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DHS Request

**Reasonable Accommodation Request Summary**

Your request (RAR0023278) is currently **Open**  
Your request was most recently worked on by **DHS OAST - FEMA Reasonable Accommodation Admin**

Connect About Your Request

Have a question? Use the chat box below to ask questions about your request

RAR0023278: COVID-19 Vaccine Exemption (for RELIGIOUS reasons)

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max**12d ago

RAR0023278 Created

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max 12d ago**

Journal type:

[**RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION REQUEST.pdf**](https://dhs.servicenowservices.com/sys_attachment.do?sys_id=01a030a41bebb050c99464a8624bcb34)  
1.2 MB

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max 14m ago**

Journal type:

[**Pages from MEINDL REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION-EXEMPTION REQUEST-VACCINE MANDATE-10-25-2021-REV2.pdf**](https://dhs.servicenowservices.com/sys_attachment.do?sys_id=3b02469c1b337014b7ec2f85624bcb69)  
2.9 MB
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Journal type: Additional comments

RA form

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max 13m ago**

Journal type: Additional comments

RA form

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max 13m ago**

Journal type: Additional comments

RA form

* **MM**

**Meindl, Max 13m ago**

Journal type: Additional comments

RA form

Top of Form





Bottom of Form

Information About Your Request

Number

RAR0023278

State

Open

Created

12d ago

Updated

13m ago

Additional Request Details

 If you would like to edit your request, send a message describing your desired changes using the chat box to the left.

Hidden Name

Meindl, Max

Who is submitting this request?

Recipient of the request (Myself)

First Name

Max

Last Name

Meindl

Work Phone

202-374-9426

Email Address

max.meindl@fema.dhs.gov

Position Title

Emergency Management Specialist

Component

FEMA

What is the Employee Type of Person to be Accommodated?

Federal Employee

Pay Plan/Grade of Person to be Accommodated

GS 11/10

Series of Person to be Accommodated

0089

Choose the Employee Subtype

FEMA

What is your FEMA Employee Type?

CORE (Cadre on Call Employee)

Are you deployed?

Yes

Disaster Number

4611

Deployment Location

Baton Rouge (ROR)

What is your Official Duty Station?

Houston TX

Supervisor

Bergin, John

Supervisor's First Name

John

Supervisor's Last Name

Bergin

Supervisor's Email

john.bergin@fema.dhs.gov

Please select all reasonable accommodation items being requested

COVID-19 Vaccine Exemption (for RELIGIOUS reasons)

Please describe the nature of your objection to the COVID-19 vaccination requirement.

QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

Would complying with the COVID-19 vaccination requirement substantially burden your religious exercise or conflict with your sincerely held religious beliefs, practices, or observances? If so, please explain how.

QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

How long have you held the religious belief underlying your objection?

QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

Please describe whether, as an adult, you have received any vaccines against any other diseases(such as a flu vaccine or a tetanus vaccine) and, if so, what vaccine you most recently received and when, to the best of your recollection.

1969 while in the US Navy, defending your right to be free. QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

If you do not have a religious objection to the use of all vaccines, please explain why your objection is limited to particular vaccines.

QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

If there are any other medicines or products that you do not use because of the religious belief underlying your objection, please identify them.

QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

Please provide any additional information that you think may be helpful in reviewing your request.

