
please forward the FOI response that you say I refuse to publish?

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 31, 2023 at 7:25 PM

To: c.g.w.smythe@sheffield.ac.uk

[REDACTED]

Carl,

A friend sent me your tweets. I do recall your name and U of Sheffield, but cannot find related files or emails. I've had computer issues at times, so it's possible I've lost some files.

I have nothing to hide. So please forward the response that you claim I'm hiding.

While you're at it, please also send or cite the valid scientific studies that - in your mind - first established the existence of "the virus"?

You have misrepresented myself and the FOIs on twitter. The worldwide collection is right there on my website for anyone to see, and I have explained the request over and over again in interviews and on social media.

You tweeted:

As viruses ONLY grow in cells, and the verification methods requested require large quantities of virus, of course she received that answer. But she never reveals this, claiming mendaciously, that institutions do not "have the virus".

My requests had nothing to do with an alleged "virus" **growing**, so this comment is irrelevant and misleading.

Do you claim that "viruses" are destroyed upon leaving a cell? If so, please explain how a "virus" could travel from one cell to another, or fly through the air, or rest on a countertop and then infect another host.

If "the virus" existed as claimed, there should be many, many copies of "it" in an "infected host". The notion that a purported "virus" wouldn't get enough of a chance to grow in a sick person - a walking cell culture - and thus would need a chance to replicate further in a (typically non-host monkey kidney) cell line is ridiculous.

And even after creating their monkey/cow/human/bacteria/fungi cell culture concoctions, virologists still don't follow through with valid methods to demonstrate the existence of a replicating, transmissible disease agent. Virology is pseudoscience by definition.

I suggest you read my article **Response to gaslighting about the "virus" isolation/purification FOI requests** so as to be better-informed of what you communicate:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/response-to-gaslighting-about-my-foi-requests/>

Freedom of Information Responses reveal that health/science institutions around the world (212 and counting!) have no record of SARS-COV-2 (the alleged covid virus) isolation/purification, anywhere, ever:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-around-the-world-have-no-record-of-sars-cov-2-isolation-purification/>

4/27/23, 6:24 PM

Gmail - please forward the FOI response that you say I refuse to publish?

FOIs reveal that health/science institutions have no record of any “virus” having been found in a host and isolated/purified. Because virology isn’t a science:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-have-no-record-of-any-virus-having-been-isolated-purified-virology-isnt-a-science/>

Do virologists perform valid control experiments? Is virology a science? <https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/do-virologists-perform-valid-control-experiments-is-virology-a-science/>

Cheers,
Christine

follow up: the FOI response that you say I refuse to publish?

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sun, Apr 2, 2023 at 3:44 PM

To: c.g.w.smythe@sheffield.ac.uk

[REDACTED]

Hi Carl,

I see you're also claiming the following on twitter

*2/2 Ms Massey tried to get my institution via a FOI request to declare that it did not have any proven SARS-Cov2 virus samples. **Unfortunately for her, we do.** Poor Christine.*

#daftasabrush

<https://twitter.com/carlsmythe/status/1641557750915256320>

My FOIs are not merely asking institutions if they themselves have samples. I've asked for any record they have of anyone on Earth obtaining pure samples from sick people. No one has been able to provide or cite any such study.

If you or someone else at University of Sheffield actually has such a record, the world needs to know.

Therefore, I ask/challenge you to send me, or publish, a record describing how these alleged proven SARS-COV-2 samples were obtained and shown to be "the virus".

Be sure to include details of all substances used in both your experimental and control arms, including all amounts/concentrations.

If control experiments weren't performed to prove disease causation and transmission, then be sure to also include the studies that you and your colleagues have relied upon for such.

Best wishes,
Christine



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 31, 2023 at 7:43 PM

To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Cc: c.g.w.smythe@sheffield.ac.uk, William Huston <williamahuston@gmail.com>

March 31, 2023

Freedom of Information
University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield,
12 Bolsover Street,
Sheffield,
S3 7AN

sent via email to: foi@sheffield.ac.uk

This is a formal requirement for records, as per your duty under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA).

Description of Records1. All Freedom of Information-related emails (including attachments) between cmssyc@gmail.com and:

- foi@sheffield.ac.uk
- any other Freedom of Information email addresses at the University

and

2. any/all letters mailed out from the University of Sheffield in response to a FOI request from cmssyc@gmail.com

in the custody/possession/control of the University of Sheffield.

