

Private criminal prosecution of the four British officials responsible for the worldwide “Covid” scamdemic

Interview transcript: Mark Devlin talks to Michael O’Bernicia

<https://www.thebernician.net/mark-devlin-talks-to-michael-obernicia-pcp-case-update/>

Episode #184 recorded Saturday, 28 March 2021: The first anniversary of the World Health Organization officially declaring Covid-19 to be a pandemic. Also World Freedom Day.

Regarding:

- Health Minister **Matt Hancock**
- UK Chief Medical Officer **Chris Whitty**
- Chief Scientific Advisor to the British government, **Patrick Vallance**
- Former British Coronavirus Advisor **Neil Ferguson** of Imperial College, London

HIGHLIGHTS

- No one in the world has amassed the kind of evidence that the team bringing the private criminal prosecution (PCP) holds. No one has ever brought a private criminal prosecution against the British government.
- The PCP team is offering to share their evidence with everyone worldwide wishing to bring criminal prosecutions against their governments for the same crimes.
- The British government, including the Cabinet Office, the Commons and the Lords, have admitted that they have no evidence of the existence of SARS-Cov-2 or Covid-19 and nor do they possess an effective and accurate test for either of them. They are relying upon an assumption that what they have been told by the WHO is true. The PCP team is requiring the British government to prove their allegation that there is such a thing as a virus.
- Covid-19 was [declassified as a High Consequence Infectious Disease](#) [HCID] on 13 March 2020, a week before the Coronavirus Act was passed.
- In order to hide the real cause of death, [section 30 of the Coronavirus Act](#) suspended the centuries-old rule regarding autopsies and inquests before juries into the cause of death. A solicitor was told by care-home staff that it was government policy to mark every death as Covid.
- The PCP team is asking the court to issue a declaration that all alleged Covid deaths must henceforth be subject to autopsy and an inquest before a jury, and that all flu and Covid vaccinations be suspended for a minimum period of 90 days.
- The PCP team has predicted with 98% accuracy how many people would die according to how many people were to be vaccinated.
- The PCP team is bringing charges of multiple breaches of Section 2 and 3 of the Fraud Act 2006 against Health Minister **Matt Hancock**, UK Chief Medical Officer **Chris Whitty**, Chief Scientific Advisor to the British government **Patrick Vallance**, and former British Coronavirus Advisor **Neil Ferguson** of Imperial College, for which the maximum sentence is five years in prison. However, upon conviction, the PCP team intends to request that the defendants be indicted for mass murder.
- **Matt Hancock**, **Chris Whitty**, **Patrick Vallance** and **Neil Ferguson** were paid by the vaccination industry, notably Bill Gates and the Wellcome Trust, to enable the global pandemic to be declared by the World Health Organization (WHO).

- Health Minister **Matt Hancock** established a relationship with Bill Gates via two meetings and had a series of ministerial meetings with all of the heads of the international pharmaceutical and vaccine industries a month after he took office.
- **Chris Whitty** became an Executive Board member of the WHO as of 1 January 2020.
- **Patrick Vallance** has had a long-established relationship with Bill Gates since being President of Research and Development at GlaxoSmithKline (GSK).
- **Neil Ferguson** is unqualified [as an epidemiologist], having no qualification in biology or maths. [He holds a PhD in theoretical physics. [A postgraduate degree, either a Masters or a PhD, in epidemiology or a related subject, such as public health, statistical science or biological science, is usually needed to work as an epidemiologist.](#)]
- **Ferguson** has been financed throughout his career at Imperial College by the Gates Foundation and the Wellcome Trust, which has given Imperial College grants of £1.2 billion over the years, all of which were for vaccine-related research and development.
- **Ferguson** is the main scientific advisor to the WHO on pandemic response policy and identification.
- Prime Minister Boris Johnson has no power and admits that everything is being controlled by the City of London, which is a euphemism for the House of Rothschild. Johnson has said: *"I haven't seen any evidence that vaccines are doing any good at all."*
- The [Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency \(MHRA\)](#) has received £7.1 million from the Gates Foundation since 2011, yet claims to be an independent regulatory authority. MHRA authorised the use of the latest WHO-approved flu vaccines and the latest Covid vaccines, despite their not having been properly tested on animals or humans.
- A leaked WHO safety study shows that WHO expects a minimum of 377 deaths from the flu vaccines (including the vaccine for Covid-19) per 100,000 healthy people between 18 and 65, and this figure does not include the elderly or infirm.
- The Wellcome Sanger Institute is named after Margaret Sanger, who was one of the founding members of Planned Parenthood, which is a eugenics operation. She and Bill Gates are on record as having made many public comments about their desire to significantly reduce the world population. Bill Gates' father was also a prominent founding member of Planned Parenthood.
- UK Prime Minister Boris Johnson and his father have both made public comments about the need to significantly reduce the world's population.
- The agenda is genocide via the vaccines. It is an attempt to wipe out the vast majority of the population of the world.

TRANSCRIPT

Mark Devlin:

... So, my guest today has been on a couple of times previously. We last spoke to him in November. It is the Bernician. Welcome back, Michael.

Michael O'Bernicia:

Glad to be here, Mark, thanks for inviting me.

1:18

Mark Devlin:

Sure. And the reason we're talking today is because you contacted me very recently to say that there have been some developments in the case that you are bringing and we are now at the point where we can talk about the progress that has been made. Now, I know that the main difference between when we were talking in October and November of last year is back then, you were bringing private criminal prosecutions against all British MPs. And I see your case has now changed to bringing action against four specific named individuals, which would be [Health Minister Matt] Hancock, [UK Chief Medical Officer Chris] Whitty, [Chief Scientific Advisor to the British government, Patrick] Vallance and [Neil] Ferguson [of Imperial College (former British Coronavirus Advisor)]. I guess the first question is: why has it changed, in that you are going after those four specific individuals rather than all the British MPs?

