

**Dr. S. de W. Oosthuizen**

M.B.,Ch.B. AUDOH. (UFS)  
HPCSA: MP 0222240 PR. NR.: 1513710

Cell. 083 2659395  
E-mail: [sdoosthuizen@xsinet.co.za](mailto:sdoosthuizen@xsinet.co.za)

MEDICOAST SURGERY,  
337A Gopalall Hurbans (Main) Road,  
4400, Tongaat.  
9/5/2024

TO: Col Mhlongo and Adv. Truter,  
and  
National Director of Public Prosecutions,  
P/Bag x752  
Pretoria,  
0001  
[Repsadmin@npa.gov.za](mailto:Repsadmin@npa.gov.za)  
CC:  
[halton@bchc.co.za](mailto:halton@bchc.co.za)  
[nicholas.crisp@health.co.za](mailto:nicholas.crisp@health.co.za)

Dear Col Mhlongo and Adv. Truter and the NPA, Pretoria,

DISSATISFACTION WITH YOUR DECISIONS  
REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF YOUR DECISIONS RE. CASE TONGAAT CAS 215-04-2023 AND DURBAN CAS  
265/4/2023

I find your decisions to decline to prosecute the suspects to be irrational and illogical.

**OVERVIEW:**

Adv. Truter and the DPP's Gross Errors and Failures in Judgment and criminal Justice:

1. The DPP committed critical and fatal errors that impacted all their subsequent assessments of COVID-19 vaccine (C19 jab) toxicity and related crimes.
2. **They failed to acknowledge consistent, repeated, first-hand eyewitness accounts of "vaccine" toxicity from frontline doctors and from thousands of patients and stretching over several years. These witnesses and international expert reports corroborated and confirmed each other's evidence.**

Legal Precedent and Expert Opinion:

1. Established criminal law dictates that repeated, multiple collaborating eyewitness accounts should take precedence over the opinions of one or two experts who have not directly observed or investigated the patients or evidence.
2. Based on this principle, the C19 jabs should have been halted immediately by health authorities or by the police if the former failed.
3. If they failed to do so, an urgent application for an interdict to stop the injections should have been granted immediately.
4. And an urgent criminal forensic investigation should have been initiated.

Consequences:

1. This failure to accept factual firsthand eyewitnesses constitutes a grave and fatal error in Adv. Truter and the DPP's judgment, and evidentiary jurisprudence.

2. This resulting travesty of justice has led to millions of deaths and health damages.

#### COMMENTS ON ADV. TRUTER'S MEMO of 1 March 2024:

##### Comments on Adv. Truter's Paragraph 1:

1. My three affidavits and all the attachments showed multiple criminal acts and unlawful conduct with evidence. Such evidence as I have presented are now also presented world-wide in several similar criminal actions against the state and job firms. Denying to investigate is denying the obvious and a serious indictment against your decision not to prosecute.
2. The following actions of government, stated with evidence in the affidavits, are all prima facie unlawful and criminal to any logical and objective person.
  - a. Their wilfully mandating, coercing, continuing to promote and administering experimental "vaccines" as safe and effective despite Pfizer stating in the recently revealed contract with the state, which they wanted to keep secret for 75 years, that safety and efficacy was not known, despite all the info they had indicating toxicity and despite all the repeated reports of toxicity which were damaging and killing large numbers of people,
  - b. The then Minister of Health, Zweli Mkhize, said in the KZN PROVINCIAL GOVERNMENT: "The vaccines that were available for the trials, and the only way South Africa could access these vaccines, was to register an implementation trial, which in this case, doesn't actually deal with issues of safety and efficacy. It's just to see what happens after people have been vaccinated - something that all the countries are doing - this vaccination, but in our case we are also just doing a study to observe what happens....." This is absolutely criminal experimentation on humans in order to get access to the vaccines with no concern for safety or efficacy, against all the ethical research codes. This is an admission of criminal and unethical intent and conduct.
  - c. Injecting experimental and potentially toxic drugs under such conditions and causing harm and death, without fully informing the public and thus without proper informed consent, is a criminal offence.
  - d. Their perjurious denial of having received my AEFI reports and
  - e. Their fraudulent omission of my reports and underreporting of toxicity.
  - f. And more as stated in the affidavits.
3. The lawful and justifiable act would have been to STOP the jobs and investigate the reports and allegations of toxicity – as was done in the Listeriosis outbreak, toxic beer from the shebeen in the EC, Cholera from contaminated water, fungus from peanut butter, etc.
4. The information is there. It is the duty of the police to investigate and find the damning evidence.
5. An unlawful act causing repeated and large numbers of injuries and deaths can never be lawful under certain circumstances, yet you say it can? How is that possible and applicable in this case?
6. Adv. Truter wrote:
  - a. *been unlawful. An act may be justified or recognized in practice as justifiable when the general criteria of unlawfulness, namely objective reasonableness or boni mores (the legal conviction of the community), recognized it. The conduct of the*

- b. This statement is illogic and incomprehensible as a reason not to prosecute. It sounds like legal jargon to circumvent a fact or a responsibility.
  - c. How did you decide or determine what the “legal conviction of the community” was or is in order to justify or overlook the unlawful conduct I reported?
7. Adv Truter wrote: *The conduct of the suspects in the instant case must be considered in the context of the Covid pandemic.*
- a. This is vague and non-specific. What conduct and about what of the Covid pandemic?
  - b. Even if the pandemic was more serious than what it proved to be, it could never justify giving and continuing to give a “vaccine” which was known and reported to be toxic and which damaged and killed many people AND whilst alternative treatments were available.
8. Adv. Truter wrote: *There is, in this regard, insufficient evidence to conclude that the suspects acted unlawfully.*
- a. This is in my view a totally wrong statement in view of all the evidence I submitted – and in view of the worldwide tendency. Exactly which of the evidence of criminal actions was insufficient?
  - b. If you thought there was insufficient evidence you could have easily used a prosecution guided investigation process to logically continue this investigation to be conducting the affairs of the NPA without favour or fear.
  - c. The SA constitution required this of you.