See attachments QUESTIONING THE ORTHODOXY OF SINCERELY HELD RELIGIOUS BELIEFS OR REQUIRING A CLERGY, PLACE OF WORSHIP, OR A THIRD PARTY TO AGREE WITH OR AFFIRM SUCH RELIGIOUS BELIEFS IS UNLAWFUL Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employers from discriminating against its employees on the basis of their sincerely held religious beliefs. See 42 U.S.C. §2000e-2(a) (“It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer . . . to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual’s race, color, religion, sex, or national origin”); see also EEOC v. Abercrombie & Fitch Stores, Inc., 575 U.S. 768 (2015) (same). Title VII defines “religion” as “all aspects of religious observance and practice, as well as belief.” 42 U.S.C. §2000e(j). Moreover, as the EEOC has made clear, Title VII’s protections also extend nonreligious beliefs if related to morality, ultimate ideas about life, purpose, and death. See EEOC, Questions and Answers: Religious Discrimination in the Workplace (June 7, 2008), (“Title VII’s protections also extend to those who are discriminated against or need accommodation because they profess no religious beliefs . . . . Religious beliefs include theistic beliefs, i.e. those that include a belief in God as well as non-theistic ‘moral or ethical beliefs as to what is right and wrong which are sincerely held with the strength of traditional religious views.’ Although courts generally resolve doubts about particular beliefs in favor of finding that they are religious, beliefs are not protected merely because they are strongly held. Rather, religion typically concerns ‘ultimate ideas’ about ‘life, purpose, and death’”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in the Wilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). In fact, the law provides protection for sincerely held religious beliefs even when some members of the same religious organization, sect, or denomination disagree with the beliefs espoused by the individual. That some individuals may have sincerely held religious beliefs which differ from those sincerely held by the employees requesting accommodation is irrelevant to whether the employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs are entitled to protection under Title VII. Department of Health, in its handout literature for those considering one of the COVID-19 vaccines, notes the following: “The non-replicating viral vector vaccine produced by Johnson & Johnson did require the use of fetal cell cultures, specifically PER.C6, in order to produce and manufacture the vaccine.” N.D. Health, COVID-19 Vaccines & Fetal Cell Lines (Apr. 20, 2021), https://www.health.nd.gov/sites/www/files/documents/COVID%20Vaccine%20Page/COVID-19\_Vaccine\_Fetal\_Cell\_Handout.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The Louisiana Department of Health likewise confirms that the Johnson & Johnson COVID-19 vaccine used the PER.C6 fetal cell line, which “is a retinal cell line that was isolated from a terminated fetus in 1985.” La. Dep’t of Public Health, You Have Questions, We Have Answers: COVID-19 Vaccine FAQ (Dec. 21, 2020), https://ldh.la.gov/assets/oph/Center- PHCH/Center-PH/immunizations/You\_Have\_Qs\_COVID-19\_Vaccine\_FAQ.pdf (emphasis added) (last visited Aug. 27, 2021). The same is true of the Moderna and Pfizer-BioNTech mRNA vaccines. The Louisiana Department of Health’s publications again confirm that aborted fetal cells lines were used in the “proof of concept” phase of the development of their COVID-19 mRNA vaccines. See La. Dep’t of Public Health, supra. The North Dakota Department of Health likewise confirms: “Early in the development of mRNA vaccine technology, fetal cells were used for ‘proof of concept’ (to demonstrate how a cell could take up mRNA and produce the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein) or to characterize the SARS-CoV-2 spike protein.” N.D. Health, supra (emphasis added). Because all three of the currently available COVID-19 vaccines are developed and produced from, tested with, researched on, or otherwise connected with the aborted fetal cell lines HEK-293 and PER.C6, many employees’ sincerely held religious beliefs compel them to abstain from accepting or injecting any of these products into their bodies, regardless of the perceived benefits or rationales. Thus, while there may be some faith leaders and other adherents whose understanding of Scripture is different, and who may be willing to accept one of the three currently available COVID-19 vaccines despite their connection with aborted fetal cell lines, any employee is entitled to interpret the Scriptural command against murder differently, which many indisputably do. Many employees have sincerely held religious beliefs that God forms children in the womb and knows them prior to their birth, and that because of this, life is sacred from the moment of conception to natural death. See Psalm 139:13–14 (ESV) (“For you formed my inward parts; you knitted me together in my mother’s womb. I praise you, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.”); Psalm 139:16 (ESV) (“Your eyes saw my unformed substance; in your book were written, every one of them, the days that were formed for me, when as yet there was none of them.”); Isaiah 44:2 (“Thus says the Lord who made you, who formed you from the womb”); Isaiah 44:24 (“Thus says the Lord, your Redeemer, who formed you from the womb: ‘I am the Lord, who made all things’”); Isaiah 49:1 (“The Lord called me from the womb, from the body of my mother he named my name”); Isaiah 49:5 (“And now the Lord says, he who formed me from the womb to be his servant,”); Jeremiah 1:5 (“Before I formed you in the womb I knew you, and before you were born I consecrated you; I appointed you a prophet to the nations”). As the Supreme Court has recognized, employees’ “religious beliefs need not be acceptable, logical, consistent, or comprehensible to others in order to merit [legal] protection.” Thomas v. Review Bd. of Ind. Emp’t Sec. Div., 450 U.S. 707, 714 (1981); see also Church of the Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. City of Hialeah, 508 U.S. 520, 531 (1993) (same). Additionally, though membership in or adherence to the tenets of an organized religion is plainly sufficient to provide protection for an individual’s sincerely held religious beliefs, it is not a necessary precondition. See Frazee v. Ill. Dep’t of Emp’t Sec., 489 U.S. 829, 834 (1989) (“Undoubtedly, membership in an organized religious denomination, especially one with a specific tenet forbidding members to work on Sunday, would simplify the problem of identifying sincerely held religious beliefs, but we reject the notion that to claim the protection [for sincerely held religious beliefs], one must be responding to the commands of a particular religious organization.” (emphasis added)); see also Office of Foreign Assets Control v. Voices in theWilderness, 329 F. Supp. 2d 71, 81 (D.D.C. 2004) (noting that the law provides protection for “sincerely held religious beliefs,” “not just tenets of organized religion”). The Emergency Use Authorization Statute Prohibits Mandating the Currently Available COVID-19 Vaccines: The United States Code provides: [S]ubject to the provisions of this section, the Secretary (of the Department of Health and Human Services) may authorize the introduction into interstate commerce, during the effective period of a declaration under subsection (b), of a drug, device, or biological product intended for use in an actual or potential emergency (referred to in thiPsasgeec t2i6o nofa 6s3an “emergency use.” 