Michael O'Bernicia:

In a nutshell, it's changed because the level of investigation that we've done into the case – and when I say 'we', I'm talking about a team of a half dozen committed, independent data analysts and legal scholars who have come together to attempt to assess and synthesize such a profound amount of information about such complex subject matter – at least at face value – that we came to the unanimous conclusion that **there were four individuals without whom the entire pandemic, not just in – or rather should I say, the entire scamdemic, not just in the UK but in the rest of the world – could not have transpired the way it has.**

3:00

And whilst we acknowledge and cite in the case that Bill Gates has played a pivotal role as financier of the international crimes against humanity that have been committed – and that obviously includes the crimes that have been committed in the UK – and we cite an enormous amount of evidence in support of that, which is unlikely to be disputed, given that it's all a matter of public record. But, **without the actions that were taken by Matt Hancock, Chris Whitty, Patrick Vallance and Neil Ferguson, none of it could have happened.**

And I know it's going to be quite extraordinary or even unbelievable for people listening to this, but what we put together is an evidence file in excess of 1,200 pages.

4:00

- in the end. We thought it would be bigger, but it's something like 1,200 pages – of evidence, including witness statements, expert witness statements, from two professors, three doctors, a dental surgeon, a mathematician, a probate solicitor with 20 years' experience, a retired nuclear submarine data analyst, and an independent data analyst, as well as a former CID fraud detective who has been an independent investigator of complex and international frauds ever since.

4:36

So, what I'm effectively saying, Mark, is last time we spoke, we didn't have anywhere near that amount of evidence. What we had were essentially the first elements that we needed in the case, which is why when we applied for an arrest warrant for [Health Minister] Matt Hancock for a simple **non-disclosure over the declassification of Covid-19 as no longer being classified as a High Consequence Infectious Disease [HCID] which happened on 13 March 2020, but was declared on the Public Health England website on 19 March, which was of course a week before**

the Corona Virus Act was passed. Now, the reason that we are saying this has such significance is because it basically means that, as of 13 March [2020], Covid-19 /SARS-Cov-2, was no longer considered to be dangerous by the Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens. And this was a matter of public record.

5:42

And yet, the draconian bill that was put forward by Matt Hancock as sponsor of the Corona Virus Act, was nothing but an interpretation of the pandemic policies that had been devised in 2014 by Chris Whitty and Neil Ferguson in response to the West African Ebola pandemic. And what we are saying, i.e., the Prosecution, The People's Union of Britain, is that, along with Vallance, Whitty, Ferguson and Hancock, have together, for the purposes of securing past and future material gains from the vaccination industry, notably from Bill Gates and the Wellcome Trust, predominantly – but many others are involved as well. And they've done it for the motive, the common motive, of maximizing vaccination uptake in the UK and the rest of the world. And we can prove it. And we couldn't before.

6:59 Mark Devlin:

Yeah. It's so clear the entire agenda has been leading up to mass vaccination, now. It's so obvious that that was always the main aim of it. Covid being classified, or no longer classified an HCID is referenced in a song put out by Van Morrison that he put out a few months ago, called "As I Walked Out". He says *"In March 2020 on the government website it said that Covid is no longer high risk, then three days later they put us into lockdown. Not many did question this very strange move. Ain't that the truth."*

So we were talking back in November and you were very optimistic about where things were going to go back then. But obviously, it didn't go the way you wanted it to and here we are, four months later, with quite a delay.

7:45

And the reason for that was that they basically knocked the thing back and said there's not enough evidence, and that's been the cause of the delay, right? You've gone out and provided more than enough of what they said they required, in terms of evidence. Even down to the submarine guy. What's the submarine guy's input? Surely now there can be no lack of evidence in terms of what you've compiled there.

8:12

Michael O'Bernicia:

Yes, that's very well put, Mark. You see, in the end, the vast majority of the people who may have spoken out in a derogatory way about the case over the weeks and months that have passed, the vast majority are not members of the legal professions and they're not experienced litigants who know what they are doing. Some of them claim to know what they're doing and none of them do. They've all been proven to be wrong. You see, when we put the application for Hancock's arrest in, it was an attempt to stop things, at least on a temporary basis, before we got the rest of the case together.

8.54

And anybody who's ever put any kind of legal case, whether in the civil or the criminal domain, knows that it normally takes a team of anywhere between six and a dozen people, working full-time, 9 to 5, for a number of weeks or months, getting everything together, before it even goes outside of one legal firm.

9.17

Now, when we were last talking, we had a legal team – and I won't name the firm – but it took a number of weeks for us to establish that the legal firm – and I don't believe they were doing it deliberately, I believe they were doing it because of the legal advice they'd taken from people that we believe are also the legal advisors or connected or conflicted with the legal advisors of the UK government, and particularly Matt Hancock.

9:44

And they were attempting to get us to change the allegations, from allegations of fraud to allegations of misconduct in public office. Now, when we discovered this, we initially allowed them to believe that we thought that was a plausible way forward, and we told them that we would get back to them. Within two days of them giving their detailed advice, which was well over 20 pages, within two days of them giving the advice that we should ditch the fraud allegations and stick with misconduct charges, we read an article that was published by the head of the Law Commission in the Law Gazette, basically recommending that the rules regarding the laying of misconduct in public office charges should be changed to prevent potential vexatious litigants.

10.44

Now, for anyone with experience in this realm of the law, they will know that there is no such thing as vexatious litigation, where people are coming and bringing misconduct charges, because misconduct in public office charges are some of the hardest charges to prove.

11:03

So generally, they very rarely go forward. So they're doing it, having advised us to take that path in an attempt – what we believe to be an attempt – to send us in the wrong direction and shut us down. So that happened after we talked before Christmas, and obviously that warranted a complete change in strategy. But we'd already devised several contingency plans, one of which was the one that we put into play and that we've worked with ever since, and resulted in yesterday, at 23 minutes past 4 yesterday afternoon, of the charges of multiple breaches of Section 2 and 3 of the Fraud Act 2006 against the defendants that was served at London Magistrate's Court, shall we say. And so the papers were served, and we don't exactly know how long it's going to take before we hear something back from the Court. We're expecting something early next week.

