

SEPTEMBER 16, 2021

**HONOR HEALTH**  
**CEO TODD LAPORTE**  
**VP HR WAYNE FRANGESCH**  
8125 N. HAYDEN RD.  
SCOTTSDALE, AZ 85258

## **NOTICE TO CEASE AND DESIST**

### **ALL MANDATORY COVID-19 MITIGATION POLICIES, MANDATED TESTING/SCREENING AND MANDATED COVID VACCINATIONS FOR ALL EMPLOYEES**

CEO TODD LAPORTE and VP HR WAYNE FRANGESCH~

This letter serves as formal notice to immediately ***cease and desist*** all actions related to mandating Covid Vaccinations, Covid-19 Mitigation, Self-Screening and Reporting Policies and Procedures as conditions of employment with HONOR HEALTH. As detailed below, many of the requirements contained in your policies are in direct violation of State and Federal Law. You are on notice that if the dispute escalates or results in a constructive or retaliatory firing, a lawsuit may be brought against you.

This letter is designed to inform you of the law regarding, among other things, the constitutional privacy rights implications of mandating measures that treat employees differently according to their vaccination status.

#### **I. MASKS, TERMINATIONS, AND OTHER “MITIGATION” REQUIREMENTS MUST NOT BE TIED TO COVID-19 VACCINATION STATUS**

The United States Constitution, as well as the State of Arizona’s Constitution, protect the fundamental rights of we the people. These rights are inherent, guaranteed by the mere fact that we were born human. According to the US and Arizona Constitution, all persons are born equally free, and have certain natural, inherent, and inalienable rights, among which are the rights of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of equal protection under the law, equal privileges, and immunities to all citizens, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of seeking and obtaining safety and happiness. U.S. Const. Bill of Rights; AZ. Const. art. II, § 13

The discharge or disciplining of an employee for refusing to either wear a mask, be required to endure a meaningless “covid-19” test in the form of PCR nasal swabs, or to take the COVID-19 Vaccine—all of which are approved for emergency use only and therefore ***may not be mandated***, is a violation of that employee’s due process right to life and liberty under the Fourteenth Amendment, his/her right to equal protection under that amendment, and an invasion of the zone of privacy and right to bodily integrity which have been held to emanate from various Bill of Rights amendments, including the first, fourth, fifth and ninth. The constitutionally protected zone of privacy and right to bodily integrity have been articulated in many Supreme Court cases, including *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643 (1961), *Griswold v. State of Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479, 85 S.Ct. 1678, 14 L.Ed.2d 510 (1965); and *Roe v. Wade*, 410 US 113 (1973).

Most relevant for the purpose of this letter, in *Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600, 97 S.Ct. 869, 876-77, 51 L.Ed.2d 64 (1977), the U.S. Supreme Court clarified that the constitutional right of privacy extends to two types of interests:

"One is the individual interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters, and another is the interest in independence in making certain kinds of important decisions." *Whalen*, 429 U.S. at 599-600 (footnotes omitted).

Further, the constitutional right to informational privacy has been recognized in the Ninth Circuit (and implicitly upheld by the Supreme Court). *See, Nelson v. Nat’l Aeronautics and Space Admin.*, 530 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 2008), *petition for rehearing en banc denied*, 568 F.3d 1028 (9th Cir. 2009), *rev’d on other grounds*, 562 U.S. 134, 131 S.Ct. 746, 178 L.Ed.2d 667 (2011).

Additionally, as a State Employer, HONOR HEALTH is subject to the unconstitutional conditions doctrine. Under this doctrine, where a constitutional right "functions to preserve spheres of autonomy . . . the [u]nconstitutional conditions doctrine protects that sphere by preventing governmental end-runs around the barriers to direct commands." *United States v. Scott*, 450 F.3d 863, 866 (9th Cir. 2005) *quoting*, Kathleen M. Sullivan, Unconstitutional Conditions,” 450 F.3d 867 102 Harv. L.Rev. 1413, 1492 (1989). “[T]he government ***may not condition public employment upon compliance with unconstitutional conditions.***” (emphasis added) *Shuman v. City of Philadelphia*, 470 F.Supp. 449, 457 (D. PA. 1979). “The unconstitutional conditions doctrine

vindicates the Constitution's enumerated rights by preventing the government from coercing people into giving them up." *Id.*

You are hereby notified that HONOR HEALTH Covid policies and information violate the privacy interests articulated above, and present unconstitutional conditions, including, but not limited to the following statements made by HONOR HEALTH to all employees:

- As listed in the revised 9/2/2021 "Questions about Covid-19 Vaccine Requirement" from HonorHealth.com: "Are the Covid-19 vaccines safe?" HONOR HEALTH'S statement: "Yes" is a false statement to deceive the employee. There are now significant, factual reports of deaths from all the current EUA vaccines, as well as hundreds of thousands of adverse reactions.
- As listed in the revised 9/2/2021 "Questions about Covid-19 Vaccine Requirement" from HonorHealth.com, the question "What should I do if a patient asks me if I am vaccinated?". HONOR HEALTH's statement to employee "you are welcome to share your vaccination status with your patient if you like" is allowing/promoting a direct violation of HIPAA laws for the employee. Also again, this violates the interest in "avoiding disclosure of personal matters," set forth in *Whalen v. Roe*, and the right to informational privacy articulated in *Nelson*.
- As listed in the revised 9/2/2021 "Questions about Covid-19 Vaccine Requirement" from HonorHealth.com, "What vaccine should I get?" HONOR HEALTH states that the FDA has granted full approval of the Pfizer vaccine, now being marketed as Comirnaty... and that this option will fulfill the vaccine requirement." The FDA has not approved the Pfizer vaccine and the FDA states that the two vaccines are "legally distinct". Comirnaty is not available in distribution in the United States. This deceptive statement is a complete falsehood, since the EUA has been reissued for the Pfizer vaccine
- As listed in the revised 9/2/2021 "Questions about Covid-19 Vaccine Requirement" from HonorHealth.com: "Why are we making vaccinations mandatory now?" this mandated vaccination policy that HONOR HEALTH now requires an employee to provide proof of vaccinated status as a condition of employment. An EUA "vaccine" or any vaccine, or medical procedure cannot be mandated against a person's will. Where there is risk, there must be a choice. While HONOR HEALTH may state these conditions as a "business necessity," the fact remains that mandating a vaccine violates the privacy right in *Nelson*. It also implicates the unconstitutional conditions doctrine set forth in *United States v. Scott*, 450 F.3d 863, 866, among others, because it is essentially an end-run around the employees' constitutional right to privacy.
- As stated in HONOR HEALTH's "EEOAA" Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action policy #8668870, last revised 6/3/2020;

POLICY: "Honor Health is dedicated to the principles of equal employment opportunity. We prohibit unlawful discrimination against applicants or employees on the basis of age, race, sex (including pregnancy), sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, color, religion, national origin, disability, military status (including veterans), genetic information (GINA) or another status protected by applicable Federal, state, or local law. These actions include, but are not limited to, hiring, promotion, discharge, pay, fringe benefits, job training, classification, referral or other conditions of employment."

#2. RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION: "Honor Health will make reasonable accommodation for qualified individuals with employees whose sincere religious beliefs interfere with work requirements provided that the accommodation will not impose an undue hardship or cause a violation of law..."

REFERENCES: "Title V11 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Civil Rights Act of 1991(stated in law):  
(b) COMPENSATORY AND PUNITIVE DAMAGES. -

"(1) DETERMINATION OF PUNITIVE DAMAGES. - A complaining party may recover punitive damages under this section against a respondent (other than a government, government agency or political subdivision) if the complaining party demonstrates that the respondent engaged in a discriminatory practice or discriminatory practices with malice or with reckless indifference to the Federally protected rights of an aggrieved individual

- HONOR HEALTH is directly and substantively violating its own EEOAA policy, as well as the constitutional rights and laws set forth to protect employees in the workplace.
- It is illegal for the president of the United States under the U.S. Constitution to mandate a "law", executive order, or any other type of directive on the people of the United States. It is outside the scope

of his authority under our firmly seated Constitution.

- All of the above measures also violate the right to equal protection as granted by the Fourteenth Amendment, by treating employees differently according to their medical status.

A: COVID19 Vaccines may not be mandated as conditions of employment

The requirements set forth in the Covid Mitigation Policies may result in a hostile work environment for unvaccinated employees. In any event, they are coercive, and may act as “de facto” vaccination mandates, which are unlawful.

Any compulsory Covid-19 vaccination requirement is a violation of Federal and state law. I urge HONOR HEALTH to advise all employees that they have the right to either refuse or to take any COVID-19 vaccine ***and that refusal will not result in any requirement to follow unnecessary and discriminatory “mitigation” measures, including and up to termination.*** Any other action is contrary to law as demonstrated below.

