**PUB’s Three Notice Process To Stop Employers Mandating Testing**

Following the success of my administrative processes to stop vaxxing in schools, care homes and against employers’ diktats, here lies PUB’s three notice process to deal with the clear and present threat that UK employers will be insisting that their employees must be tested, against the experimental COVID-19 and ‘variants’ in order to continue working.

**Notice of Conditional Acceptance**

Once you have filled in the relevant information, the Notice of Conditional Acceptance should be sent to the directors of the employer which has indicated that you must be tested in order to continue working there, conditionally agreeing to grant your consent in the event they can provide you with the material evidence you ask for.

Moreover, everybody should engage in this process acting as a Trustee of the People’s Union of Britain [PUB], in order to establish their legal protection, under the provisions of the Treaty of Universal Community Trust.

Each missive must also be sent by recorded mail or special delivery before 1pm next day and all mailing receipts must be retained, so that it can proven that every notice was duly served upon the intended recipients.

**Also any text in […..RED….] you need to replace appropriately**

NAME OF EMPLOYEE

EMPLOYEE’S ADDRESS / EMAIL ADDRESS

FAO: NAME OF EMPLOYER, DIRECTORS

ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER

**[Date of Sending]**

**NOTICE OF CONDITIONAL ACCEPTANCE**

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: EMPLOYER TESTING DEMANDS**

In relation to UK Government COVID-19 ‘Testing Policies, under the protection of the People’s Union of Britain, you are hereby served notice that I conditionally accept that you have the right to mandate COVID-19 ‘Testing’ by of, yet not limited to PCR or Lateral flow testing, for all staff, provided you deliver to me the following:

1) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing by, yet not limited to PCR and lateral flow are incapable of harming me.

2) Please provide evidence that the inventor of the PCR test, Kary B. Mullis, did not say that the test is not reliable to test for anything.

3) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing methodologies have undergone rigorous safety studies.

4) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that I will not suffer or develop any adverse reactions or die as a result of testing by, yet not limited to, PCR and lateral flow.

5) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing, approved for use by the MHRA provide total and reliable proof of outcome, indicating either SARS-COV-2 or COVID-19 is present.

6) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have sought legal advice on whether it is lawful to mandate testing of staff at their place of work and that you have performed an appropriate risk assessment.

7) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have informed your public indemnity insurers if there is any possibility that serious or even fatal adverse events might ensue if I obey the testing mandate, in which case you would be liable for gross negligence and perhaps even manslaughter.

8) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have employed the Precautionary Principle when deciding whether or not to test staff for Covid and/or all variants or where you require mandatory testing upon staff.

9) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that testing as a condition of entry to the workplace or any other action that discriminates is contravening the Equality Act 2010, in which case you would be liable for gross discrimination and perhaps even causing psychological and physical damage to employees.

Please deliver to me these reasonably requested items within seven days of your receipt of this notice, given the seriousness of the matters raised and the apparent imminence of the employer adhering to the UK Government policy of mandating the COVID testing all staff.

I look forward to hearing from you without delay in signed writing.

In sincerity and honour, without ill will, frivolity or vexation,

***[Wet signature]*  
  
  
  
[NAME OF Employee]**

Trustee of People’s Union of Britain

All Rights Reserved under the Treaty of Universal Community Trust

Errors & Omissions Excepted

**Notice of Opportunity To Cure**

Given that the evidence you will be asking for does not exist, in the extremely likely event you don’t receive what you asked for within seven days, the Notice of Opportunity To Cure should be sent, reiterating the terms of the first notice, giving the employer and directors another three days to respond appropriately.

However, the only acceptable responses would be either providing you with the material evidence requested, or an agreement to cease and desist in their ‘testing’ plans.

NAME OF EMPLOYEE

EMPLOYEE’S ADDRESS / EMAIL ADDRESS

FAO: NAME OF EMPLOYER DIRECTORS

ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER

***[DATE OF SENDING 7 days after receipt of first Notice]***

**NOTICE OF OPPORTUNITY TO CURE**

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: EMPLOYER MASK DEMANDS**

Following your failure to respond to my notice dated **[add date],** in relation to UK Government COVID-19 Testing Policy, under the protection of the People’s Union of Britain, you are hereby served notice that you have a further three days to deliver to me the following:

1) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing by, yet not limited to PCR and lateral flow are incapable of harming me.

2) Please provide evidence that the inventor of the PCR test, Kary B. Mullis, did not say that the test is not reliable to test for anything.

3) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing methodologies have undergone rigorous safety studies.

4) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that I will not suffer or develop any adverse reactions or die as a result of testing by, yet not limited to, PCR and lateral flow.

5) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing, approved for use by the MHRA provide total and reliable proof of outcome, indicating either SARS-COV-2 or COVID-19 is present.

6) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have sought legal advice on whether it is lawful to mandate testing of staff at their place of work and that you have performed an appropriate risk assessment.

7) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have informed your public indemnity insurers if there is any possibility that serious or even fatal adverse events might ensue if I obey the testing mandate, in which case you would be liable for gross negligence and perhaps even manslaughter.

8) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have employed the Precautionary Principle when deciding whether or not to test staff for Covid and/or all variants or where you require mandatory testing upon staff.

9) Material evidence, not hearsay or opinion, which proves beyond reasonable doubt that testing as a condition of entry to the workplace or any other action that discriminates is contravening the Equality Act 2010, in which case you would be liable for gross discrimination and perhaps even causing psychological and physical damage to employees.

Please deliver to me these reasonably requested items within three days of your receipt of this notice, otherwise I will hold you all personally liable for any adverse events which arise from the employers, directors and any adhering to the UK Government policy and/or your own, of rolling out the COVID ‘testing’ for employees.

I look forward to hearing from you without delay in signed writing.

In sincerity and honour, without ill will, frivolity or vexation,

***[Wet signature]*  
  
[NAME OF Employee]**

Trustee of People’s Union of Britain

All Rights Reserved under the Treaty of Universal Community Trust

Errors & Omissions Excepted

# Notice of Default

If the employer, directors propose that you should enter reasonable discussions before they take a position on the issues you have raised, this process should be suspended pending the outcome of further communications. The same would apply in the event this happens at an earlier stage.

However, if you don’t receive what you have reasonably requested and the employers, directors refuse to cease and desist in their plans to mandate testing in the workplace, the Notice of Default should be sent, notifying them of the potential civil and criminal liabilities they have incurred.

NAME OF EMPLOYEE

EMPLOYEE’S ADDRESS / EMAIL ADDRESS

FAO: NAME OF EMPLOYER DIRECTORS

ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER

***[DATE OF SENDING 3 days after receipt of second Notice]***

**NOTICE OF DEFAULT**

**NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO AGENT**

Dear Sir/Madam,

**RE: EMPLOYER MASK DEMANDS**

Following your failure to respond to my notices dated **[*input date*]** and **[*input date*],** in relation to UK Government COVID-19 Testing Policy; under the protection of the People’s Union of Britain, you are hereby served Notice of Default.

Please be advised that your silence on this very serious matter has given rise, by tacit procuration, to your agreement that:

1) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing by, yet not limited to PCR and lateral flow are incapable of harming me.

2) There is no material evidence that the inventor of the PCR test, Kary B. Mullis, did not say that the test is not reliable to test for anything.

3) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing methodologies have undergone rigorous safety studies.

4) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that I will not suffer or develop any adverse reactions or die as a result of testing by, yet not limited to, PCR and lateral flow.

5) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that the designated testing, approved for use by the MHRA provide total and reliable proof of outcome, indicating either SARS-COV-2 or COVID-19 is present.

6) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have sought legal advice on whether it is lawful to mandate testing of staff at their place of work and that you have performed an appropriate risk assessment.

7) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have informed your public indemnity insurers if there is any possibility that serious or even fatal adverse events might ensue if I obey the testing mandate, in which case you would be liable for gross negligence and perhaps even manslaughter.

8) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that you have employed the Precautionary Principle when deciding whether or not to test staff for Covid and/or all variants or where you require mandatory testing upon staff.

9) There is no material evidence which proves beyond reasonable doubt that testing as a condition of entry to the workplace or any other action that discriminates is contravening the Equality Act 2010, in which case you would be liable for gross discrimination and perhaps even causing psychological and physical damage to employees.

In sincerity and honour, without ill will, frivolity or vexation,

***[Wet signature]*  
  
  
[NAME OF Employee]**

Trustee of People’s Union of Britain  
All Rights Reserved under the Treaty of Universal Community Trust  
Errors and Omissions Excepted
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# Next Steps

Unless the employers/directors abandon their plans to mandate testing in the workplace, PUB will hold them criminally liable for acts ancillary to genocide against employees,, in multiple breaches of well-established international law and conventions.

Furthermore, using a Common Law Lien process developed over the course of the past thirteen years, the injured parties will be able to obtain damages secured against the personal legal estates of the owners/directors, for the injuries caused by the masks mandate.

Needless to say, the templates for that non-judicial process of obtaining damages payouts will be posted at thebernician.net in due course, along with a webinar which will cover any question and queries people are likely to have.

However, it is anticipated that many of the employers/directors who are served the preceding three notice process will either suspend or terminate any and all plans to mandate testing, rather than risk both bankruptcy and prison by ignoring or dismissing the serious issues raised.