Mark Devlin:

And there's a beautiful synchronicity to the fact that it was the one year anniversary of Covid being downgraded from an HCID (High Consequence Infectious Disease) on the government website on 19 March, exactly one year later, you served those papers.

12:21

You know, the thing about Hancock is, he does seem untouchable. It does seem like he's very heavily protected because a story broke in the mainstream news, a few weeks ago, of this clash of interests when it comes to these private contracts with the PCR tests and testing kits and such, and it turned out that Hancock had some private interests in the companies that have been used for this. And there was a bit of a storm kicked up about it. And it looked, for a short while, as if it might cost him his job and he might get kicked out. *But he's still there.* And it fizzled out. And it came to nothing. And it does tend to create the impression that he's very heavily protected, and that he has friends in high places, doesn't it?

Mark Devlin:

Well, put it this way. I don't think there's ever been a political puppet in known history – certainly in modern history – who has ever enjoyed the role that Hancock is playing, more than him, except, perhaps, Tony Blair. But he's a similar political animal. He really doesn't care about actually having power, he just wants people to *think* that he has the power. And you can look at Chris Whitty, and listen to the words he said, and read the words he said, and you can read the same, and listen to the same from Matt Hancock, from Vallance and Ferguson.

13.52

And what you see is that each of them have been placed in the only positions that could have prevented Covid 1984 happening, because – whether people want to believe it or not – we can prove, with prima facie evidence, the majority of which is in the public domain, in addition to expert witness testimony, that *had those four individuals not done what they have done, the WHO [World Health Organization] would never have declared a global pandemic.* And it may seem that Hancock has more protection, but from what I have read and seen thus far, Whitty has far more power than Hancock.

14:42

Mark Devlin:

Whitty strikes me as someone who's doing this under duress. He comes across that way, he comes across as if he's taken on this role somewhat reluctantly; whereas Hancock seems to be relishing every minute, absolutely relishing the power that he's got. That's been my personal observation. Now, where does this leave [Prime Minister] Johnson, because Johnson's not a part of this?

Michael O'Bernicia:

Well again, this is something which isn't currently part of the case, because it's a much more contentious issue, but *all of the evidence that we have, emphatically suggests that Johnson has no power whatsoever, and that all of this is happening because of Ferguson, Whitty, Vallance and Hancock.*

15.29

That literally there's nothing that Johnson could do, even if he wanted to, and this is the reason why, when you see him appear, it's obvious that he's reading a script. And the only time that I've seen, in the last year, actually, that he's gone off the script, is at one of their press briefings, very recently – you might have seen it, you might not have done – but he was given the briefing with Vallance. And he put Vallance on the spot! He was asked what he thought about the vaccine rollout, and he said – off the script, looking at the camera, without looking at notes, for the first

time since the beginning – he said, *“Well, from the data that I’ve seen, I haven’t seen any evidence that vaccines are doing any good at all. What do you think, Patrick?”*

16.15

And Vallance looked like he’d swallowed a plate! Actually, he could easily have swallowed his tongue easily in the moment. And he said (stuttering and nervous), *“Well we need more time, we need more time to see. The vaccines are going to have an effect”*. And then Johnson went *“Well, judging by the evidence that I’ve seen, it doesn’t seem to be having any effect at all. Over to you, Patrick*. And Vallance did the same thing again, repeated himself, stumbling.

16.45

So, what I’m saying is that, even though there’s no excuse for any of them, the evidence is emphatic. When you investigate fraud – this is what people have to understand - I spent a decade investigating and proving banking fraud in the High Court and established a point of law, having proven mortgage fraud against a bank, for the first time in legal history. And I was a lay litigant without any legal training or legal representation, and I did it all, it was all self taught. And every remedy that I’ve ever come up with and put into the public domain, works, when people do it correctly, and many thousands of people have used the remedies that I created, which have largely been under the Common Law. But when a statute applies, a statute can be used successfully in order to force our legal adversaries into a position where they have to behave in a certain way, that benefits whatever outcome we’re seeking in legal proceedings.

17.46

And if anybody out there has actually run legal proceedings themselves, they’ll know that they can drag on for years at a time very easily. However, they aren’t won in court, they are won before you go to court by establishing beyond any doubt whatsoever, with the facts and the law, that your position is correct. Now, anyone who’s been following my work for over a decade will literally testify to this – and I could probably find you at least 200 witnesses within 24 hours, probably more, who would testify to it – that every single time I make a public pronouncement, no matter how outlandish it might seem to people, if I say I’m going to do something, I don’t just talk the talk, I walk the walk every single time. And yet, I get attacked by people, completely unprovoked, who defame my character and my work and tell people that what I’m saying is absolute bullshit and will never work. And none of them have ever achieved the results that I’ve achieved. And that’s why I have a 100% track record in legal proceedings, and they have a 100% track record in slagging me off!

19:01

Mark Devlin:

Well, this has been a constant source of frustration for me, hearing these various names that are very big in the Common Law scene all disagreeing on how things should be done, and all insisting that their way is the way to do it. And I just think, if all these people could just put their differences aside, and unite and get on the same page, the same way our enemy does. They don’t seem to have a problem with fixing a goal and sticking to achieving that, whatever it takes. But we don’t seem to be able to organize ourselves in that way. It’s just disagreement, finger pointing, bitching ... I just think, if these people would only all come together, it would be one almighty powerhouse that would be so formidable that success would be virtually guaranteed.

But just get all this disagreement over ways in which it should be done. It's just very despairing to witness that.

