce the public to take the Covid Vaccines without fully informing the public, including the Plaintiff of the risks. The risks from Covid Vaccines were known but not clearly laid out for the public, and in fact intentionally censored and suppressed, which did not allow people to make an independent, informed assessment about whether the Covid Vaccines were a necessary or safe therapeutic intervention.

52. The actions of the Defendants in preventing the Plaintiff, and Class Members,

from accessing information which would have allowed her to provide full and informed consent amounts to a conspiracy by the Defendants to commit assault and battery upon the Plaintiff and Class Members. The Defendants, by agreement, or with a common design or intention, presented false information about the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines to the public while supressing factual information from the public about the risks and dangers of the Covid Vaccine. The Defendants know or ought to have known that these actions was likely to result in injury or harm from the Covid Vaccine and did in fact cause injury and harm to the Plaintiff and the Class Members.

53. The objective of the Vaccine Campaigns was to vaccinate everyone, young and old, without any regard to the risk that Covid actually presented to such persons versus the risk of the Covid Vaccines.

54. The Vaccine Campaigns include, but are not limited to:

a. the “safe and effective” campaign;

b. the “we are in it together” campaign;

c. #ThisIsOurShot campaign;

d. the “first vaccine is the best vaccine” campaign;

e. the “mix-and-match” campaign;

f. #ShotofHope campaign; and

g. the “trust the science” campaigns.

55. On or about March 15, 2021, the Defendants marketed the Covid Vaccines with ~~the~~ various Vaccine Campaign slogans like, “the first vaccine, is the best vaccine”. Specifically, the Defendants represented that all the approved vaccines for Covid are highly effective at preventing severe disease and

reducing transmission none of which was objectively verifiable.

56. During the Vaccine Campaigns, the Defendants made the following public statements, but not limited to:

a. On January 20, 2021, Dr. Hinshaw, Alberta CMOH publicly stated: “We will continue to monitor every dose that is administered to make sure we’re protecting Albertans health. I am providing regular updates on this because I want Albertans to understand that we are watching closely and that the benefits of these vaccine far outweigh the risks. I hope this information helps Albertans understand what the options are and make the informed choice to get immunized when it’s their turn. That choice will help protect them, their loved ones and their community. That choice will save lives.”

b. On or about May 4, 2021, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau publicly stated “The impacts of catching Covid are far greater and far deadlier, as we’ve seen across the county, than potential side effects. Let me remind everyone that every vaccine administered in Canada is safe and effective, as evaluated by Health Canada.”

c. On or about May 17, 2021, the federal Minister of Health, Patty Hajdu publicly stated that the Government of Canada is supporting Canadians to make informed Covid-19 vaccines choices and announced the launch of a new national campaign to encourage vaccine uptake which will appear on television, radio, print, out-home and online.

d. On or about June 15, 2021, Dr. Theresa Tam, Chief Public Health Officer of Canada publicly stated: “Having safe and effective vaccines along with informed, confident and motivated people getting vaccinated are key to Canada’s success for widespread and long-term control of

Covid-19. Through the 'Ask the Experts' campaign, trusted Canadian health experts listen and provide answers to your important questions about Covid-19 vaccination that are fundamental to vaccine confidence and informed decision making for you and your loved ones."

e. On or about June 29, 2021, Dr. Hinshaw publicly stated: "It has been a tremendous privilege to support Albertans over the last 16 months and to help keep you informed. This pandemic has tested us and at time it has polarized us. It has challenged all of us in ways we never could have expected. But it has also made clear one indisputable fact, we are stronger and safer together."

f. On or about July 27, 2021, the office of the Prime Minister published the following public statement: "The best way to end this pandemic is for everyone to get their shots as soon as they can."

g. The Canadian military acknowledged employing propaganda techniques (otherwise known as "information operations campaigns") on the public as early as April 2020 and it is alleged that the Federal Defendant was aware of and directed the propaganda plan employed by the Canadian military on the public.

57. The Defendants failed to ensure that the information they disseminated to the public was credible, reliable, and accurate and instead acted in a false, misleading, and manipulative manner to the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members. The Defendants censored and suppressed information relating to the adverse events from the Covid Vaccine to influence public confidence in Covid Vaccines and maintain trust in the public health authorities.

58. The Vaccine Campaigns had the effect of violating the Plaintiff's and the Class Members' right to informed consent to accept or reject a medical treatment, freedom from coercion to accept a medical treatment not

voluntarily chosen and freedom from medical or scientific experimentation and amounts to a conspiracy to commit assault and battery by the Defendants.

