

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

APR 25 PM 2:34

**Motion for Clarification:**

Health Freedom Defense, Daza, Pope v. CDC, et al.

Tampa Court, Judge Kathryn Mizelle

Case: 8:21-cv-1693-KKM-AEP

**Questions:**

.....1) Does this order affect all federal agencies/facilities, to include the Department of Veterans Affairs and its medical facilities?

.....2) Would enrolled and qualified veterans using services from the VA, also be considered "individuals with liberty interests" as those using the airport services were described as "individuals with liberty interests" in the order?

.....3) If VA enrolled veterans are considered the same, ...would enrolled and qualified veterans of the VA system who are being denied healthcare or benefits services, because they cannot wear a mask/face covering, have standing to file for relief for such disruptions to their liberty interests?

On pages 12-15 of the order: "sanitation" in context, was described as 'active cleaning'.

.....4) Would this also imply that the wearer of such 'masks' are a type of provider of 'sanitation' service to others inside the facilities and to the property?

Factoring that individual's in this context are their own private property, who are/were forced to work for "the government" and/or be used for 'public use', under threat of legal penalties.

.....5) With no consent nor compensation to wear a face covering, would that 'mask mandate' violate the 13th amendment and/or the 5th amendment?

date:

4-21-22



Mark Joseph

608-843-0820