19.55

Michael O'Bernicia:

It is, yes, it is, I agree, but at the same time, the first 10 years are the hardest and after that, it's just water off a duck's back. Because in the end, all that matters is that everybody has the right information. I couldn't give a shit whether I'm right or they're right. Only I have no problem holding my hands up if I'm wrong, and I don't make public pronouncements, as I say, without knowing that I'm right, and if I'm ever wrong, I always correct it, and I never have a problem correcting whatever mistakes I make. However, the people who lay criticisms at me, would never ever take me on in any kind of debate, and they would never have the balls to say the things that they say on their keyboards, to my face. And for that reason, I not only don't have any respect for them, I don't waste time thinking about them.

20.47

Mark Devlin:

What you were saying earlier about Johnson going off script with his comments about the vaccine, much to Vallance's embarrassment. I wonder if that had anything to do with him turning up yesterday to receive his vaccine, sitting there with his mask on, like a good, obedient little puppet, and emblazoned across the newspaper headlines today is "*Boris Johnson takes the vaccine*". I wonder if those two events were connected.

21.14

Michael O'Bernicia:

I think that that's a very probable link that you've just drawn there. That would make perfect sense, and my instinct says that it's correct, and it's also logical that that would be the case. Because, as you've observed yourself, there's something about the way that he's behaving. It's not like a prime minister. It's like someone who's playing a role but he's not comfortable within the role. From what I've witnessed, judging by some evidence which I'm not going to disclose in public at the moment. I may do so in the near future, but we have been given information that confirmed that **Johnson admits that everything is being controlled by the City of London, which is a euphemism for the House of Rothschild**. Now, that being the case, what I believe would happen in the event that our private criminal prosecution for breaches of the Fraud Act 2006 against the defendants, in the event that goes forward to trial and Johnson is called as a witness, I believe Johnson will sing like a canary. And I also believe many other people will who've relied on the judgment of those four people. But I should also say, that in the skeleton of Hancock's history is a former nickname which I think speaks volumes. Because we have been reliably informed by someone of his ilk, that his nickname was once "Accident-Waiting-To-Happen".

22.59

Mark Devlin:

I've long suspected that this entire scamdemic was cooked up from London, and probably the City of London, the belly of the beast. It wouldn't surprise me if certain individuals from Tavistock

and these other agencies that specialize in psychological manipulation exported the entire agenda to all these other countries around the world. That's been my suspicion. And this would indicate that Johnson is being controlled by other forces, he's not his own man, he's being directed, in terms of what to do and say, and he's not really in control of the whole thing at all.

23.37

Michael O'Bernicia:

No. And if you also remember that, in the autumn [2020], all of a sudden, when everyone had been accusing him of running Covid 1984, **Cummings resigns**, and first of all he's working a notice until January, and then he resigns immediately. **And this was just after we served notice of private criminal prosecution.** And what I also believe – apart from the fact that I think that because he's sharper than a lot of them, whether he's an unscrupulous wretch or not, he's smarter than most of them – and I think he got out of Dodge when he saw that this could end a way that none of them had ever even thought possible.

24.27

And I think Johnson trusts him, right or wrong, and will have gone along with that point of view. I think **Hancock has done it because of a relationship that he established with Bill Gates via two meetings that he had.** The first one was in January 2019 at the World Economic Forum, with Bill Gates, where they discussed various vaccine-related issues, and then a year, virtually to the day, later, in his ministerial office, he met with Bill and Melinda Gates, again to discuss vaccine-related issues, although the discussion that took place is subject to FOIA [Freedom of Information] requests, and we don't really know the exact details of it yet, but we can assume that it was vaccine-related, given that their previous meeting was vaccine-related, and everything that has transpired since would back that up.

25.27

So what we assume, given that Hancock, remember, took on Johnson in a Tory leadership bid, prior to Johnson winning and then the Tories winning the election and Johnson, surprisingly, keeping Hancock on as Secretary of State for Health, and it really was only after that, after the Tories won the supposed "Brexit" election, that **Hancock** started getting his teeth into the role, at the Department of Health, and I mean, literally, a month **after he took office, he starts a series of meetings, ministerial meetings, all proven, with all of the head honchos of the international pharmaceutical and vaccine industries.**

26.15

And most notably, one of the most frequent visitors to his ministerial office, was GlaxoSmithKline (GSK), which Patrick Vallance is former President of. And **Patrick Vallance** has pretty much had a hand, when he was at GlaxoSmithKline, he had a hand in a number of vaccines that were produced for pandemics, one of which, one prime example being the Ebola pandemic, which he put in, **as President of Research and Development, he put into development a year before the Ebola pandemic!**

26.54

So what we've got is a situation where someone who has an existing relationship with Bill Gates because GSK and the Gates Foundation, since 2013, have had an actual business partnership,

and that business partnership started a year after Vallance became President. So he has an actual, well-established, long-established relationship with Bill Gates.

And then you have Ferguson, whose entire career has been financed by the pharmaceutical industry. He starts off in the Noughties [2000-2009] – and unqualified, by the way; he hasn't even got an "A" level [secondary school graduation certificate] in biology, let alone a [university] degree, or in maths – and he starts off in the Noughties as a consultant for GSK, when Vallance is also at the company in a senior position, before he became President. And Ferguson is the one who is responsible for all of the ridiculous predictions of the previous pandemics that were declared on the same bullshit notions that they were taking place. And every single step of his career, Ferguson, at Imperial College, has been financed by the Gates Foundation and the Wellcome Trust.

28.07

Every single step. The Wellcome Trust, for people who don't know, is literally a vaccine charity. I couldn't put it in any other way. I believe the last estimate is that the Wellcome Trust have put £1.2 billion into Imperial College over the years, in grants. Every single one of them was for vaccine-related research and development. Same with the Gates Foundation. You've got the [Medicines & Healthcare products Regulatory Agency] in the UK, the supposedly independent regulation authority that has to decide which products are safe and which products are dangerous, and you've got that organization who said "Yes" to the latest WHO-approved flu vaccines and the latest untested Covid vaccines. And they said "Yes" to them despite not having been properly tested on animals or humans, they said "Yes" to them having received, since 2011, £7.1 million from the Gates Foundation for projects that look like Research and Development agendas for a vaccine company.