**Paragraph 2:**

1. Adv. Truter’s statement that the AEFI reports and confirmatory affidavits of patients do not disclose any criminal offence illustrates your twist of words to circumvent to obvious and the implications.
2. These reports per se obviously cannot and was not meant to disclose criminality.
3. However, they clearly and undeniably indicate and prove that large numbers of patients got sick, injured and damaged by the vaccines. No one investigated the patients and proved they were not injured by the “vaccines.”
4. -AND the suspects knew and were repeatedly informed of the damage caused by the jabs but still deliberately and knowingly continued to promote, advertise, and administer it as safe
  - AND continued to coerce people to get the known poisonous shots,
  - and fraudulently denied that they received the reports of damage,
  - and fraudulently reported low numbers of adverse events,
  - etc.
5. THESE ARE ALL UNDENIABLY CRIMINAL.
6. How can you deny the obvious without proper investigation? It seems it is only an attempt to evade having to investigate the allegations.

**Paragraph 3**

1. This statement is patently wrong.

2. I have submitted undeniable proofs that the suspects committed perjury and fraud and it is undeniable that the suspects deliberately and wilfully supplied the injections which was known and evidenced and first hand reported to make recipients ill. There is an undeniably clear link between the actions of the suspects and the damaged suffered by my patients, yet you wrongly state there is no nexus or link between the alleged crimes and the suspects. Have you spoken to any of the patients? To how many? Your statement is wrong and every patient and objective observer will tell you that.
3. ALL the patients on the AEFI reports are first-hand witnesses that they became ill after the vaccines. No one can deny that or has disproved that. However, you wrongly state there is no link and deny to investigate. On what grounds did you make the decision that there is no nexus, except on wrongful subjective wishful denial?

#### **PARAGRAPH 4**

1. This statement is also patently wrong.
2. The whole nation was told the “vaccines” were safe and effective and many were coerced into taking the injections – whilst I submitted proof that the suspects KNEW AND HAD IN THEIR POSSESSION information that the vaccines were not tested for safety and efficacy and that vaccines caused large percentages of death and damage – yet the suspects continued the deception, promotion and administration of the toxic injections.
3. NO person in SA received proper informed consent about the lack of safety testing and of the risks and were thus clearly deceived into taking something they were wrongly told is safe and effective. I submitted expert reports confirming this.
4. Attorney Riekie Erasmus stated under oath and submitted to the courts that she and a witness visited two clinics and personally observed and reported that proper legal informed consent for the experimental injections with potential serious and unknown long term adverse effects were not given by any patient. No informed and objective person and not a single injured patient deny this fact. This is unlawful and criminal. The prosecuting agencies can investigate this and will find the same.
5. To state that patients were not deceived and were able to make informed decisions about the safety and risks of the injections are patently wrong and uninformed.

#### **Paragraph 5 – unnumbered.**

It is a travesty and an evasion of justice that you inform me after a whole year that the case of perjury should have been laid at the Gauteng North Division who heard the case. You should then have referred my charges and send the docket to that division when I first laid them with you in April 2023 or you should have advised me to lay it there. In the meantime, the government continued with impunity to promote and administer the poison shots which damaged and killed many more patients.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

**The SA population undeniably and deliberately received a poisonous and damaging substance whilst the state failed to monitor this, failed to acknowledge and act on first-hand reports of**

**toxicity, continued to give it despite warnings and whilst they continued to falsely and fraudulently tell the population it is “safe and effective.”**

These undeniably warrants criminal investigation and prosecution.

By denying to investigate and prosecute the crimes witnessed and reported, Adv. Truter and the DPP failed massively and fundamentally in their judgement and duty.

Adv. Truter’s reply gives the clear impression that he tried to be as vague as possible by denying and twisting the facts in order to avoid the responsibility to investigate this massive crime. In many countries, alluded to in the affidavits and in recent news reports, similar criminal charges are underway for the very same reasons. AstraZeneca has just recently withdrawn it’s “vaccines” due to toxicity and has massive claims against it. The DPP has avoided making a decision now, but it will not go away and it will haunt you for the rest of your lives – as the people were and are still haunted who failed to properly investigate and act in the Steve Biko death and similar crimes of the past. This is MUCH worse.

From your decision it is logical for me to conclude that you are fearful of the suspects that are listed in my document and you therefore favour them in this matter, this is the basis for my request for a review of this whole matter.

**REQUEST:**

- a. I hereby request the National Director of Public Prosecutions to review Adv. Truter and the DPP’s decision not to investigate and prosecute the criminal actions of the suspects.
- b. I request that the docket is sent to the NPA.
- c. I also request that you refer the docket with the fraud charges to the appropriate division in the Gauteng North Division.

Thank you and regards,

Dr. S de W Oosthuizen