59. The Vaccine Campaigns prevented access to the information necessary for members of the public to understand and assess critical issues about the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines, the medical consequences of refusing the Covid Vaccines, alternative treatments to the Covid Vaccines and the application of each of these factors to individual personal medical profiles.

60. Further, the Defendants provided the Covid Vaccines to the public at no cost and the Provincial Defendant offered monetary incentives to entice and coerce the public to take the Covid Vaccines under false assurances. In addition, Alberta's CMOH issued numerous public health orders *ultra vires* the *Public Health Act* which were unlawful in an effort to coerce and restrict the civil rights of persons who failed or refused to take the Covid Vaccines against their will.

61. The Vaccine Campaigns provided false, misleading, and deceptive information to the public and did not allow individuals to access or receive information necessary for informed consent thereby eviscerating informed consent by the public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members.

d. The Plaintiff

62. Starting around March of 2020, Carrie was continuously exposed to the Defendants' fear-based messaging regarding the Covid pandemic. From around December of 2020, Carrie was inundated by the Defendants' imploring her to take claiming the Covid Vaccines will protect her health and safety, and the health and safety of others.

63. On April 21, 2021, Carrie was administered a vaccine manufactured by AstraZeneca by an AHS representative in Lethbridge, Alberta. On June 18, 2021, Carrie was administered a vaccine manufactured by Pfizer by an AHS

representative in Lethbridge, Alberta. The representations made by the Defendants instilled fear in Carrie regarding the Covid pandemic causing her to take the Covid Vaccines in the belief that it would protect her health and safety, and the health and safety of those around her.

64. Immediately following the administration of the Pfizer Vaccine, the Plaintiff experienced severe flu-like symptoms including nausea, dizziness, and fever. Her symptoms continued to get worse throughout the week.

65. On July 1, 2021, the Plaintiff's husband took her to the Chinook Regional Hospital in Lethbridge, Alberta (the "**Hospital**") because her symptoms were becoming increasingly severe. On the way to the Hospital, the Plaintiff noticed that the right side of her face began to droop and she experienced stroke like symptoms. The Plaintiff was discharged that day from the Hospital and~~,~~ was told her symptoms would resolve themselves. She was told to go home.

66. Throughout the night and into the next day the Plaintiff's symptoms got worse, and she went back to the Hospital. She was admitted to the Hospital on July 2, 2021. Her symptoms got increasingly worse and she was put on a feeding tube because she was unable to properly chew and swallow her food.

67. On or about July 9, 2021, the doctors at the Hospital informed the Plaintiff that her injuries were caused by the Pfizer Vaccine administered to the Plaintiff on June 18, 2021. The right side of her throat was paralyzed and she had to relearn how to swallow. The right side of her face and tongue were paralyzed making chewing and swallowing without choking extremely difficult. Her speech was slurred. Her right eye was paralyzed open so it had to be covered and taped shut. She experienced pain in her face, ear and head at all times. She experienced hearing loss in her right ear. Her balance was affected such that she needed a walker to move around. She constantly experiences vertigo. She takes four different medications every day. She has memory loss and sleeping is difficult for her. She is still in pain and has swelling in her face, ear and head, and experiences constant headaches. She was advised that

the damage is permanent.

68. As a result of being administered the Covid Vaccines, the Plaintiff has suffered the following injuries ("**Injuries**"):

a. Severe and permanent Bell's Palsy;

b. Anxiety;

c. Depression;

d. Memory loss;

e. Vision loss;

f. Hearing loss;

g. Cognitive impairment;

h. Synkinesis;

i. Loss of sleep;

j. Speech impairment;

k. Facial disfigurement;

l. Facial paralysis;

m. Tinnitus; ~~and~~

n. Vertigo; and

o. Such further and other injuries as will be proven at a trial of this action.

69. On July 15, 2021, the Plaintiff was discharged from the Hospital.

70. On August 30, 2021, the Plaintiff was sent a letter from the Vaccine Injury Support Program.

71. On November 1, 2021, the Plaintiff and her family put their home and farm up for sale. She could not perform household tasks, she experienced fatigue,

lack of concentration, was on several medications and required constant medical treatment. She lost her independence and ability to maintain her farm and family home.

72. In the fall of 2021 and into early 2022, two separate AHS representatives called the Plaintiff at home and specifically advised her to take the Covid Vaccine as a booster and told her that it was “safe” for her to do so.