Note re Publicly Available Records:

If any records match the above description of requested records and are currently available to the public elsewhere, please assist me by providing enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty; provide URLs where possible.

Format:

Pdf documents sent to me via email; do not ship anything to me;

Contact Information:email: cmssyc@gmail.com

Thank you in advance and best wishes,

4/27/23, 12:41 PM

Gmail - Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

christine: woman of the Massey family



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Wed, Apr 5, 2023 at 6:38 AM

To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

Thank you for your request for Freedom of Information request, made to the University of Sheffield.

You requested:

1. All Freedom of Information-related emails (including attachments) between cmssyc@gmail.com and:

- foi@sheffield.ac.uk
- **any other Freedom of Information email addresses at the University**

and**2. any/all letters mailed out from the University of Sheffield in response to a FOI request from cmssyc@gmail.com****in the custody/possession/control of the University of Sheffield.**

Under section 40(5B)(a)(i) of the Freedom of Information Act, we can neither confirm nor deny whether the University of Sheffield holds "*Freedom of Information-related emails* [...] between cmssyc@gmail.com and foi@sheffield.ac.uk".

This is because disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act is 'to the world', rather than limited to one individual requester, and it would not be fair to confirm 'to the world' whether we hold correspondence from a named individual in most instances. If we were to do so, this would in itself involve disclosure of personal information, and would contravene the data protection principle that processing is fair and lawful.

If you wish to receive copies of emails sent to or from you, we would instead process this request under the UK General Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act 2018, as this concerns your personal data, rather than the Freedom of Information Act. A request for your personal data is called a 'subject access request' or SAR. You can find further information on our website here: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/govern/data-protection/subject-access-requests>. In order to do this, we would require a copy of your ID sent to dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk. I hope this is clear, but please let me know if you have any questions.

If you are not satisfied with the University's response to your FOI request, please see details of our internal review process [here](#), including details of how to contact the Information Commissioner's Office for an independent review.

Best wishes

Elspeth

--

Elspeth Summerfield

Assistant Data Protection Officer

4/27/23, 12:42 PM

Gmail - Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield
First Floor
Arts Tower
[12 Bolsover Street](#)
Sheffield
S3 7NA

Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Wed, Apr 5, 2023 at 8:51 AM

To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi Elspeth,

Thanks for your response. The cmssyc@gmail.com email address is mine (as you can tell from the fact that I'm using it right now), but to simplify things, I will alter the request to:

Description of Records

1. All Freedom of Information-related emails (including attachments) **on the topic of purification of the alleged "SARS-COV-2" from clinical samples** and
2. any/all letters mailed out from the University of Sheffield **in response to FOI requests on that topic,**
in the custody/possession/control of the University of Sheffield.

Timeframe:

June 2020 - June 2022

Note re Publicly Available Records:

If any records match the above description of requested records and are currently available to the public elsewhere, please assist me by providing enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty; provide URLs where possible.

Format:

Pdf documents sent to me via email; do not ship anything to me;

Thanks, best wishes,
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Thu, Apr 27, 2023 at 12:26 PM

To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

Thank you for your revised request for information from the University of Sheffield.

Please see attached the emails sent in response to Freedom of Information requests on the topic of the 'purification of the alleged "SARS-COV-2" from clinical samples'. Please note that a small amount of information has been redacted from these emails with regard to section 40(2) of the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Section 40(2) provides an exemption from disclosure for personal data, where this would contravene data protection principles. The information redacted includes names and email addresses.

Thank you for your interest in the University of Sheffield. If you are not satisfied with the University's response to your FOI request, please see details of our internal review process [here](#), including details of how to contact the Information Commissioner's Office for an independent review.


Best wishes
Elspeth


--

Elspeth Summerfield
Assistant Data Protection OfficerUniversity Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield
First Floor
Arts Tower
[12 Bolsover Street](#)
Sheffield
S3 7NAWeb: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]

4 attachments **University of Sheffield Mail - FOI request re _SARS-COV-2_ purification, Professor Carl Smythe _ University of Sheffield_Redacted (3).pdf**
278K **University of Sheffield Mail - FOI request re _SARS-COV-2_ purification, Professor Carl Smythe _ University of Sheffield_Redacted (2).pdf**
231K

 **University of Sheffield Mail - FOI request re _SARS-COV-2_ purification, Professor Carl Smythe _ University of Sheffield_Redacted.pdf**
150K

 **University of Sheffield Mail - FOI request re _SARS-COV-2_ purification, Professor Carl Smythe _ University of Sheffield_Redacted (4).pdf**
185K



FOI request re "SARS-COV-2" purification, Professor Carl Smythe / University of Sheffield

[REDACTED]
To: foi@sheffield.ac.uk

24 March 2021 at 18:32

March 24, 2021

To:

Freedom of Information
University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield,
[12 Bolsover Street](#),
Sheffield,
S3 7AN

Email: foi@sheffield.ac.uk

Dear Freedom of Information Officer,

This is a formal request for access to general records, made under the *Freedom of Information Act, 2000*.

