

**CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE AND WARNING TO ALL WASHINGTON STATE
EMPLOYERS, NOTICE TO PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO ALL AGENT(S), AND
NOTICE TO AGENT IS NOTICE TO ALL PRINCIPAL(S)**

To all Employers, and all Business Owners, and/or to whom it may concern, this legal informational flyer is meant to provide you advance constructive and actual “legal notice” that I am under no legal obligation to wear a mask or be Vaccinated for the Covid-19 Virus or PCR-Tested in your place of business which is a place of “Public Accommodation” under both Federal Laws (28 CFR § 36.202) and Washington State Law as codified at RCW 49.60.030 and RCW 49.60.215. It is undisputed that there is no statute or law in existence that requires me to be vaccinated, tested or masked or that allows any Employer in the State of Washington to grant or deny the continued employment or new employment of any person based upon whether or NOT they have received a Covid-19 Vaccination or PCR Test. I have a “vested” Constitutional Right to my continued employment under the common law pursuant to RCW 4.04.010; RCW 9A.04.060; CrR 1.1; 1 Sutherland Statutory Construction (3d ed.), p 525, § 2043.

Washington State Governor Jay Inslee, and the Chief Medical Officer Dr. Kathy Lofy only have the power granted by statute. Hoppe v. King County, 95 Wn.2d 332, 337, 622 P.2d 845 (1980); 63 Am. Jur. 2d, Public Officers and Employees, section 263 (1972); Neither officer can make laws on their own motion without violating “The Separation of Powers Doctrine.” State v. Osloond, 60 Wash. App. 584, at 587, 805 P(2d) 263 (1991); Myers v. United States, 272 U.S. 52, 47 S.Ct. 21, 71 L.Ed. 160 (1926). Only the legislature can make laws. “A flat prohibition against regulation of a matter in one direction does not give Congress power to regulate the matter in another direction.” Powe vs United States, 109 F.2d 140 (1940). **Neither officer can re-delegate any authority or power to Employers to hire or fire any employee for refusal to be vaccinated or masked in their work place without violating “The Non-Delegation Doctrine.”** Noe v. Edmonds Sch. Dist. 15, 83 Wn.2d 97, 515 P.2d 977 (1973); Ledgering v. State, 63 Wn.2d 94, 385 P.2d 522 (1963). What the Legislature is forbidden to do directly, certainly [the Governor and Chief Medical Officer] cannot [illegally solicit or recruit Employers] to do indirectly.” The City of Seattle v. Filson, 98 Wn.2d 66 (Nov. 1982).

Any Employer who gives False Legal advice is subject to being charged with and prosecuted for “unauthorized practice of law” pursuant to RCW 2.48.180 et seq, or “practicing medicine without a license” in violation of RCW 18.130.190. This notice is also to inform you that “forced vaccinations or forced masking” violates my Constitutional Rights under both Constitutions, State and Federal, the laws of the State, the laws of the United States, and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, which are

enforceable via Title 42, Section 1983.

It is undisputed pursuant to CR 8(d), that the Social Security Act as codified in Federal law at Title 42, Chapter 7, Subchapter XIX, Section 1396 (f), cited hereafter as “42 U.S.C. § 1396f”, which provides a **“religious exemption”** from all unwanted vaccinations and provides that no one is required by law to undergo any medical screening, examination, diagnosis, or treatment or to accept any other health care or services provided under such plan for any purpose if such person objects (or, in case such person is a child, his parent or guardian objects) thereto on religious grounds.

Washington law at RCW 7.70.050; RCW 7.70.030; RCW 7.70.040, and W. PROSSER, LAW OF TORTS 165 (4th ed. 1971), indicates that the Chief Medical Officer of this State Dr. Kathy Lofy has a duty to disclose that 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, requires that all Doctors and Employers are to provide the appropriate conditions designed to ensure that individuals to whom the Covid-19 Vaccine or PCR Test is administered are informed . . . **“of the option to accept or refuse administration of the [medical] product, of the consequences, if any, of refusing administration of the product, and of the alternatives to the product that are available and of their benefit and risks”** as clearly stated in subsection (e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) of 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3, and as required by the **“Doctrine of Informed Consent”** whose main purpose is to protect the patient from being given “Unauthorized Treatments or PCR Tests” without the patients knowledgeable permission. If any physician performs any treatments or tests on any patient without fully informing the patient of his or her “option to accept or refuse administration” of any “Emergency Use Authorization” of any PCR Test and/or any Covid-19 Vaccination under 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3 (e)(1)(A)(ii)(III), he has committed an **assault and battery** against that patient for failure to obtain the patients knowledgeable permission. All vaccine-mandating employers could be sued. Holt v. Nelson, 11 Wn.App. 230 (1974); Miller v. Kennedy, 11 Wn.App. 272 (1974); Miller v. Kennedy, 85 Wn.2d 151 (1975); Gates v. Jenson, 92 Wn.2d 246 (1979); ZeBarth v. Swedish Hosp. Med. Center, 81 Wn.2d 12 (1972); Harris v. Groth, 99 Wn.2d 438 (1983); Smith v. Shannon, 100 Wn.2d 26 (1983); Watkins v. Parpala, 2 Wn.App. 484 (1970); Canterbury v. Spence, 464 F.2d 772 (D.C.Cir.), cert. denied, 409 U.S. 1064 (1972).