1. Covid-19 Vaccines are experimental

COVID-19 vaccines are not approved by the Federal Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”). The COVID-19 vaccines are only approved under an Emergency Use Authorization (“EUA”), for investigational use only. COVID-19 vaccines lack requisite studies and are not approved medical treatments. The FDA’s guidance on EUA medical products requires the FDA to “ensure that recipients are informed to the extent practicable given the applicable circumstances ... That they have the option to accept or refuse the EUA product ...” 21 U.S. Code Section 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the “FD&C Act”) vests the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the permissive authority to grant EUAs providing those appropriate conditions designed to ensure that individuals to whom the product is administered are informed, and in pertinent part:

1. that the Secretary has authorized the emergency use of the product;
2. of the significant known and potential benefits and risks of such use, and of the extent to which such benefits and risks are unknown; and
3. of the option to accept or refuse administration of the 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 benefits and risks.

The right to avoid the imposition of human experimentation is fundamental, rooted in the Nuremberg Code of 1947, has been ratified by the 1964 Declaration of Helsinki, and further codified in the United States Code of Federal Regulations. In addition to the United States regarding itself as bound by these provisions, these principles were adopted by the FDA in its regulations requiring the informed consent of human subjects for medical research. It is unlawful to conduct medical research, even in the case of an emergency, unless steps are taken to secure informed consent of all participants.

Any attempt to force anyone to take a COVID-19 vaccine is a violation of Federal law and the conditions under which the COVID-19 vaccine has been authorized for use. The law is clear, experimental medical treatment cannot be mandated. Thus, 21 U.S. Code § 360bbb–3, Section (e)(1)(A) does not permit HONOR HEALTH to ***coerce*** an employee to accept an unapproved vaccine on penalty of discipline or discharge, or other sanctions, including discriminatory treatment as set forth in the Policies.

Moreover, as HONOR HEALTH must be aware, the vaccines have only been shown to reduce symptoms of the recipient and not prevent infection or transmission. This is extremely important, because the argument for mandated vaccines is that they are necessary to protect society at large. There is no argument to be made that a competent person can be compelled to have a medical intervention “for the greater good” when such intervention has been shown to, at ***most***, benefit the single recipient. However, even if society could be benefited in some way from mandated vaccination, the constitutional rights articulated in the Supreme Court cases cited above would prohibit it. These constitutional protections reaffirm basic human right to bodily autonomy, privacy, and the right to voluntary, informed consent.

Forced vaccination is not only unconstitutional and unethical, but it also violates the tenets fundamental to a free society. There is no pandemic exception to the law or the Constitution.

**B: Masks may not be mandated as conditions of employment**

The mandate for *any* individual to wear a mask against COVID-19 for employment violates federal law for the same reason that experimental vaccination mandates do: namely that all COVID-19 masks, whether surgical, N95 or other respirators, are authorized under EUA only. Again, EUA products are by definition experimental and thus require the right to refuse. *See, e.g. Doe #1 v. Rumsfeld*, 297 F.Supp.2d 119 (2003) (the U.S. military could not mandate EUA vaccines to soldiers).

**C: PCR tests cannot be mandated as conditions of employment**

The mandate for any individual to be forced to accept or adhere to a PCR test COVID-19 for employment violates Federal law for the same reason that experimental vaccination mandates do: namely that all PCR tests are authorized under EUA only. Again, EUA products are by definition experimental and thus require the right to refuse. *See, e.g. Doe #1 v. Rumsfeld*, 297 F.Supp.2d 119 (2003) (the U.S. military could not mandate EUA vaccines to soldiers). Subsequently, PCR tests have been proven to be ineffective and unreliable in providing true data on the existence of the Covid-19 “virus”.

**II: The Arizona Whistleblower Act**

As a State employer, HONOR HEALTH is also advised that the Arizona Employment Protection Act (AEPA), Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 23-1501(3)(c)(ii) et seq., protects employees who speak up about employer acts. It prohibits retaliatory action against an employee for “refusing to commit an act that would violate State law.” Ariz. Rev. Stat. § 23-1501(3)(c)(i). Since, as set forth above, the policies set forth in HONOR HEALTH Covid-19 policies, are unlawful, an employee’s unwillingness to follow them constitutes “refusing to participate in an unlawful act.” A successful litigant can obtain treble damages and attorney's fees in a Whistleblower action.

For all the above statements and facts, you are hereby on notice that if you illegally or irresponsibly mandate “mitigation” procedures and forced vaccinations as a condition of employment such as those set forth in the HONOR HEALTH Covid policies, which violate constitutional protections, signatory below may have no choice but to take legal action. Legal action can and may place an additional fine of \$2,000,000 to be paid by you personally to each employee whose rights are violated by your illegal and unconstitutional mandates. We urge you to comply with the U.S. Constitution, Federal and State law and cease and desist these illegal requirements.

Sincerely,

---

**Signature**

---

**Printed Name**

COPY TO: Arizona Attorney General Mark Brnovich  
2005 N Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85004