

Question 1: Not Confidential

As this remains a 'Chicken and Egg' conundrum by repeating:

"We are not responsible for Health and Safety"

"We are not responsible for ICNIRP Directives"

Then we refer you to our original objections as you are repeating the same 'story' and yet expecting a different outcome from us?

Therefore we now direct you to the Nuremberg Code whereby it is illegal to follow directives knowing them to be incorrect. This is punishable by law and you have been served both with the science that proves without a shadow of doubt, the Biological Harm to - All Life.

We serve you once more with:

"Liability of Harm"

<https://documentcloud.adobe.com/link/track?uri=urn:aaid:scds:US:c2cddcfa-9c8c-44c0-81c5-dd5d118dcfae>

Question 2: Not Confidential

AS ABOVE

Question 3: Not Confidential

AS ABOVE

References:

Members of the public and policymakers have been made fully aware that the ICNIRP is a group which, despite purporting to be independent, is known to have financial conflicts of interest and to show bias regarding EMF emissions and health. Please note the following:

The ICNIRP was ruled biased by the Court of Appeal of Turin in 2020:

<https://www.globalresearch.ca/court-appeal-turin-confirms-link-between-head-tumour-mobile-phone-use/5701050>

The ICNIRP conflicts of interest have been fully exposed by two MEPs in the following report:

[https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/ICNIRP-report-FINAL-JUNE-2020\\_EN.pdf](https://www.michele-rivasi.eu/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/ICNIRP-report-FINAL-JUNE-2020_EN.pdf)

The ICNIRP bias and conflicts of interest are discussed in this article in the International Journal of Oncology: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28656257/>

Public Health England is currently the object of two legal cases regarding EMR emissions:

<https://actionagainst5g.org>, <https://www.crowdjustice.com/case/5g-judicial-review-2020/>

Public Health England's own lawyers, DLA Piper, have stated in legal information that members of the public or other parties should use their own discretion, *based on available evidence*, when making decisions regarding RFR. Evidence available on request.

PHIRE Medical have produced this consensus statement, signed by 3500 medical doctors and bodies, stating that it is medical consensus that RFR from masts and devices causes harm to health.

<https://www.ofcom.org.uk/consultations-and-statements/category-1/limiting-exposure-to-emf>

It is therefore unacceptable for Ofcom to proceed with proliferation of masts emitting EMR which has been shown in the majority independent science to cause harm to health, including serious harm such as cancer, based on the ICNIRP guidelines which are considered biased and even fraudulent by some of the world's leading experts in the biochemical effects of RFR.