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(a)(1) (emphasis added) [hereinafter EUA Statute]. As an essential part of the explicit statutory conditions for EUA, the EUA Statute mandates that all individuals to whom the EUA product may be administered be given the option to accept or refuse administration of the product. See 21 U.S.C. § 360bbb-3(e)(1)(A)(ii)(III) (requiring that “individual to whom the product is administered are informed . . . of the option to accept or refuse administration of the product” (emphasis added)). The only currently available COVID-19 vaccines (Janssen/Johnson & Johnson, Moderna, and Pfizer-BioNTech) are only authorized for use under the EUA Statute and have no general approval under federal law. Thus, the administration of such vaccines cannot be mandatory under the plain text of the EUA Statute. The statutorily required Fact Sheets for each of the EUA COVID-19 vaccines acknowledge that individuals cannot be compelled to accept or receive the vaccine. See Moderna, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 24, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144638/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Moderna COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Pfizer-BioNTech, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (June 25, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/144414/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Pfizer-BioNTech COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)); Janssen, Fact Sheet for Recipients and Caregivers (July 8, 2021), https://www.fda.gov/media/146305/download (“It is your choice to receive or not to receive the Janssen COVID-19 Vaccine. Should you decide not to receive it, it will not change your standard medical care.” (emphasis added)). I have a strong moral and sincere religious beliefs and objection to vaccines that were derived from aborted fetal cells. It is my sincerely held religious belief that, in being vaccinated with any of the currently available alleged COVID-19 vaccines, I would be cooperating with and complicit in abortion – the ending of an innocent human life –and that such would constitute a sin against God and a violation of His Commandments, for which I would be held morally accountable by God. For that reason, I am demanding a medical and a religious accommodation, under Title VII and any similar Texas and or Washington DC state (district) law(s), that will excuse me from having to receive a COVID-19 vaccine, and further request that no adverse employment action be taken against me on account of my religious beliefs. A. Pfizer and BioNTech – The Pfizer Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [3]. B. Moderna – The Moderna Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is cited by the vaccine researchers Kizzmekia S. Corbett, Darin K. Edwards, and Sarah R. Leist [4]. C. Johnson & Johnson – The J&J Vaccine has publicly admitted to using a cell line called PER.C6. This is published on the Janssen website [5]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. D. Sputnik V – The Sputnik V Vaccine cites their manufacturers as using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293 [6][7]. E. AstraZeneca – AstraZeneca was developed using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is also contained in documents permitting its emergency use in the United Kingdom [8]. F. Vaxart – Vaxart was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [9]. G. Altimmune – The Altimmune vaccine was produced and developed with the abortion-derived cell line PER.C6. This information is recorded by Altimmune’s own Clinical Trial Protocol [10]. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. H. COVAXX and United Biomedical – COVAXX was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [11]. I. Medicago – The Medicago Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [12]. J. Novavax – The Novavax Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [13]. K. University of Pittsburgh “PittCoVacc” – PittCoVacc was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by EBioMedicine at the Lancet [14]. L. Walter Reed Army Institute – The Walter Reed Vaccine was produced with the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [15]. M. Sanofi Pasteur and Translate Bio – The Sanofi Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the vaccine researchers at NPJ Vaccines [16]. N. Inovio Pharmeceuticals – The Inovio Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [17]. O. Arcturus Therapeutics – The Arcturus Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [18]. P. Imperial College London – The Imperial College Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [19]. Q. Providence Therapeutics – The Providence Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [20]. R. CoronaVac – CoronoVac was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at ScienceMag [21]. S. CanSino Biologics – The CanSino Vaccine was protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by researches at BioSpace [22]. T. ImmunityBio and NantKwest – The ImmunityBio Vaccine was developed, produced, and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory [23]. U. Institut Pasteur and Themis and Merck – The Institut Pasteur Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America [24]. V. Rega Institute, KU Leuven – The Rega Vaccine protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Global Virus Network [25]. W. Anhui Zhifei – The Anhui Zhifei Vaccine was developed and protein tested using the abortion-derived cell line HEK-293. This information is enumerated by the Lozier Institute [2]. This information is recorded by the Cell Press Journal [26]. I Max J Meindl do hereby stipulate: “I understand the above is your position. I am signing this document without waiver of y legal right to seek religious exemption and accommodation from any requirement that conflicts with my sincerely held religious beliefs, and without waiver of the right to seek legal redress from any wrongful denial of such exemption or accommodation.”

Please describe your job duties.

Program Delivery Manager Task Force Lead, remote/telework for over 20+ months, coordinating/mentoring remote/teleworking employees assigned. delivering services to assist applicants in their recovery.

I declare to the best of my knowledge and ability that the foregoing is true and correct.

true

Do you work in a SCIF?

No

I have read the Privacy Act Statement

true

Cancel Request

Attachments

Upload attachments

* [Pages from MEINDL REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION-EXEMPTION REQUEST-VACCINE MANDATE-10-25-2021-REV2.pdf (2.9 MB)](javascript:void(0))

14m ago

* [RELIGIOUS EXEMPTION REQUEST.pdf (1.2 MB)](javascript:void(0))

12d ago