



What the Dentist Saw
and What the Judge Thought

Hatchard Report

Dr. Guy Hatchard

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

The Dentist:

My dentist friend received mRNA COVID-19 vaccines in 2021. He and his partner developed cardiac issues, both have since struggled to recover their full health. They have been alert and informed enough to examine published evidence and concluded the vaccine was likely at fault.

His subsequent experience at his dental practice paints a picture of vaccine harm that is sobering and truly frightening. He has 2200 patients; during the last two years, a great number of them have reported new serious health conditions as follows. These figures only include accounts that his patients raised with him in order to seek specific advice or help. It doesn't include the many who suffered in silence.

Clinically recognised cardiac issues – 69 (not counting the significant numbers who have told him they are struggling but not having sought help).

Stroke – 5.

Cancer – 20. (Pancreatic cancer stands out in incidence).

Blood clots – 3.

Sudden death – 11.

Autoimmune conditions – 23.

Postural Orthostatic Tachycardia Syndrome (POTS) – 3.

Sudden onset dementia- 2.

That is a total of 136 life threatening conditions among his patients, a rate of 6.2% over two years. In his experience pre-pandemic, there was nothing even remotely comparable by way of health queries and complaints.

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

This is the testimony of one dentist. There are 3336 dentists in New Zealand. There is an almost total media blackout of discussion of vaccine adverse effects in New Zealand. As they are being deliberately isolated by the media and the government, he reports many patients reject any association of their health problems with COVID-19 vaccination. They have no context to objectively understand what is going on. Unlike the dentist, who is simply overwhelmed by the extent of the harm his patients are reporting and deeply concerned at the lack of public debate. Many have written to me saying that they are expecting or rather hoping that matters will eventually be resolved by the courts.

Not So The Judge:

In complete contrast, in [an extraordinary ruling](#), Judge Robyn von Keisenberg has ordered three children aged 6, 8 and 10 receive the full suite of Ministry of Health-approved vaccines after their mother objected on health and religious grounds and their father petitioned the court to overrule her.

Judge von Keisenberg was appointed to the family court in 2020 during the pandemic. Her ruling appears to break new legal ground. She suggested that the mother accompany her children while they receive the eighteen different Ministry of Health vaccines as an indication of support. She said:

"My expectation is that the mother will support this decision and explain to the children that a judge has made the decision and that she will not undermine this decision in any way."

The judge said, *"I think it very sad"* that *"this is yet another issue that these parents have embroiled their children in."*

You will appreciate that the tenor of this ruling appears to amount to an attempt to control the right to speak freely to our children in family settings on a topic whose rights and wrongs are subject to ongoing learned scientific research and assessment. It puts limits on the right of parents to engage their children in discussions of matters affected by science, health and religious belief.

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

As an educator and grandfather, I understand that discussions on serious matters within a family, even if the parents are separated and hold different views, are a vital part of growing up. In contrast, the judge appeared to be of the opinion that parents should not be allowed to share their views on health with their children if they differed from the policies of the Ministry of Health.

In effect, where a parent has an opinion different from the Ministry of Health, the judge appeared to feel that the court not only has the right to act *in loco parentis* (in place of parents) on the side of the Ministry of Health, but also to suppress the right of any parent to continue to hold or express a contrary opinion. If this is her view, it appears to be in contrast to the provisions of the New Zealand Bill of Rights, which explicitly states:

“Everyone has the right to refuse to undergo any medical treatment.”

And

“Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion, and belief, including the right to adopt and to hold opinions without interference.”

The judge went further and said *“while the mother had provided multiple affidavits from alternative viewpoints, she [the judge] could not consider them expert evidence as there was no background about the writers.”*

The NZ Herald reported von Keisenberg took particular aim at the mother’s assertion that many of the diseases vaccinated against in New Zealand are treatable. If this is her true opinion, it must be considered at variation with fact, most diseases are in fact treatable. According to the Herald the mother did not assert all are.

The main point here is that the courts are following a practice that seems to have become established during the pandemic to refuse to consider expert witness testimony in any depth if it differs from the advice of the Ministry of Health. This seems to be a denial of natural justice and a perversion of science. Although this was not a criminal case, this refusal to consider countervailing arguments in any detail or encourage cross examination is also at variation with the New Zealand Bill of Rights, which states that in matters before a court there is

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

“a right to examine the witnesses for the prosecution and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses for the defence under the same conditions as the prosecution”

And

“Every person has the right to the observance of the principles of natural justice by any tribunal or other public authority which has the power to make a determination in respect of that person’s rights, obligations, or interests protected or recognised by law.”