73. In the fall of 2021 and into early 2022, the Plaintiff reached out to many Canadian mainstream media networks, including the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, to tell them her story so they could share the impacts of adverse events from the Covid Vaccines with the public and medical doctors. She was advised that they could not report on information that negatively reported on the Covid Vaccines.

74. On April 13, 2022, her family sold their family farm because she could not drive and live independently on the farm with her three children and husband due to the Injuries and increased medical appointments in Lethbridge. The rushed sale caused the Plaintiff and her family a significant financial loss.

75. On August 10, 2022, upon her request, the Plaintiff received a letter from her medical doctor stating that it is not safe for her to take additional Covid Vaccines.

76. On March 3, 2023, the Plaintiff is informed by letter that she is accepted into the Vaccine Injury Support Program confirming that the Pfizer Vaccine likely caused her serious and permanent Bell’s Palsy. Carrie was offered a modest compensation from the Vaccine Injury Support Program limited to losses for the following injuries: (i) hearing, (ii) mimic (facial paralysis), and (iii) esthetic of the face.

III. CLAIMS

Public Duty

77. The Defendants held themselves out to the public as public health experts, reporting on behalf of health experts establishing a relationship of trust between themselves and the public during the Covid pandemic at a time when the public was vulnerable. The Defendants knew or ought to have known that the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members, would be relying on their information for their health, safety and protection. Further, these governmental agents and agencies encouraged, and even implored, the public to trust the Defendants for their health, safety, and protection during the Covid pandemic and specifically with respect to the Covid Vaccines.

78. The Federal Defendants failed to follow previous practices of the Government of Canada in withdrawing unsafe vaccines from the market upon confirmation that the vaccine products caused death or injury.

79. Traditionally, for therapeutic product approvals in Canada the Minister of Health has a legal duty to:

a. Ensure that the therapeutic products approved for use in Canada are safe and effective s. C.08.002(2)(g) and (h) of the *Food and Drugs Regulations*;

b. Recall therapeutic products from distribution where it is believed that a therapeutic product presents a serious or imminent risk of injury to health under s. 21.3(1) the *Food and Drugs Act*;

c. Ensure that advertisement of therapeutic products are not false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its design, construction, performance, intended use, quantity, character, value, composition, merit or safety under s. 9(1) of the *Food and Drugs Act*; and

d. Disclose confidential business information about a therapeutic product without notifying the person to whose business or affairs the

information relates or obtaining their consent, if the Minister believes that the product may present a serious risk of injury to human health under s. 21(2) of the *Food and Drugs Act*.

80. However, the Minister of Health's traditional legal duty regarding safety and efficacy was removed for approval of the Covid Vaccines under the Interim Order. The Minister of Health did not have a legal duty to ensure that the Covid Vaccines approved for use in Canada were safe and effective. Instead, the duty of the Minister of Health in regard to the Covid Vaccine approval test was based on whether there was "sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the benefits associated with the drug outweigh the risks, having regard to the uncertainties relating to the benefits and risks and the necessity of addressing the urgent public health need related to COVID-19" (s. 5(c)) of the Interim Order. In all of the circumstances the Minister of Health was negligent, or in the alternative, intentionally failed in his duty.

81. In respect of the Covid Vaccines, the Minister of Health maintained a legal duty to:

a. Recall therapeutic products from distribution where it is believed that a therapeutic product presents a serious or imminent risk of injury to health; Ensure that advertisement of therapeutic products;

b. Ensure that advertisement of therapeutic products is not false, misleading or deceptive or is likely to create an erroneous impression regarding its design, construction, performance, intended use, quantity, character, value, composition, merit or safety; and

c. Disclose confidential business information about a therapeutic product without notifying the person to whose business or affairs the information relates or obtaining their consent, if the Minister believes that the product may present a serious risk of injury to human health.

82. The Minister of Health retained a public duty with respect to the Covid

Vaccines, as described above, which it could not abrogate simply by the Interim Order. The Minister of Health had a legal duty to monitor, recall and update the public messaging and disclose confidential business information about the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines and failed to do so when a serious or imminent risk of injury to health was perceived and in doing so fettered its discretion and was negligent and breached fiduciary duties in failing to carry out his duties.

83. Meanwhile the Defendants engaged in Vaccine Campaigns that deceived the public by telling the public that the Covid Vaccines were “safe”, “effective” and/or of “high quality” rather than candidly telling the public the truth about the novel approval process for the Covid Vaccines. All Defendants were promoting the Covid Vaccines and were subject to the *Food and Drugs Act*. The Defendants had a legal duty to monitor and update the public messaging about the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines which ~~it~~ they failed to do. The Minister of Health failed to exercise his duty to ensure the advertisements regarding the Covid Vaccines were not false, misleading or deceptive and in doing so fettered its discretion and was negligent in not protecting the public from the Covid Vaccines.