Description of Requested Records:

All studies or reports **in the possession, custody or control of University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), or any health or science department / administrator at the University of Sheffield** describing the purification of "SARS-COV-2" aka "COVID-19 virus" (including any "variants") (via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge; also referred to at times by some people as "isolation"), directly from a sample taken from a diseased human, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of **genetic** material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum).

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to **purify** the suspected "virus" and instead:

- cultured an unpurified sample or other unpurified substance, and/or
- performed an amplification test (i.e. a PCR test) on all the RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture, or on genetic material from any unpurified substance, and/or
- sequenced the total RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture or from any unpurified substance, and/or
- produced electron microscopy images of unpurified things.

Clarifications re the above Request

For clarity, please note I am already aware that according to virus theory a "virus" requires host cells in order to replicate, and I am **not** requesting records describing the **replication** of a "virus" without host cells.

Further, I am **not** requesting records that describe a suspected "virus" floating in a vacuum; I am simply requesting records that describe its **purification (separation)** from everything else in the patient sample, as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other small things).

Please also note that my request is **not limited** to records that were authored by someone at the University of Sheffield or that pertain to work done at/by the University of Sheffield. Rather, my request includes any record **matching the above description**, for example (but not limited to) a published peer-reviewed study (authored by anyone, anywhere) that has been downloaded or printed by a scientist or administrator at the University of Sheffield and relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus".

An appropriate time-frame for the records search would be from the date of the first "COVID-19 cases" in China until the day on which the records search is commenced.

Please note that to my knowledge no such records exist, and I am unable to access records that to my knowledge do not exist. Therefore, if any records matching the above description of requested records are in the possession, custody or control of Professor Smythe or any **health or science** department or administrator at the University of Sheffield and are currently available to the public, please provide enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty (i.e. title, author(s), date, journal, where the public may access it). Please provide URLs where possible.

Format:

Pdf documents sent to me via email; I do not wish for anything to be shipped to me.

Contact Information:

[Redacted contact information]

Thank you in advance and best wishes,

[Redacted signature]



FOI request re "SARS-COV-2" purification, Professor Carl Smythe / University of Sheffield

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

20 April 2021 at 09:18

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

We have considered your FOI request and estimate that we will not be able to respond to your request without exceeding the appropriate limit set out in section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act.

We have 5,114 researchers, 609 technicians and 2,011 administrators. If each spent 10-20 minutes examining their downloads and printouts for records matching the description you outlined, since "the date of the first 'COVID-19 cases' in China", this would entail 1,289-2,578 hours of work.

Section 12 allows public authorities to refuse requests which exceed the appropriate limit. For the University, this is the equivalent of one person spending 18 hours establishing whether the information is held, as well as locating, retrieving, and extracting it.

In accordance with Section 16 of the Freedom of Information Act, we are happy to look at ways in which you can refine your request in order to have access to some of the information you have requested. If you would like to look at refining your request please contact the Data Protection team on foi@sheffield.ac.uk

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

On Wed, 24 Mar 2021 at 18:32, [REDACTED] > wrote:

March 24, 2021

To:

Freedom of Information
University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield,
12 Bolsover Street,
Sheffield,
S3 7AN

Email: foi@sheffield.ac.uk

Dear Freedom of Information Officer,

This is a formal request for access to general records, made under the *Freedom of Information Act, 2000*.

Description of Requested Records:

All studies or reports **in the possession, custody or control of University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), or any health or science department / administrator at the University of Sheffield** describing the purification of "SARS-COV-2" aka "COVID-19 virus" (including any "variants") (via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge; also referred to at times by some people as "isolation"), directly from a sample taken from a diseased human, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of **genetic** material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum).

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to **purify** the suspected "virus" and instead:

- cultured an unpurified sample or other unpurified substance, and/or
- performed an amplification test (i.e. a PCR test) on all the RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture, or on genetic material from any unpurified substance, and/or



FOI request re "SARS-COV-2" purification, Professor Carl Smythe / University of Sheffield

20 April 2021 at 14:05

To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Dear [REDACTED] and Data Protection team,

Thank you.