29.27

And those are the people who decided that these vaccines are safe. And those are the people who ignored the WHO whistleblower research, which we were sent. This comes directly from the WHO. It's a WHO safety study on the latest WHO-approved and UK-approved flu vaccines, which the WHO say, in their safety study, are representative, or this study is representative of all recently approved influenza vaccines.

And this study extrapolates in the information which proves that they expect a minimum of 377 deaths from the flu vaccines, per 100,000 healthy people between 18 and 65. So that's not even including the elderly and the infirm. And they expect this, and they say it's representative of the other influenza vaccines, and that also includes Covid-19.

30.34

Now, to people who are listening to this, who have heard the other podcasts, they will probably have a grasp and a chance of putting everything together. But for those who are coming to it for the first time, what we're saying here is: we've been sent by a WHO whistleblower a safety study which says you've got a 0.377 % chance of dying from a flu vaccine. But 39% [this is what he says, but this figure should be checked as he may have meant 0.39%] of those who were vaccinated with it suffered serious adverse events, including brain damage, heart problems, the onset of chronic illness which they didn't have before. It really is a smorgasbord of horrendous results. And that is why the Establishment is working so hard to demonize anybody who speaks out about the vaccines. And they're trying to create the illusion, as we speak, that the vaccines are the reason why the deaths are going down and the cases are going down.

31.48

But we can demonstrate, with official data backed up by a highly qualified mathematician, and – as I alluded to and as you mentioned yourself – a data analyst who used to work on a nuclear submarine. Now, to answer your question, what has that man been doing in the case? What he's been doing is going over the evidence of an independent data analyst I've been working with called Mark Opford [?], who is already in the public domain, with this information, but nothing like what we have in our possession, has been disclosed, for obvious reasons.

32.27

But what Mark has done, through his amazing synthesis of an enormous amount of data, having been helped by the retired submarine data analyst, having been helped by him in putting together a huge amount of data, taken from all the original sources, all of the data available, and updating it in real time, we proved, mathematically, that **we were predicting, with 98% accuracy, how many people were going to die, in accordance with how many people were going to be vaccinated.** We proved it to within 2% of what it was. And we've done it ever since. And we wouldn't have the knowledge, we wouldn't have had the ability to know these things, had we not been given that leaked WHO safety study. So this, in and of itself, is extraordinary, and I understand people who think, *"Oh, until I see it with my own eyes, I won't believe it"*. Well, you will. You'll just have to be patient.

33.41

In addition to that, we have a very experienced, very knowledgeable and soulful solicitor, who has a lot of experience dealing with Covid issues and death certificates. And she has testified in the case that she's got three cases of clients that she knew very well, to be suffering from multiple co-morbidities in the latter stages of their lives, in their late 80s or early to mid 90s. And it was known that they had these co-morbidities in the care homes where they died, but in each case, when she went to check the death certificates, and make sure everything was as it should be, **she found out, and was told on the telephone, by email and face to face, by staff in the care homes, that it was government policy to mark every death as Covid, no matter what.**

34.47

And, as per Section 30 of the Coronavirus Act 2020, which the anniversary – obviously the anniversary of the unlawful passing of that Act is coming up at midnight on the 25th – **Section 30 of that act suspended the usual rule regarding autopsies**, which normally have to be done on every single type of notifiable disease. And Section 30 clearly states that, for the purposes of Covid-19, they have to treat it as not being a notifiable disease, in order to get out of the statutory requirement that every notifiable disease results in an autopsy and an inquest before a jury. So **why would they legislate to suspend inquests before juries into the actual cause of death - the way we've done it for centuries – why would they suspend that, if they didn't want to hide what the real cause of death was?**

35:48

Mark Devlin:

We'll have to go after Bill Gates another day, or somebody else can. But you mentioned the Wellcome Trust there, and that's alternatively known as the Wellcome Sanger Institute, named after Margaret Sanger, who was one of the founding members of **Planned Parenthood, which is**

a eugenics operation, and she's on record as having made many public comments about her desire to reduce the world population significantly, as has Bill Gates. And Bill Gates's father, William Gates, Sr., was also a prominent founding member of Planned Parenthood.

36.35

And you've also got Boris Johnson, and his father, Stanley Johnson, who have both made comments about the need to significantly reduce the world's population, and then all of them crop up in this scamdemic narrative. So it's all pretty damning. And it all gives an insight into what the agenda has been all along, which is genocide via the vaccines. And I hope one day, there's gonna be some kind of Nuremberg style trials for genocide. There's this German American lawyer, Reiner Fuellmich, that's trying to bring cases along those lines. You know, we've got so much damning evidence here to suggest that the agenda all along, as you have pointed out through your social media posts in the past several months, has been world population reduction by way of vaccine.

37:25

Michael O'Bernicia:

Yes, and we can prove it, which we couldn't before. We had some evidence, we had circumstantial evidence, but now we've got enough prima facie – which means “on the face” evidence – that shows that there's a reason why all of these issues have to go before a jury. All of these allegations have to be tried before a jury. There's no other way to do it. And the fact is that, I understand that the Reiner Fuellmich case, it's something that I obviously support, and I understand that he's got an awful lot of support from right around the world, from academia, from science, and from the legal professions.

38.12

My only concern is that it's not going to move forward, something of that kind of magnitude, is not going to move forward anywhere near as quick as we can move something forward here. And the reason we can do it, is because there's nobody in the world that currently has amassed the kind of evidence that we have.