84. The Defendants established a relationship of trust with the Plaintiff and the Class Members, breached their legal duties and the Plaintiff and the Class Members, and the Plaintiff and the Class Members relied on the representations made by the Defendants when taking the Covid Vaccine and the Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered significant physical, emotional, psychological damages and other damages as a result.

85. The Defendants acted negligently, or in the alternative, deliberately manipulated Covid Vaccine adverse event data by either refusing to allow physicians to submit adverse reports or deleting such reports to the Adverse Events Following Immunization (AEFI) or taking the AEFI website offline.

86. The Defendants negligently, or in the alternative intentionally, advised the public that they could mix-and-match the Covid Vaccines without any information, evidence or assurances from the Covid Manufacturers about the Covid Vaccine mix-and-match immunization strategy. There was no scientific basis or evidence that a mix-and-match immunization strategy was safe, effective or appropriate. The Defendants knew, or ought to have known that the Plaintiff, and some of the Class members relied on the Defendants representations that the mix-and-match Covid Vaccine strategy was safe, effective or appropriate and were harmed and injured as a result.

Negligent Misrepresentation

87. The Defendants breached the standard of care by making representations regarding the safety of the Covid Vaccines that the Defendants knew or ought to have known were inaccurate. Alternatively, the Defendants made the representations recklessly when the Defendants had insufficient information, while representing themselves to the public as having sufficient information.

88. The Defendants, individually and collectively, made false, inaccurate, or misleading representations, including but not limited to:

a. The Covid Vaccines were safe and fit for its intended use;

b. The Covid Vaccines were effective for its intended use;

c. The Covid Vaccines were of merchantable quality;

d. The Covid Vaccines had been adequately tested to ensure that the risks or adverse reactions were likely to occur with the appropriate range of tolerance;

e. The mix-and-match Covid Vaccine strategy was safe, effective and appropriate;

f. The representations made in the Vaccine Campaigns; and

g. Such further and other representations as will be particularized in the course of this proceeding.

(collectively the "**Representations**").

89. The Representations were made by the Defendants when the Defendants knew or ought to have known they were inaccurate. Alternatively, the Representations were made negligently or recklessly when the Defendants had insufficient information, while representing themselves to the public as having sufficient information. Further the Defendants had a duty to update the Representations and messaging about the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines which they also failed to do.

90. The Defendants breached the standard of care and negligently misrepresented the safety of the Covid Vaccines and did not disclose the risks associated with the Covid Vaccines which included serious injury and death.

91. The Defendants' Representations deceived the public and abused their special relationship of trust by making the Representations rather than candidly telling the public the truth about the Covid Vaccines. The Defendants intentionally misled the public about the Covid Vaccines claiming they were "safe", "effective" and of "high quality" despite not being required to pass any formal safety or efficacy testing. In addition to making the Representations, the Defendants urged the Plaintiff and the Class Members to obtain any available vaccine at the very first opportunity.

92. The Defendants acted negligently and recklessly by suppressing information related to adverse events from the Covid Vaccines and suppressing opinions of medical and scientific experts, from Canada and around the world, who raised concerns about the Covid Vaccines and disagreed with the Representations made by the Defendants.

93. The Defendants~~, and each one of them,~~ engaged in strategic and coordinated

messaging which was false, misleading~~,~~ and deceptive. They also engaged in fear and censorship ~~in the~~ based Vaccine Campaigns, designed to entice, implore, shame and coerce Canadians to take the Covid Vaccines. Because the Defendants, and each of them, agreed on a common purpose to brand and advertise the Covid Vaccines as “safe” and “effective” they are jointly and severally liable.

94. The Defendants provided the Covid Vaccine to the public at no cost, and the Provincial Defendant even offered monetary rewards, in an effort to entice and encourage the public to take the Covid Vaccines thereby vitiating the informed consent required to treat the Plaintiff and the Class.

95. The Plaintiff and the Class state~~s~~ that they were in a proximate relationship of trust to the Defendants as a citizen, taxpayer and consumer of the information offered by the Defendants.

96. The Plaintiff and the Class claim~~s~~ that the Defendants owe a duty of care to accurately inform the Plaintiff and the Class about the harms and dangers of the Covid Vaccines.