Please refine my request such that it is limited to: studies/reports relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus" by:

- University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), and/or
- University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies, and/or
- University of Sheffield President, and/or
- University of Sheffield Faculties, and/or
- University of Sheffield Vice-Chancellor, and/or
- University of Sheffield Senate, and/or
- University of Sheffield Officers, and/or
- University of Sheffield Executive Board, and/or
- University of Sheffield Council, and/or
- University of Sheffield Secretary

but otherwise the same as originally stated.

Thank you, best wishes,

On Tue, Apr 20, 2021 at 4:18 AM Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk> wrote:

Dear [REDACTED]

We have considered your FOI request and estimate that we will not be able to respond to your request without exceeding the appropriate limit set out in section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act.

We have 5,114 researchers, 609 technicians and 2,011 administrators. If each spent 10-20 minutes examining their downloads and printouts for records matching the description you outlined, since "the date of the first 'COVID-19 cases' in China", this would entail 1,289-2,578 hours of work.

Section 12 allows public authorities to refuse requests which exceed the appropriate limit. For the University, this is the equivalent of one person spending 18 hours establishing whether the information is held, as well as locating, retrieving, and extracting it.

In accordance with Section 16 of the Freedom of Information Act, we are happy to look at ways in which you can refine your request in order to have access to some of the information you have requested. If you would like to look at refining your request please contact the Data Protection team on foi@sheffield.ac.uk

Best wishes

On Wed, 24 Mar 2021 at 18:32, [REDACTED] wrote:

March 24, 2021

To:

Freedom of Information
University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield,
[12 Bolsover Street](https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/bolsover-street),



FOI request re "SARS-COV-2" purification, Professor Carl Smythe / University of Sheffield

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

17 May 2021 at 12:22

To: [REDACTED]

Dear [REDACTED]

I am writing in response to your updated Freedom of Information request, received on 20 April.

We have considered your request carefully, and feel that the scope of the request remains too great for the University to comply with within the 18 hour limit. We must therefore engage Section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000.

*Section 12 - Exemption where cost of compliance exceeds appropriate limit
(1) Section 1(1) does not oblige a public authority to comply with a request for information if the authority estimates that the cost of complying with the request would exceed the appropriate limit.*

We estimate that your request would involve approximately 130 individuals. As a conservative estimate, if each were to spend 3 minutes searching for and retrieving records that meet the scope of your request, this would take approximately 21 hours.

Under Section 16 of the Freedom of Information Act, we can consider ways you can refine your request so that we can search for the requested information.

Best wishes

[REDACTED]

On Tue, 20 Apr 2021 at 14:05, [REDACTED] > wrote:

Dear [REDACTED] and Data Protection team,

Thank you.

Please refine my request such that it is limited to: studies/reports relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus" by:

- University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), and/or
- University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies, and/or
- University of Sheffield President, and/or
- University of Sheffield Faculties, and/or
- University of Sheffield Vice-Chancellor, and/or
- University of Sheffield Senate, and/or
- University of Sheffield Officers, and/or
- University of Sheffield Executive Board, and/or
- University of Sheffield Council, and/or
- University of Sheffield Secretary

but otherwise the same as originally stated.

Thank you, best wishes,

[REDACTED]

On Tue, Apr 20, 2021 at 4:18 AM Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk> wrote:

[REDACTED]

We have considered your FOI request and estimate that we will not be able to respond to your request without exceeding the appropriate limit set out in section 12 of the Freedom of Information Act.

We have 5,114 researchers, 609 technicians and 2,011 administrators. If each spent 10-20 minutes examining their downloads and printouts for records matching the description you outlined, since "the date of the first 'COVID-19 cases' in China", this would entail 1,289-2,578 hours of work.



Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Thu, Apr 27, 2023 at 1:04 PM

To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi again Elspeth,

I was just reviewing the April 20, 2021 and May 17, 2021 responses that I was given to my original request. The April 20 letter states:

*Section 12 allows public authorities to refuse requests which exceed the appropriate limit. For the University, this is the equivalent of one person spending **18 hours** establishing whether the information is held, as well as locating, retrieving, and extracting it.*

The May 17 letter states:

*We estimate that your request would involve approximately **130 individuals**. As a conservative estimate, if each were to spend **3 minutes** searching for and retrieving records that meet the scope of your request, this would take approximately **21 hours**.*

I don't follow this logic. 130 x 3 minutes is 390 minutes. 390/60 = 6.5 hours, not 21. Was an error made in that response?