And obviously we are offering to everybody, in every single country everywhere around the world, we're offering them the opportunity, if they are bringing criminal prosecutions against their governments for the same crimes, we can share this information. Because it proves beyond doubt that all of this started here, all of this started with Public Health England, not with the WHO, and we can prove it. Nobody knows – or hardly anybody knows that the number one scientific advisor, in any event, to the WHO since 2009 on pandemic response policy and identification, is Neil Ferguson, who hasn't even got a biology degree! He was placed there in 2019.

39.20

As of 1 January 2020, Chris Whitty became an Executive Board member of the WHO – the WHO, which has been primarily financed since its inception by the Bill Gates Foundation. And Chris Whitty, who has worked for only institutions that function on Bill Gates' money. And we can prove it. The London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine – multiple grants from the Gates Foundation. Whitty was given a little over 31 million pounds to go and research, malaria vaccines in Africa. Those same malaria vaccines, since the first started being administered in

Africa, have been responsible for an increase in malaria in Africa, not a decrease, although they claim the reasons are otherwise.

40.20

It's the same with polio. People claim falsely all the time, "*Oh, you can't say that vaccines don't work, because it got rid of polio*". No, it didn't. Polio, or "wild polio" as they call it, is worse and more virulent than it's ever been, and it's taken the world in a way that it never did before, before the vaccines. People have to understand, this is not just some Johnny-Come-Lately attempt to make money. **This is an attempt to wipe out the vast majority of the population of the world**, because if they don't do that, the Establishment, the bankster Establishment that's behind it all, will be overthrown, and they'll be lucky to spend the rest of their lives in prison.

41.10

Mark Devlin:

So, you laid the papers yesterday, Friday 19 March. They will doubtless try to kick the can further and further down the road to buy themselves more time and drag this whole thing out. What do you anticipate them coming back with, to you?

41.26

Michael O'Bernicia:

Over the years, what I've learned, dealing in various legal proceedings involving allegations of fraud, against credit card companies, against banks, against car dealerships, and even against home [film?] sales companies. And the reason why I have won on every occasion, usually without having to go into the court, is because, in reality, no case is won in court, it's won *before* court. And that's why, if you win before court, then you're obviously an inflated chance of getting a settlement without going to court. In this particular occasion, the remedy can't be had without going into court.

42.09

I've had over a decade's experience dealing with the rigged civil justice system in this country, fighting mortgage fraud, along with numerous other people who I've been working with for a number of years, fighting institutionalized mortgage fraud. We were on the brink of launching a class action in the criminal courts against the entire fraudulent mortgage industry, starting with the Chief Land Registrar, just before Covid 1984 happened. To get to that point, we had to do all of the research necessary, so it wasn't even necessary for us to look at the research that we already knew.

42.50

We'd done, and we'd come to a conclusion about the right way to proceed, using certain statutes in a certain way, at exactly the right time, in the right way. Now, if you don't know how to do it, then it will seem like Greek, gobbledygook, something that you would never get your head round, and you wouldn't want to. But if you can get your head around it, it's as simple as this: anybody in this country can bring a private criminal prosecution against any other party, if they have prima facie evidence that that other party has committed a criminal offence. A common law criminal offence. And this is done under a statute, and it's specifically for private criminal prosecutions.

43.36

And yet, despite that fact, despite the fact that only one simple Internet search would be all it would take for people to find that out, I had certain prominent voices saying that I was a fantasist and making it all up, that it wasn't true, that you couldn't do that. And this is despite the fact that in 2013, I *ran* a private criminal prosecution against Bank of Scotland and its LPA [?] receivers, in which the judge complimented me on the way I'd run the case, and refused to chuck it out, and in fact chucked out three applications of the bank. The first one to have me struck out against a vexatious litigant. The second one to have a wasted costs order stuck on my head for tens of thousands of pounds, that was struck out as well. And the third one, they wanted a press reporting restriction! And the judge said to them, *"You want a press reporting restriction on some little case that's going on in North Shields Magistrate's Court?"* And they said, *"Yes, we do"*. Little did the judge know that a couple of years later, we'd release a film about the whole fraud that was committed by Bank of Scotland, which was the reason why they wanted the restriction, but nevertheless, they didn't get it.

44.49

Now, I've already done all of this, as well as all of the civil cases that I've run, and yet people still will say that I'm full of shit and making it all up. So what I'm basically trying to stress, the reason I'm saying it so strenuously, is so that any of your listeners who heard the first two podcasts and were disappointed because of how long it was taking, and assumed that it wasn't happening, you believed what a lot of trolls, a lot of agents and a lot of egotists want you to believe, because, regardless of the reasons why, they don't like the fact that I'm the only one who has a record achieving, getting seemingly unobtainable results within a rigged system. And they don't like it; they're threatened by it.

45:40

Mark Devlin:

Now, what's the most extreme result we might get from all of this? Is it realistic to assume that those four individuals we are talking about will get jail time?

45:50

Michael O'Bernicia:

So the maximum sentence that they're going to get, if we get convictions for fraud by false representation under Section 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, and Fraud by Non-disclosure under Section 3 of the same Act. If we get those convictions, **the maximum sentence will be five years**. It used to be fourteen and then they cut it to five. However, the way the case is framed – and this has been confirmed by everyone within our team, who has been over it with a fine-toothed comb, and everybody confirms the same thing – and that is, that the way that it's been framed is that, **if you convict them of fraud, you have to conclude that the consequences were murderous. And therefore, what we will be asking for, upon that conviction, is that they're all immediately indicted for mass murder.**

46:48

Mark Devlin:

Party round at my place, that day. I'll DJ for 12 hours straight.

Michael O'Bernicia:

I think I might, if that happened.

46.55

Mark Devlin:

What the hell would the mainstream media do about this? Because if this ever happened, they couldn't ignore it. How would they handle this?

47.04

Michael O'Bernicia:

I'll tell you how they're going to handle it, and I'm predicting this. So I'm putting this prediction on the line. I could easily be wrong, and I'll hold my hands up if I am. However, I predict that the media is going to have no choice but to write and speak about this case on the basis that there is one type of issue that transcends all others, and that is an issue that isn't about race, it isn't about gender, it isn't about sexism, it isn't about any of the rest of the *-isms* that they've created, to divide and conquer.