97. Each of the Defendants knew, or ought to have known, that the Plaintiff and the Class would rely upon the Representations made. Opting to be administered the Covid Vaccines, the Plaintiff and the Class relied upon the Representations made by each of the Defendants, to their detriment.

98. Given that the information about the Covid Vaccines was negligently misrepresented by the Defendants to the public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members, it vitiated the Plaintiff’s and the Class Members’ ability to provide informed consent.

99. But for the negligent Representations made by the Defendants, the Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have taken the Covid Vaccines. But for the negligent Representations made, the Plaintiff and the Class Members would not have suffered injury or death.

Negligence and Wrongful Death

100. The Federal Defendant owed a duty of care to the Plaintiff and Class Members when exercising its operational function of independent review of submission by the Vaccine manufacturers to determine, based only on scientific and medical evidence that the Covid Vaccines were safe and effective.

101. The Federal Defendant owed a duty of care to the Plaintiff and Class Members when exercising its operational function authorizing use of the Covid Vaccines in Canada.

102. The Defendants owed a duty of care to the Plaintiff and Class Members regarding the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines.

103. The Defendants owed a duty to warn the Plaintiff and Class Members of the risks associated with the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines.

104. The Defendants owed a duty to the Plaintiff and Class Members to accurately inform them of all risks associated with the Covid Vaccines.

105. The Defendants owned a duty of care to the Plaintiff and Class Members to inform them of the risks and dangers associated with being administered two, or more, Covid Vaccines from two, or more, different Vaccine Manufacturers.

Misfeasance/Abuse of Public Office

106. As a department, Health Canada is responsible for administering acts and regulations, and for implementing government-wide regulatory initiatives. Health Canada was responsible for discharging the operational role of regulatory approval, monitoring, and compliance of Covid Vaccines for use in Canada.

107. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead that Health Canada was recklessly indifferent or willfully blind in discharging its responsibilities of regulatory

approval and oversight of the Covid Vaccines by, *inter alia*:

a. Failing to reasonably and accurately review, interpret and report on the clinical data presented by the Vaccine Manufacturers in relation to the approval of the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines;

b. Recommending the Covid Vaccines for approval for use in Canada;

c. Failing to regulate, monitor, review, interpret and report on data presented by the Vaccine Manufacturers in relation to new data which became available following the approval of the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines; and

d. Failing to recommend or issue revocation of compliance to the Vaccine Manufacturers following public release of data showing that the risks of the Covid Vaccines were outweighed by the minimal efficacy of the Covid Vaccines.

108. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead Health Canada's reckless indifference or wilful blindness produced the foreseeable result of providing false representation to the public that the Covid Vaccines were "safe and effective" and caused people to undergo a medical treatment or procedure without having the opportunity to provide informed consent.

109. The Minister of Health is responsible for the oversight and direction of the Department of Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada which were key agencies coordinating the Canadian government's response to the Covid pandemic.

110. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead the federal Minister of Health was recklessly indifferent or willfully blind in discharging its responsibilities of approval, oversight, direction, and control over the vaccine approval process and Health Canada in relation to the regulatory approval and oversight of the Covid Vaccines by, *inter alia*:

a. Issuing a certificate of compliance to the Vaccine Manufacturers allowing the Covid Vaccines to be purchased and distributed to persons in Canada for use;

b. Failing to maintain oversight and control over Health Canda in relation to its regulatory responsibility for oversight, monitoring, evaluation, and assessment of the Covid Vaccines;

c. Representing to Canadians in public statements and press releases that the Covid Vaccines were safe and effective, despite the Defendants possessing data to the contrary; and,

d. Failing to revoke the certificate of compliance issued to the Vaccine Manufacturers following the release of clinical data showing that the risks of the Covid Vaccines were outweighed by the minimal efficacy of the vaccination.

111. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead Defendants reckless indifference or willful blindness produced the foreseeable result of instilling a false representation to the public that the Covid Vaccines were safe and effective.

112. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead the Defendants reckless indifference or willful blindness produced the foreseeable result injury to the public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members.

113. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead that the conduct of the Defendants were recklessly indifferent or willfully blind in the exercise of public functions.

114. The Plaintiff and Class Members state that the Defendants were reckless or willfully blind as to the fact that this conduct was unlawful and likely to injure the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members. As such, the Plaintiff pleads that the Defendants are liable for misfeasance in public office.

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

115. The federal Minister of Health abused its public office, acted in bad faith and intentionally misled the public about the Covid Vaccines by way of a novel approval scheme that did not require evidence that the Covid Vaccines be either “safe”, “effective” or of “high quality”. In direct contradiction with the public messaging from the Minister of Health, the novel Covid Vaccines approvals, in fact, lowered the approval standards.