Thanks in advance.

Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Tue, May 2, 2023 at 11:55 AM

To: "Christine, of the Massey family" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

Thank you for your reply.

I've looked again at the calculation and I apologise that this is incorrect and that I did not pick this up at the time.

Using an estimate of just 3 minutes for each individual to check their records for 'studies/reports relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus"' would be unrealistic. In our response to your initial request, we outlined that it could take approximately 10-20 minutes for researchers, technicians and administrators to examine their downloads and printouts for records matching the description and within the timescale your outlined. If we used the same estimate for the refined request, for the time for the 130 or so individuals to examine their records, we would be looking at between approximately 21 and 43 hours of work.

Best wishes

Elspeth

--

Elspeth Summerfield

Assistant Data Protection Officer

University Secretary's Office

The University of Sheffield

First Floor

Arts Tower

[12 Bolsover Street](#)

Sheffield

S3 7NA

Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Christine, of the Massey family <cmssyc@gmail.com>
To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Tue, May 2, 2023 at 12:15 PM

Hi Elspeth,

Ok thanks.

Could you please conduct a refined version of the search limited to:

University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), and
University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies,

but otherwise the same as originally stated?

Best wishes,
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>
To: "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Tue, May 16, 2023 at 5:34 AM

Dear Christine

My apologies that we did not respond to you before now.

I can confirm that we have received your refined scope, and will be in touch further with a full response by the close of 1st June 2023.

All the best

Bethan

--

Bethan Cook (she/her)
Data Protection Assistant

University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield
First Floor
Arts Tower
[12 Bolsover Street](#)
Sheffield
S3 7NA

Email: bethan.cook@sheffield.ac.uk
Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Thu, Jun 1, 2023 at 12:10 PM

To: "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

Thank you for your request for information from the University of Sheffield relating to SARS-COV-2 purification, received 2 May 2023.

For clarity, I have outlined your request in full below:

"All studies or reports in the possession, custody or control of University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), or University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies, describing the purification of "SARS-COV-2" aka "COVID-19 virus" (including any "variants") (via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge; also referred to at times by some people as "isolation"), directly from a sample taken from a diseased human, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of genetic material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum).

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to purify the suspected "virus" and instead:

- cultured an unpurified sample or other unpurified substance, and/or*
- performed an amplification test (i.e. a PCR test) on all the RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture, or on genetic material from any unpurified substance, and/or*
- sequenced the total RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture or from any unpurified substance, and/or*
- produced electron microscopy images of unpurified things.*

Clarifications re the above Request

For clarity, please note I am already aware that according to virus theory a "virus" requires host cells in order to replicate, and I am not requesting records describing the replication of a "virus" without host cells.

Further, I am not requesting records that describe a suspected "virus" floating in a vacuum; I am simply requesting records that describe its purification (separation from everything else in the patient sample, as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other small things).

Please also note that my request is not limited to records that were authored by someone at the University of Sheffield or that pertain to work done at/by the University of Sheffield. Rather, my request includes any record matching the above description, for example (but not limited to) a published peer-reviewed study (authored by anyone, anywhere) that has been downloaded or printed by a scientist or administrator at the University of Sheffield and relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus".

An appropriate time-frame for the records search would be from the date of the first "COVID-19 cases" in China until the day on which the records search is commenced.

Please note that to my knowledge no such records exist, and I am unable to access records that to my knowledge do not exist. Therefore, if any records matching the above description of requested records are in the possession, custody or control of Professor Smythe or University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies" and are currently available to the public, please provide enough information about each record so that I may identify and

access each one with certainty (i.e. title, author(s), date, journal, where the public may access it). Please provide URLs where possible.”

For clarity, purification refers to the process(es) in which biological substances are progressively enriched, compared with the original source material. We can confirm that the University holds “*studies or reports*” within the scope you have requested outlined above. However, having considered your request carefully, we judge that the information is exempt from disclosure under section 22 and 22A of the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 22 and 22A

Section 22 exempts information which is intended for future publication, where it is reasonable in all of the circumstances that information should be withheld from disclosure until its planned publication.

Section 22A exempts information obtained in the course of, or derived from, a programme of research, subject to certain conditions. These conditions include where the programme is continuing with a view to publication, and where disclosure ahead of publication would prejudice the programme and the interests of the authority holding the information.