47.50

It's about whether or not the people who are the grieving relatives of the supposed "Covid" deaths have had finality. Because, if someone is marked down as a Covid death, with multiple underlying serious conditions, each of which could have killed them, or did kill them, and their families are being told that they've died of Covid, that's fraud. That's fraud, plain and simple. So why are they committing the fraud? Why are they saying that they're Covid deaths, when they're not Covid deaths? All the families of the deceased, they're owed that finality from the State. This is an established point of law, as well.

48.37

So, in other words, what we're doing in addition to laying those allegations of fraud, is **we're asking the court, under its own inherent jurisdiction, to issue a declaration that, henceforth, all alleged Covid deaths have to have an autopsy and an inquest before a jury** in order to establish evidence that we need in this case, to prove whether or not our evidence, our data evidence and our safety study evidence, which suggests that 377 people out of every 100,000 are dying after these vaccines, to prove whether or not that correlation proves causation. We need autopsies on these supposed Covid dead, and the families of the deceased are owed finality on that subject.

49:45

So the mainstream media are going to have no choice – it's already happening right across the country, right across the world. Families are coming out, they're speaking out, saying we've been told it was a Covid death, but we know it was cancer, or we know it was a heart attack, or we know it was leukemia - it doesn't matter, they're coming out all over the place, in their droves. And they're also approaching us, and they're offering their testimony. And that's only going to grow, the more people who know about this case and who get behind it.

50.11

And Mark, have no doubts, whatever the naysayers have been saying. They may have made a lot more noise than the vast majority, but the vast majority, tens and tens of thousands – and

that number's growing every day – have been right behind this from the beginning and they've respected and understood the requests that I've made over the months on my blog, and on social media, for people to be patient and understand that these things aren't done overnight. **No one in the history of this country has ever taken on the government in a private criminal prosecution!**

50.46

We would love to be able to take on every single MP [member of parliament] because they've all been negligent to some degree, but the truth is the vast majority didn't read the Coronavirus Act, had no real idea about what the research was about SARS-Cov-2, Covid-19. And then the FOIA requests that we got, the responses confirm, when we asked them for proof that SARS-Cov-2 and Covid-19 existed, they said that **they had on record that no evidence of the existence of either, but they were relying upon an assumption that what they were told by the WHO was true.**

51.26

Well, the WHO told the world what *they* were told by Neil Ferguson. And Neil Ferguson is part of an organization, the WHO, and Chris Whitty is also part of, that Bill Gates is in charge of, via his financial contributions! And therefore you only have Hancock and Vallance – and Vallance is already a partner with Bill Gates through his former employment with GSK. And then you've got Matt Hancock, who took on Johnson and lost. He didn't get the leadership, but quite clearly he has ambitions to be prime minister, and in those two meetings he had with Bill Gates, we are alleging that he had both the motive and the opportunity to say to Bill Gates, *"You know what, Bill? I'll go along with your maximization of vaccination uptake plan. I'll go along with creating a safe market for vaccines in the UK, where we indemnify the manufacturers against all potential civil and criminal claims, even if the products kill people. I'll do all of that if you support me in a campaign to be leader, or prime minister."* Well, you can imagine what Bill Gates would have said, given that **he has financed every single aspect of the frauds that we are alleging, along with the Wellcome Trust.** And as I say, we can prove it – it sounds fantastical, but we can prove all of this, otherwise I wouldn't be telling you.

52:56

Mark Devlin:

Matt Hancock as PM! What a terrifying prospect! It's never going to happen, though. And you know, if and when you have success in this, I think it should be made mandatory for everyone in Britain to buy you a pint, so you'll have 65 million pints to drink. How does that sound?

53.16

Michael O'Bernicia:

(Laughter) Well, I don't think my wife would appreciate the beer belly that would come back, but I do appreciate the sentiment, mate, I really do. And you see, the fact is, honestly, I'd much rather, like you would be rather deejaying and enjoying your life. I'd much rather be making films and spending time with my wife and daughter. You know, and being creative. All of this, from the fight against the banks. The fight against the banks now seems like a warm-up, but at the time it seemed like a nightmare that would never end. But what I'm saying to people, what I want people to know in this situation is, honestly, if anyone can prove that I have been full of shit anywhere down the line, I'll give you a 100 grand's-worth [£100 thousand's-worth] of

cryptocurrency. I promise, I'll give you it. You don't have to accept it, I'll offer it to you, if you can prove I was wrong about any of the things that I've said. And the reason why I'll never pay it out is because nothing like that has ever happened.

54.24

I'm not doing this for any kind of gratification, glorification, egotistical or otherwise. I couldn't give a shit about that. I come from a background – and you know how nightmarish it can be, Mark, the music industry and the film industry, they're riven with total corruption and evil, which is why I walked away from it when I had a career that was envied by many people in my life. But I walked away from it because they would not let me say the things that I wanted to say about the state of the world with their money.

55.03

So I had to go and do it myself. And I never said any of this when I started speaking out about these subject, but I need to say it now, so people understand. Look, this literally is, because if I don't, who else is going to? And that doesn't mean that I haven't got an amazing team behind the scenes, because I have. And I'm talking about the kind of people who I trust with my life, and I don't say that lightly. It has to be that way. But nevertheless, all those people are saying to me, this, what you've created, this paperwork, it's monumental. It's historic. It's a hand grenade down the pants of each of the defendants.

55:45

Mark Devlin:

So, next things that people can expect to see?