116. Under the Interim Order, the requirements for approval of the Covid Vaccines were altered such that the approvals were given based on the conclusion that the benefits associated with the Covid Vaccines outweigh the risks making the new Covid Vaccines approval a subjective test. There must be strict objective evidence of both safety and efficacy. It must also be objectively clear that the benefits outweigh the risks before a new drug is approved. It can only be objectively clear that the benefits of a drug outweigh the risks when the benefits and risks are objectively known.

117. Further, in the novel approval process for the Covid Vaccines, the Minister of Health relied on Relative Risk Reduction over Absolute Risk Reduction metrics. In communicating the risks and benefits associated with the Covid Vaccines, the more accurate and reliable measure for providing medical information to the public, and the Plaintiff and Class Members so they could make informed health decisions is Absolute Risk Reduction. Relative Risk Reduction analysis is the same generally irrespective of their level of risk and therefore suggests higher benefits than really exist. The Minister of Health abused its public office, acted in bad faith and intentionally mislead the public about the risk and benefit metric used for approving the Covid Vaccines.

118. The Minister of Health and Alberta’s CMOH abused their public office, acted in bad faith and intentionally mislead the public in stating that the Covid Vaccines would stop the public from getting infected and stop transmission. The Vaccine Manufactures did not study these clinical endpoints and there

was no data to support such representations.

119. The Minister of Health and Alberta's CMOH abused their public office, acted in bad faith, and negligently, or in the alternative intentionally, advised the public that they could mix-and-match the Covid Vaccines, which the Plaintiff and some of the Class Members did, with absolutely no evidence of such a practice was safe, effective or appropriate. There was no scientific basis on which to recommend such a practice. In fact, the World Health Organization issued a strong warning against Canada's mix-and-match approach for the Covid Vaccines and called it a "dangerous trend".

120. A fundamental safeguard for therapeutic products allows the Minister of Health to pause or recall therapeutic product approval if new evidence raises a safety or efficacy concern or if fraud is discovered. The Minister of Health should not have relied on misleading representations from the Vaccine Manufacturers. The Minister of Health ignored the Vaccine Manufacturers' own evidence which demonstrated that the harm caused by the Covid Vaccines could exceed its benefit. The Minister of Health acted in bad faith for not recalling or pausing the Covid Vaccines and continuing to recommend the Covid Vaccines despite increased safety and efficacy concerns.

121. The Interim Order allowed unapproved Covid Vaccines to be imported into Canada as long as the Canadian Government was the purchaser. The rationale was to deal with the Covid pandemic by purchasing the unproven Covid Vaccines so that they would be available for distribution once approved for use, thereby creating a serious conflict of interest. Meanwhile, the Minister of Health abused its public office, acted in bad faith, and intentionally coordinated with the Vaccine Manufacturers to keep the Covid Vaccine agreements confidential and to indemnify the Vaccine Manufacturers for negligence and against any financial liability in the event of vaccine related harm.

122. The Defendants, and all of them, intentionally censored and suppressed data

relating to adverse events and injuries from the Covid Vaccines to influence public confidence in Covid Vaccines and maintain trust in the public health authorities. The Defendants knew or ought to have known of the increased risk from the Covid Vaccines through information submitted by the Vaccine Manufacturers, and from medical and scientific experts that raised this issue, but that information was not provided to the public, and in fact it was intentionally censored and suppressed, which did not allow the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members, to make an independent, informed assessment about whether the Covid Vaccines were a necessary or safe therapeutic intervention.

123. Further, the Minister of Health and Alberta's CMOH made it difficult for the public to report severe adverse events and injuries from the Covid Vaccines to the public health authorities in an effort to censor and suppress data relating to adverse events and injuries from the Covid Vaccines.

124. The Minister of Health and Alberta's CMOH intentionally engaged in conduct that it knew was unlawful or was negligent in a manner likely to cause harm to the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members.

Conspiracy to Commit Assault and Battery

125. At all material times, the Defendants conspired or acted in concert to prevent the public from acquiring knowledge of the risks and dangers associated with Covid Vaccines, and conspired to commit assault and battery in circumstances where they knew or ought to have known that harm and healthcare costs would result from acts done in furtherance of the conspiracy, concert of action and common design.

126. This conspiracy, concert of action and common design was entered into or continued at or through various public health offices and officers representing the Defendants.