In relation to your request, the “*studies or reports*” you have requested form part of an ongoing research programme between the University of Sheffield and Paraytec Ltd, led by Professor Smythe of the University of Sheffield’s School of Biosciences, which will lead to future publication.

We judge that disclosure of studies or reports at this point, ahead of planned publication, would be likely to result in information and findings entering the public domain without the rigorous scientific commentary and context that would be part of the final publication, which could allow for misinterpretation and manipulation of the research, with the potential for this to be used in support of pseudo-scientific claims.

We also judge that disclosure of the information would be likely to allow other researchers to carry out analysis and draw conclusions from the data ahead of the publication of the findings of the research. Individuals could then publish their own findings ahead of the planned publication, without having collected the data themselves. This would be likely to offer other researchers an advantage over the current study, and jeopardise the University’s relationship with its commercial partners.

Additionally, we judge that disclosure of the data at the current time would be likely to prejudice the peer review process. It is important that there is sufficient time for the peer review process to be completed to allow findings to be examined, and the high standards of research and scientific application to be upheld.

Public Interest Test

In line with the terms of the exemptions, we have considered whether it is in the public interest for the information to be disclosed or withheld.

We recognise a public interest in the openness and transparency of research carried out by the University and in ensuring that value for money is achieved from public investment, and that commercial partnerships can be scrutinised.

However, there is also a public interest in allowing researchers to carry out their research and reach conclusions before their reports and studies are scrutinised externally. The proper completion of this process allows for higher quality research, and guards against a misleading or incomplete view of the ongoing research programme being published without sufficient context, which in this instance could impact the understanding of the virus, SARS-COV-2.

On balance, while the University acknowledges the public interest in transparency of research, we feel the greater public interest lies in allowing the research programme to continue with its planned publication.

If you are not satisfied with the University’s response to your FOI request, please see details of our internal review process [here](#), including details of how to contact the Information Commissioner’s Office for an independent review.

Best wishes
Elspeth

6/1/23, 4:35 PM

Gmail - Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

--

Elsbeth Summerfield
Assistant Data Protection Officer

University Secretary's Office
The University of Sheffield
First Floor
Arts Tower
[12 Bolsover Street](#)
Sheffield
S3 7NA

Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Thu, Jun 1, 2023 at 4:34 PM

To: Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi Elspeth,

Thank you; unfortunately there is an error in the response:

"purification refers to the process(es) in which biological substances are progressively enriched, compared with the original source material"

That is not what purification means; also I stated in the request that:

*"I am simply requesting records that describe its purification (**separation from everything else in the patient sample, as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other small things**)"*

This is also made clear by my references to filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge, and where I specifically ruled out culturing (which is what is typically, irrationally passed off as "isolation" in virology);

I suspect that Carl Symthe or someone else at the university has intentionally lead you astray; regardless the response above does not address the request;

Since it will be necessary to re-do the search, please replace this part of the request:

(via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge; also referred to at times by some people as "isolation")

with:

(i.e. via use of ultracentrifugation, chromatography, etc)

Note that 215 institutions in 40 countries have already been asked about this and no one has a responsive record, as documented on my website:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/fois-reveal-that-health-science-institutions-around-the-world-have-no-record-of-sars-cov-2-isolation-purification/>

Best wishes,
Christine

6/1/23, 4:35 PM

Gmail - Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Records required: all communications between myself and FOI staff

Freedom Of Information <foi@sheffield.ac.uk>

Fri, Jun 2, 2023 at 9:04 AM

To: "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Dear Christine

Thank you for your reply to the response to your Freedom of Information request.

Where individuals are not satisfied with the response they have received, they can request that the public authority undertakes an internal review of the FOI. As you have raised concern that the response you received does not address your request, an internal review will be undertaken and the outcome communicated to you following this.

Best wishes

Elsbeth

--

Elsbeth Summerfield

Assistant Data Protection Officer

University Secretary's Office

The University of Sheffield

First Floor

Arts Tower

[12 Bolsover Street](#)

Sheffield

S3 7NA

Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>
To: cmssyc@gmail.com

Tue, Jun 13, 2023 at 3:18 AM

Dear Christine

Thank you for your request for an internal review into the initial decision provided to you by the University on the 1st June 2023. After undertaking the review I have decided to uphold the initial response you received and would like to state that, currently, this information is exempt by virtue of sections 22 and 22a Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA 2000)

I know you disagree with the interpretation of certain terms however given your understanding and interpretation it would be impossible to answer your question. We are, under section 16 FOIA 2000, providing you with advice and specialist guidance in an effort to ensure we provide you with a response, rather than providing you with 'no information held' which would be misleading for anybody who views that response.

