

The MHRA Withdraws its Meeting Minutes

Censoring the censored?



TOM JEFFERSON AND CARL HENEGHAN

JAN 18, 2025



147



24



9

S

Many thanks to our reader, John Davison, who [alerted](#) us to [this](#):



[Home](#) > [Health and social care](#) > [Medicines, medical devices](#)

Collection

Meeting minutes of the Vaccine Benefit Risk Expert Working Group from the Covid-19 Pandemic

Meeting minutes taken from meetings of the Commission on Human Medicines' Vaccine Benefit Risk Expert Working Group (VBREWG) between 25 August 2020 and 5 May 2023.

This collection was withdrawn on 18 January 2025

The data on this page has been temporarily withdrawn from publication. We are committed to maintaining the highest standards of accuracy and transparency, and this information will be republished shortly.

Surprised? Aghast? Elated?

The best part is the rest of the page. Somebody forgot to take out the original post page, but the UKHSA is still committed to transparency:

From: [Medicines and Healthcare products Regulatory Agency](#) and [Commission on Human Medicines](#)

Published 9 December 2024

Last updated 19 December 2024 — [See all updates](#)



Get emails about this page

As part of our ongoing mission to improve transparency, we are publishing minutes taken from meetings of the Commission on Human Medicines' Vaccine Benefit Risk Expert Working Group (VBREWG) between 25 August 2020 and 5 May 2023.

The VBREWG meetings focused on evaluating the safety, efficacy, and overall benefits versus risks of vaccines, providing expert advice and recommendations on licensing and regulatory action.

Under Section 40 and 43 of the Freedom of Information Act respectively, personal data of individuals and commercially sensitive information has been redacted from these minutes.

Published 9 December 2024

Last updated 19 December 2024 [+ show all updates](#)

We can only guess as to why the minutes of the meetings of the MHRA's [Commission on Human Medicines \(CHM\) COVID-19 Vaccines Benefit Risk Expert Working Group](#) were withdrawn today. Shame may be high on the list.

It does not matter to us: We have downloaded all the PDFs and extracted all the critical text.

Whoever chose to override the FIOA has made a bad decision. Staff must be aware that under [section 77](#) of FOIA, it is a criminal offence to deliberately conceal, tam with or destroy information after it has already been requested.

Section 77 of FOIA States:



“(1) Where—

(a) a request for information has been made to a public authority, and

(b) under section 1 of this Act or section 7 of the Data Protection Act 1998, the applicant would have been entitled (subject to payment of any fee) to communication of any information in accordance with that section,

any person to whom this subsection applies is guilty of an offence if he alters, defaces, blocks, erases, destroys or conceals any record held by the public authority, with the intention of preventing the disclosure by that authority of all, or any part, of the information to the communication of which the applicant would have been entitled.

“(2) Subsection (1) applies to the public authority and to any person who is employed by, is an officer of, or is subject to the direction of, the public authority.”

This post was written by two old geezers who would like to thank their readers for support they received.

Trust the Evidence is a reader-supported publication. To receive new posts and support our work, consider becoming a free or paid subscriber.

Subscribe



147 Likes · 9 Restacks

Discussion about this post

Comments

Restacks



Write a comment...



Tom Jefferson ✓ 1d

Author

Dear Brian, to my knowledge Dr Bridle was the first to alert the public that that the LNPs went at the rats' systems and organs and they were designed to evade immunity. All this is explained in the Comirnaty series (see posts 9 to 9e). Exactly what went on when is what the Inquiry should be looking at instead of kowtowing to modellers.

Best wishes, Tom

♥ LIKE (5) 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE



dick stroud 2d

This has panic written all over it. I would add your warning to all future posts. 'Staff must be aware under section 77 of FOIA, it is a criminal offence to deliberately conceal, tamper with or destroy information after it has already been requested.'

♥ LIKE (25) 💬 REPLY ↗ SHARE

22 more comments...