127. The conspiracy, concert of action and common design was continued when:

a. Some, or all, of the Defendants agreed to supress, or did suppress, adverse events data related to the Covid Vaccines so as to avoid any admission, directly or indirectly, concerning the risks of the Covid Vaccines; and

b. Some, or all, of the Defendants misrepresented to the public that the Covid Vaccines were safe and effective along with the other Representations made to the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members;

c. Some, or all, of the Defendants maintained a united front minimizing the dangers and risk of injury and death from the Covid Vaccines; and

d. Some, or all, of the Defendants misrepresented to the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members, that there was no causal connection between the Covid Vaccines and injury and death.

128. Some, or all of the Defendants, coordinated with international governing bodies and pharmaceutical companies to recommend, encourage and promote the pharmaceutical industry's positions on vaccines and health issues in order to mislead the Plaintiff and Class Members on the safety and efficacy of the Covid Vaccines.

129. In furtherance of the conspiracy, concert of action and common design, some, or all of the Defendants:

a. Disseminated false and misleading information regarding the risks of the Covid Vaccines including making false and misleading submissions to the public;

b. Refused to admit that the Covid Vaccines caused injury or death;

c. Suppressed and concealed material facts, research and data regarding the risks of the Covid Vaccines such that all limitation of actions are suspended;

d. Participated in a public relations program on vaccines and health issues with the object of promoting the Covid Vaccines, protecting uptake of Covid Vaccines and protecting Covid Vaccines from attack by misrepresenting the link between Cvoid Vaccines and injury or death; and

e. Offered financial and other initiatives in order to induce uptake of the Covid Vaccines.

130. Further particulars of the manner in which the conspiracy, concert of action and common design was entered into or continued, and of the Covid Vaccine related wrongs committed by the Defendants in Canada in furtherance of the conspiracy, concert of action and common design are within the knowledge of the Defendants.

131. The Defendants through repeated representation and the expenditure of millions of dollars in campaigns to promulgate the Representations intended that the public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members, should act in reliance upon the Representations.

132. The public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members, acted in reliance of the Defendants Representations when obtaining the Covid Vaccines.

133. The public, including the Plaintiff and the Class Members, acting in reliance upon the Defendants repeated Representations, obtained the Covid Vaccines which led to injury and death to some.

134. As a result of the aforementioned conspiracy, concert of action and common design, persons in Alberta consented to the Covid Vaccines approved, distributed and promoted by the Defendants and thereby suffered injury or death from the Covid Vaccines.

135. The Defendants tortious conduct and breaches of fiduciary duty as plead above herein were the legal cause of the Plaintiff's and the Class Members' damages and the damages suffered are compensable in law.

Concealment of Facts

136. The Defendants willfully concealed the fact of their wrongdoing from the Plaintiff and Class Members, and the fact that the injuries suffered by the Plaintiff and the Class from the Covid Vaccines were caused or contributed to by the Defendants' acts or omissions. The Plaintiff and the Class plead and rely on the doctrine of concealment and equitable fraud.

137. In addition, or in the alternative, the injuries suffered by the Plaintiff and the Class Members from the Covid Vaccines have a latency period and do not arise until years after exposure. The Plaintiff and Class Members had no way of knowing about the risk of serious illness associated with the use of and/or exposure to the Covid Vaccines until the Plaintiff was injured.

138. The Plaintiff and Class Members rely on the doctrines of postponement and discoverability to postpone the running of any applicable limitation period. The Plaintiff and Class Members plead and rely on *Limitations Act*, R.S.A. 2000, c L-12, s. 4.

IV. Damages

139. The Plaintiff and Class Members claim that the Defendants' actions and breaches, as set out above, caused the Plaintiff and Class Members extensive damages.

140. As a result of the Defendants' actions and breaches, the Plaintiff and Class Members haves suffered from severe physical, psychological, and emotional harms, and other related health problems.

141. The psychological damages caused by the Defendants' actions and breaches have caused the Plaintiff and Class Members to suffer significant mental distress and loss of enjoyment of life.

142. The Plaintiff and Class Members have incurred and will continue to incur medical expenses, lost income, and other expenses due to the Defendants' actions and breaches.

143. Continuously since June 18, 2021, the Plaintiff has been unable to complete many of her activities of daily living, her housekeeping duties, her farm responsibilities, and family responsibilities.

144. The Plaintiff's Injuries, including but not limited to paralysis, hearing loss, vision loss, speech impairment, vertigo and memory loss have impaired her from staying focused, and have left her able to perform daily tasks.