After speaking to colleagues within the University we have tried to assist in breaching the gap of knowledge, interpretation and understanding and want to provide you with the information you are seeking. We will do this when we release the information requested, which for the time being is exempt. It is our intention to release the information you have requested into the public domain at which time your request will be answered in full.

For completeness , I have outlined your request in full and the original response you received, which as stated I am upholding.

"All studies or reports in the possession, custody or control of University of Sheffield Professor Carl Smythe (Cell Biology), or University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies, describing the purification of "SARS-COV-2" aka "COVID-19 virus" (including any "variants") (via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge; also referred to at times by some people as "isolation"), directly from a sample taken from a diseased human, where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of genetic material (i.e. monkey kidney cells aka Vero cells; fetal bovine serum).

Please note that I am not requesting studies/reports where researchers failed to purify the suspected "virus" and instead:

- cultured an unpurified sample or other unpurified substance, and/or*
- performed an amplification test (i.e. a PCR test) on all the RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture, or on genetic material from any unpurified substance, and/or*
- sequenced the total RNA from a patient sample or from a cell culture or from any unpurified substance, and/or*
- produced electron microscopy images of unpurified things.*

Clarifications re the above Request

For clarity, please note I am already aware that according to virus theory a "virus" requires host cells in order to replicate, and I am not requesting records describing the replication of a "virus" without host cells.

Further, I am not requesting records that describe a suspected "virus" floating in a vacuum; I am simply requesting records that describe its purification (separation from everything else in the patient sample, as per standard laboratory practices for the purification of other small things).

Please also note that my request is not limited to records that were authored by someone at the University of Sheffield or that pertain to work done at/by the University of Sheffield. Rather, my request includes any record matching the above description, for example (but not limited to) a published peer-reviewed study (authored by anyone, anywhere) that has been downloaded or printed by a scientist or administrator at the University of Sheffield and relied on as evidence of a disease-causing "virus".

An appropriate time-frame for the records search would be from the date of the first "COVID-19 cases" in China until the day on which the records search is commenced.

Please note that to my knowledge no such records exist, and I am unable to access records that to my knowledge do not exist. Therefore, if any records matching the above description of requested records are in the possession, custody or control of Professor Smythe or University of Sheffield policy-makers responsible for the University's "COVID-19" policies" and are currently available to the public, please provide enough information about each record so that I may identify and access each one with certainty (i.e. title, author(s), date, journal, where the public may access it). Please provide URLs where possible."

For clarity, purification refers to the process(es) in which biological substances are progressively enriched, compared with the original source material. We can confirm that the University holds "*studies or reports*" within the scope you have requested outlined above. However, having considered your request carefully, we judge that the information is exempt from disclosure under section 22 and 22A of the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 22 and 22A

Section 22 exempts information which is intended for future publication, where it is reasonable in all of the circumstances that information should be withheld from disclosure until its planned publication.

Section 22A exempts information obtained in the course of, or derived from, a programme of research, subject to certain conditions. These conditions include where the programme is continuing with a view to publication, and where disclosure ahead of publication would prejudice the programme and the interests of the authority holding the information.

In relation to your request, the "*studies or reports*" you have requested form part of an ongoing research programme between the University of Sheffield and Paraytec Ltd, led by Professor Smythe of the University of Sheffield's School of Biosciences, which will lead to future publication.

We judge that disclosure of studies or reports at this point, ahead of planned publication, would be likely to result in information and findings entering the public domain without the rigorous scientific commentary and context that would be part of the final publication, which could allow for misinterpretation and manipulation of the research, with the potential for this to be used in support of pseudo-scientific claims.

We also judge that disclosure of the information would be likely to allow other researchers to carry out analysis and draw conclusions from the data ahead of the publication of the findings of the research. Individuals could then publish their own findings ahead of the planned publication, without having collected the data themselves. This would be likely to offer other researchers an advantage over the current study, and jeopardise the University's relationship with its commercial partners.

Additionally, we judge that disclosure of the data at the current time would be likely to prejudice the peer review process. It is important that there is sufficient time for the peer review process to be completed to allow findings to be examined, and the high standards of research and scientific application to be upheld.

Public Interest Test

In line with the terms of the exemptions, we have considered whether it is in the public interest for the information to be disclosed or withheld.