Michael O'Bernicia:

That's a good question, again. So the way it works is this. We've sent the papers in to the Court Manager at the Court. The Court Manager will then pass the papers to the Court's legal department. How long the legal department takes to make an assessment of the papers depends on them, not me. But let's just say that, given the urgent nature of the situation, they got through the papers in a week. So this would mean, by the end of the week, they would send them to the legal department of the Chief Magistrate of the UK, which is just down the road from the actual court where we filed the papers, so it's not too much of a shank [walk]. And that legal department will then probably take up to a week to assess the papers for the Chief Magistrate. But it could be sooner, but let's just say conservatively two weeks is what that takes. Then the Chief Magistrate's legal department sends it back to the legal department at the originating Court, and they give it to the senior district judge on duty when it comes back to them.

57.03

Now, from that moment we have a situation where, you have to understand, behind the scenes in the courts, you've got district judges who fulfill a role for a certain amount of time each month, being duty judge, where they get the short end of the stick rather than the shit end of the stick, where they have to deal with what comes over the counter that needs immediate attention. Now, they will get this, and they would then decide whether or not they were going to make their minds up, whether to grant the applications presented to them on paper, or at a preliminary hearing. Now, if there is a preliminary hearing, the defendants will be asked to plead, at that hearing, guilty or innocent.

57:52

Now if the judge decides to deal with them on paper, he will be able to say, instead, that they are summonsed to court on a certain day, which would be as soon as possible, to plead whether or not they are innocent or guilty. And on that day, which could be within 24 hours to a week, two weeks after it goes to the judge. It could be – so we're talking anywhere between 2 weeks and 4 weeks, we could have a summons issued by the judge to each of the defendants. But in addition, because we're asking for that initial declaration, in order that autopsies be performed on the dead – and the second thing that I haven't mentioned yet, is the second part of the declaration that **we're asking for is that vaccinations – the flu vaccinations and the Covid vaccinations – are suspended for a minimum period of 90 days**. And the reason we are asking for this, is that we are alleging, based on the evidence that we've cited into the proceedings, we are saying that that would result – the suspension of vaccinations would result - in 377 out of every 100,000 people that would have been vaccinated, not dying. And we'll see it in the statistics in reverse, if we're correct. But autopsies would also reveal whether or not people were dying of something related to the vaccines, some co-morbidity that they already had, or of the famed government [?]. And I think we know that it won't be the latter.

59:49

Mark Devlin:

Indeed. And if that suspension of the vaccines happens, it would doubtless be used to justify a continuation of lockdown measures, because the vaccine is being framed as being the cause of the case figures going down. It's all a massive scam, of course. It's all fraud and it's all illusion, but you can bet that it will be seized upon to justify dragging the draconian measures out even more, right?

1:00:15

Michael O'Bernicia:

Well, not when we win the case, Mark, because we've got that covered as well. You see, this is why I'm not exaggerating. This [?] that have been said, every single angle has been covered. We've got the expert witness testimony of those professors and doctors, confirming that, after thorough investigations, they have found no evidence of the existence of SARS-Cov-2, Covid-19 or an effective and accurate test for either of them. That's expert witness testimony, and there are many more who are coming forward every day to offer the same. So they can't claim that. What we're saying is that, when we win this case, the whole thing is over. And it might be over before then, because all the information that we have to pump out over the weeks and months about the case. We're in a different position to how a criminal case would be normally.

1.01.15

Normally, if you put out the wrong information about the case, or even part of the information regarding the case, you can prejudice the evidence with the jury. In our case it's different, because all of the allegations that we are making have already been prejudiced by government propaganda and lies since the beginning. So we have a right to redress the balance in law by exposing some of the evidence that we have, as long as it doesn't jeopardize anything that we're doing, which it doesn't. So that's the reason why we're talking in such detail about this evidence.

1.01.52

What we're saying is that we can prove – and we're not saying that we can prove there's no such thing as a virus. **We're saying they can't prove that there is such a thing as a virus.** Which is very different. In other words, **the onus of proof for that allegation is not on us; it's on them.** They have to prove that it exists, after **every single government department, including the Cabinet Office, the Commons and the Lords, they all admitted that they've got nothing on record that proves that either exist.** That the whole thing is based on a presumption. But that, if you believe that was *just* the reason, you would exonerate them by saying that it was incompetence. It wasn't incompetence for these four. These four had material gains to be had – or that already had been received from the vaccine industry, every single step of the way. And it's simple: **if Bill Gates had done everything that the public record proves that he did – without what Hancock, Whitty, Vallance and Ferguson did, the whole scandemic would never have happened worldwide.** And as I say, we can prove it.

1:03:09

Mark Devlin:

Sounds like you've got all bases covered. And as anyone who watched my video of yesterday will know, I've been in need of some kind of uplift, some kind of reason for hope, some glimmer of light in the darkness. And I've really enjoyed this conversation today because it's offered me that glimmer of hope. There's not been a lot of that around over the past few weeks, not that you can verify and pinpoint as having any validity, anyway. So thanks for coming on today, brother, and updating us on the situation. I hope that, as things progress, we can do some more shows, and see where we're at with things. But thank you for all your efforts in this as well, and your diligence and all your hard work. I'm sure many people out there would like to echo those sentiments, because not many people have been standing up in all of this, and doing what needs to be done. But *you* have. And I want to thank you for that, and just thank you for coming on the show and updating us today.

01:04:09

Michael O'Bernicia:

That means a lot man, it really does. And I also want to thank you for the patience because I know it's been a long time waiting for the third instalment. And I know it's taken longer than we would have liked and everyone would have liked.

Mark Devlin:

I've never been renowned for my patience, you may have noticed.

Michael O'Bernicia:

(Laughing) Seriously, neither have I, and I'm a Geordie [an inhabitant of Newcastle-upon-Tyne or its environs] and I'm a Taurus, so imagine how hard that is.

Mark Devlin:

Oh, I'm a Taurus.

Michael O'Bernicia:

Are you? Oh, well it makes perfect sense.

Mark Devlin:

All right, well thanks for coming on today.

Michael O'Bernicia:

You're welcome, Mark. It's a pleasure.