145. The Plaintiff has, and Class Members have, as a direct and proximate result of the Defendants' actions and breaches suffered damages, such as past and future loss of income, out-of-pocket expenses, past and future medical expenses, as well as non-pecuniary damages arising from the harms suffered.

146. As a result of the Defendants' actions and breaches, the Plaintiff and Class Members have suffered and will continue to suffer the following damages and loses, but not limited to:

1. Personal injury;

2. Pain and suffering and loss of enjoyment of life;

3. Infliction of psychological harm;

4. Past and future loss of future income earnings, earning capacity and competitive advantage;

5. Past and future loss of housekeeping capacity;

6. Past and future cost of care;

7. Pecuniary loss due to the expedited sale of the Plaintiff's farm;

8. Out-of-pocket expenses; and

9. Other such damages as will be proven at the trial of this action.

147. The Plaintiff and Class Members claims that the Defendants, and each of them, are liable for the negligence and breach of fiduciary duty of their employees, agents, or servants, acting within the scope of their employment or agency.

148. The Plaintiff and Class Members claims that the Defendants, and each of them, are vicariously liable for the actions of their employees, agents, or servants.

Exemplary or Aggravated Damages

149. The Plaintiff and Class Members claim exemplary, or aggravated damages from the Defendants. A high standard of conduct is expected from the government for Canada and the government of Alberta toward its citizens, including promoting accurate and factual information to the public, which was not provided, and the Defendants conduct towards the Plaintiff, the Class Members and the public at large was reprehensible, high handed and oppressive.

Punitive Damages

150. The Defendants knew or should have known that the Covid Vaccines were not safe or effective. Despite their knowledge, the Defendants continued aggressively to market, distribute and promote the Covid Vaccines to the public, including the Plaintiff and Class Members, without disclosing its dangerous and fatal side-effects. The Defendants' conduct was high-handed,

reckless, egregious, deliberate, wilful, callous, and in wanton disregard of the rights and safety of the Plaintiff and Class Members.

151. The Plaintiff and the Class Members proposes that the trial of this action take place at the Calgary Courthouse, in the Province of Alberta.

152. In the opinion of the Plaintiff and the Class members, the trial of the within action will not exceed 25 days.

V. Remedy Sought

153. The Plaintiff, personally and on behalf of the Class Members, claim:

A. An Order certifying this action as a class proceeding and appointing Carrie Sakamoto as the Representative Plaintiff for the Class pursuant to the CPA;

B. General damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

C. Special and punitive damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

D. Punitive damages in the amount to be proven at trial.

E. Exemplary, or aggravated damages in an amount to be proven at trial.

F. Costs of this action pursuant to the CPA, or alternatively, on a full or substantial indemnity basis, plus the cost of administration and notice pursuant to the CPA, plus applicable taxes.

G. The Plaintiff claims prejudgment interest in accordance with the provisions of the *Judgment Interest Act*, RSA 2000, c J-1, as amended.

H. Such further and other relief as counsel may advise and this Honourable Court may deem just.

154. The Plaintiff pleads and relies on the following:

a. The *Alberta Rules of Court,* Alta Reg 124/2010;

b. *Class Proceedings Act, SA 2003,* c C-16.5;

c. *Conflict of Interest Act,* SC 2006, c 9, s 2;

d. *Conflicts of Interest Act,* RSA 2000, c C-23;

e. *Food and Drugs Act,* RSC 1985, c F-27;

f. *Food and Drug Regulations,* CRC, c 870;

g. *Judgment Interest Act*, RSA 2000, c J-1;

h. *Public Service Employment Act*, SC 2003, c 22, ss 12, 13;

i. *Public Service Employee Relations Act*, RSA 2000, c P-43;

j. Regional Health Authorities Act, RSA 2000; and

k. Such other enactments and legislation as the Plaintiff may advise and this Honourable Court may consider given the circumstances.

NOTICE TO THE DEFENDANT(S)

You only have a short time to do something to defend yourself against this claim:

- 20 days if you are served in Alberta
- 1 month if you are served outside Alberta but in Canada
- 2 months if you are served outside Canada.

You can respond by filing a statement of defence or a demand for notice in the office of the clerk of the Court of King's Bench at Calgary, Alberta, AND serving your statement of defence or a demand for notice on the plaintiff's(s') address for service.

WARNING

If you do not file and serve a statement of defence or a demand for notice within your time period, you risk losing the law suit automatically. If you do not file, or do not serve, or are late in doing either of these things, a court may give a judgment to the plaintiff(s) against you.