We recognise a public interest in the openness and transparency of research carried out by the University and in ensuring that value for money is achieved from public investment, and that commercial partnerships can be scrutinised.

However, there is also a public interest in allowing researchers to carry out their research and reach conclusions before their reports and studies are scrutinised externally. The proper completion of this process allows for higher quality research, and guards against a misleading or incomplete view of the ongoing research programme being published without sufficient context, which in this instance could impact the understanding of the virus, SARS-COV-2.

On balance, while the University acknowledges the public interest in transparency of research, we feel the greater public interest lies in allowing the research programme to continue with its planned publication.

If you are not satisfied with the University's response to your FOI request, please see details of our internal review process [here](#), including details of how to contact the Information Commissioner's Office for an independent review.

Kind regards

Luke

--

Luke Thompson

Head of Data Protection & Legal Services

The University of Sheffield

First Floor

Arts Tower

[12 Bolsover Street](#)

[Sheffield](#)

[S3 7NA](#)

Tel: +44 0114 22 21117

Mobile: 07596550031

Web: <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/uso>



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 4:51 PM

To: Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi Luke,

The more I review your response, the less clear I find it.

You wrote:

*"For clarity, purification refers to the **process(es)** in which biological substances are **progressively enriched, compared with the original source material**. We can confirm that the University holds "studies or reports" within the scope you have requested outlined above."*

So you "confirmed" that there are records within the scope of my request, but in the same breath you (like Elspeth) re-defined "purification" to be a mere *process*, and you did this contrary to my stated intent which included an **end result**, namely:

*"purification ... via maceration, filtration and use of an ultracentrifuge...where the patient sample was not first combined with any other source of genetic material...purification (**separation from everything else in the patient sample...**)"*

Can you please clarify whether the records you refer to resulted in alleged "virus" particles being **separated from everything else in the patient sample**, and that this was done **without any other source of genetic material being introduced**?

Thank you,
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>

Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 5:14 PM

To: Data Protection <dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk>, "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Hi Christine,

Thank you for your email. You have the response from the university. I believe your initial request and request for an internal review have been comprehensively addressed.

As stated in my previous email, we have tried to assist in the knowledge gap and understanding surrounding your request, to that end if you are still dissatisfied with the response the university has provided in relation to your FOI request please contact the ICO in relation to this matter. I now consider this matter closed.

Kind regards

Luke

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sat, Sep 16, 2023 at 5:48 PM

To: Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>

Cc: Data Protection <dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi Luke,

Thanks for responding so quickly.

If my request had been comprehensively addressed I would not be writing back to you with such a question.

I didn't ask for assistance with an alleged knowledge gap and understanding, or an internal review. The internal review was "the university's" decision, see pages 23-25:

<https://www.fluoridefreepeel.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/U-of-Sheffield-Carl-Smythe-PACKAGE-redacted-updated.pdf>

I requested records, and I made clear what sort of records. They were to describe alleged "virus" particles being separated from everything else in the patient sample, without any other source of genetic material being introduced.

Is there a provision in the legislation that authorized you to project your own intentions/agenda onto my request?

Have a nice day,
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>

Sun, Sep 17, 2023 at 9:21 AM

To: Data Protection <dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk>, "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Hi Christine,

As stated I believe the university has comprehensively addressed the question and provided you with a response. This response was provided in such a way as to assist you and bridge the knowledge gap. Our response to your question will not change.

If you are dissatisfied with the response you have been provided please contact the ICO.

Kind regards

Luke

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

Sun, Sep 17, 2023 at 12:35 PM

To: Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>

Cc: Data Protection <dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk>

Hi Luke,

"The university" (you and Elspeth actually) addressed a request that I hadn't actually made, and you wrote:

"given your understanding and interpretation it would be impossible to answer your question".

Your response was actually obfuscation, interference and avoidance, and I notice you haven't cited any provision in the legislation that authorized you to project your own intentions/agenda onto my request.

I require a response to the request that I actually filed.

Have a nice day,
Christine

[Quoted text hidden]



christine: massey <cmssyc@gmail.com>

FOI Internal review

Luke Thompson <luke.thompson@sheffield.ac.uk>
To: "christine: massey" <cmssyc@gmail.com>
Cc: Data Protection <dataprotection@sheffield.ac.uk>

Sun, Sep 17, 2023 at 1:43 PM

Hi Christine,

You have received a response from the University and I consider this matter concluded. If you remain dissatisfied with your response please contact the ICO 0303 123 1113 or www.ico.org.uk

Kind regards

Luke
[Quoted text hidden]