You will appreciate that through this ruling, the judge might be seeking to interpret the enforcement of law to a degree that is not intended by or written into existing law. In summary, the pro-vaccination argument seems to have acquired a protected status in court cases that it does not enjoy in law.

The judge went much further and denied the request of the mother to administer homeopathic preparations for her children and for testing to ascertain if there were any adverse effects from the vaccines. As there is no medical evidence that either of these would be in any way harmful, this part of the ruling could appear to be punitive and might establish that a judge’s ruling on health could not be subject to testing. All the more concerning since the mother claimed that one of the children had had a reaction to a previously administered vaccination. In any case, the ruling appears to limit rights of medical choice.

This was a difficult and distressing case, where two parents disagree and the children are caught in between. One can appreciate from the ruling that the judge believed she was acting sternly in the best interests of the children, but in doing so she apparently overstepped the intent of the New Zealand Bill of Rights. After all, no vaccination in New Zealand is currently mandated, all are optional.

The ruling appeared to restrict the examination of new evidence as it comes to light, put court judgements on health outside of the accepted canons of scientific evaluation, extended the power of the state to stifle discussion and further wrested control of children from their parents. It appears to fly in the face of the intent and wording of the New Zealand Bill of Rights.

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

Particularly concerning is the reported assertion of Judge von Keisenberg that the mother should put on a face of approval and subservience to the court when dealing with her children. This is reminiscent of dictatorial regimes where people are required to make a public show of support for the government both in public and private for fear of reprisals. Faced with this, the mother said she would comply with the court orders.

I found one further point very striking. The mother cited her moral compass based on her religious convictions which were opposed to vaccination, but nothing in the available New Zealand press coverage records any discussion of this at the court hearing or any response from the judge. Why? There appears to be a concerted effort to exclude religious matters from everyday life.

I want to contrast the opinion of the judge and the dentist. One who from the newspaper account seems to be completely confident of her judgement to the exclusion of scientific doubt, religious sentiment, human rights and possibly family values, while the other injured by vaccination and a witness to great suffering of others, resolving to speak up, but faced with a lonely path and wall of official silence.

In contrast, the lead article in the UK Daily Telegraph today entitled "[Oxford AstraZeneca Covid jab was 'defective', claims landmark legal case](#)" concerns a victim of VITT – a new vaccine-induced condition identified by specialists which can lead to permanent brain damage – who has launched a legal case against AstraZeneca and the failure of the British government to adequately monitor of the safety of the vaccine's rollout and its efficacy.

I hope this provides some context and a dose of reality for those still believing, against all the accumulating evidence, that COVID-19 vaccines were safe and effective. The wheels of science turn slowly but inexorably, and their direction is now very clear. The government and the medical establishment failed to take account of the risks of biotechnology, which were, in fact, discussed and evidenced in mainstream science publishing even before the pandemic.

Quite apart from the individual circumstances we have discussed above, it is apparent that the policies and influence of our government during the last three years have established ways of working and taking decisions that contrast with previous practice. Those in responsible positions of authority in public service have in some cases taken extreme positions which rather than reflecting the wording of the law, reflect the discriminative social attitudes and prescriptive control of the outgoing government. In doing so they have left little or no room for scientific doubt or legal appeal.

What the Dentist Saw and What the Judge Thought

This is not in the spirit of our New Zealand history. We have been a nation that is proud of self-reliance and independence. It seems the authorities may now have developed a different conception of New Zealand, one in which compliance with and deference to government policy is the required norm irrespective of the law or human rights. Remarkably also one in which there is little room for faith and conscience, two values which are inextricably linked with the development of civilisation and natural justice.

It should be clear to the incoming government that any continuance of the past efforts to silence open debate are not in the national interest. They are threatening to undermine the vitality of the nation. The government will need to become proactive to correct those in public office misusing their authority to quash individual rights, family values and national independence. Whether they can rise to the occasion will be a mark of their depth of understanding of the pandemic missteps and their ability to change course.

Dr. Guy Hatchard

09 November 2023