

Florida Grand Jury Exposes Widespread Failures of Pfizer and Moderna COVID Vaccine Development



A Florida grand jury has released a scathing 144-page [report](#) detailing widespread failures in the development, approval, and distribution of Pfizer and Moderna's mRNA COVID-19 vaccines. Convened by Governor Ron DeSantis and authorized by the Florida Supreme Court, the grand jury's investigation exposed significant lapses in regulatory oversight, unethical clinical trial practices, and a troubling pattern of behavior by federal health agencies and pharmaceutical companies.

The report outlines how the initial success of developing COVID-19 vaccines was quickly overshadowed by mismanagement in subsequent years. Sponsors and federal regulators collaborated to push out booster after booster based on shallow and inaccurate safety and efficacy data. Regulatory safeguards were sidelined to expedite vaccine distribution to every American, regardless of individual risk factors for the SARS-

CoV-2 virus. Federal regulators, once trusted gatekeepers, transitioned into cheerleaders, failing to publicly confirm emerging safety signals and allowing long delays in mandatory post-marketing studies related to those very same concerns.

Moreover, pharmaceutical companies manipulated scientific journals and regulatory reporting requirements, failed to publicly disclose serious adverse events from clinical trials for years, and suppressed critical information. The grand jury revealed that Pfizer and Moderna selectively reported data, delayed adverse event disclosures, and withheld complete safety data from independent researchers and the public, all while aggressively promoting their vaccines.

Experienced and respected scientists saw their careers turned upside down for dissenting from “the science,” while experts with opinions that aligned with regulatory agencies filled the gaps with contrived research and ill-conceived study designs, propagandizing citizens into believing things about the SARS-CoV-2 virus and the COVID-19 vaccines that simply “were not true.”

The Twenty-Second Statewide Grand Jury was initially established to investigate potential criminal or wrongful activities related to the development, promotion, and distribution of COVID-19 vaccines and whether pharmaceutical companies engaged in fraudulent practices that misled the public. The grand jury was later given a broad mandate to scrutinize pharmaceutical manufacturers, their executive officers, and other medical associations involved in every stage of vaccine development and distribution.

Governor DeSantis, commenting on the report, said his team is still reviewing the findings and noted the report shows how “Big Pharma” manipulated scientific journals, concealed adverse events, and engaged in a “pattern of deceptive and obfuscatory behavior” while profiting billions from the vaccine rollout.

Manipulated Clinical Trials

A focal point of the grand jury's investigation was the premature unblinding of Pfizer and Moderna's flagship clinical trials. Originally designed as rigorous two-year, randomized, placebo-controlled studies, these trials were abruptly altered after the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) granted Emergency Use Authorization (EUA) for COVID-19 vaccines.

After receiving EUA from the FDA in December 2020, both Pfizer and Moderna offered their vaccine to participants in the placebo group. This decision effectively dismantled the control group necessary for long-term safety and efficacy assessments. Like Pfizer, Moderna justified this action by citing ethical concerns about withholding a potentially life-saving vaccine during a global pandemic.

However, this move drew significant criticism because it compromised the ability to gather robust long-term data on the vaccine's safety and efficacy. The unblinding made it impossible to compare vaccinated participants with placebo recipients over the originally planned two-year follow-up period, hindering the detection of delayed adverse effects and the durability of vaccine-induced immunity.

Although pharmaceutical companies Pfizer and Moderna argued that it was unethical to not offer the vaccine to participants in the control group after EUA was authorized, the grand jury noted that participants had agreed to the possibility of receiving a placebo as part of their informed consent. While they found it reasonable to expedite vaccine access for elderly and high-risk groups, prematurely extending the EUA to the general population was scientifically unsound.

The FDA's Vaccines and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee (VRBPAC) actively discussed the consequences of unblinding and debated alternatives to preserve trial integrity. One VRBPAC member compared the vaccine's modest

mortality risk reduction to a hypothetical cancer drug that barely increased survival rates, arguing that more data was needed before making broad public health decisions.

Ultimately, the FDA allowed Moderna and Pfizer to compromise their clinical trials and endorsed an “open-label” model that allowed this unblinding. The report called this “a disaster from a public health perspective,” which cast “a cloud of scientific doubt” that undermined public confidence for years to come.”

“We wish we could say that the unblinding and vaccinating of the placebo groups was the first and last major public health blunder we would see in the COVID-19 pandemic. The reality, however, was that the real mess was just beginning,” they wrote.

Pfizer, Moderna Used Studies to Cut Corners

Following the premature unblinding of clinical trials, both Pfizer and Moderna pivoted to immunogenicity studies, relying on antibody response data to infer vaccine efficacy against new variants and in younger populations. Pfizer and Moderna relied on surrogate endpoints, particularly neutralizing antibody levels, to justify the efficacy of vaccines against emerging SARS-CoV-2 variants. Without randomized, placebo-controlled data, they assumed that similar antibody responses across age groups or against new variants would translate into comparable clinical protection.

This method was extended to justify vaccine use in children by demonstrating that children’s immune responses were “non-inferior” to those observed in adults, bypassing rigorous, direct evidence of clinical efficacy and safety in these groups. Additionally, immunogenicity data was used to fast-track boosters tailored for new variants without conducting

full-scale trials.

The grand jury criticized this reliance on surrogate data as scientifically inadequate for assessing long-term safety and effectiveness. They argued that this approach bypassed standard regulatory safeguards, neglected long-term safety monitoring, and overstated vaccine effectiveness.

This reliance on immunogenicity studies, the report asserts, allowed Pfizer and Moderna to rapidly expand the use of their vaccines without providing the public with robust safety and efficacy data.

Regulatory Failures and Media Complicity

Normally, vaccines are categorized as biologics and are overseen by the FDA's Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (CBER). This process typically involves extensive, multi-phase trials that account for long-term safety in diverse populations. Unlike conventional vaccines targeting stable viruses, the COVID-19 vaccines targeted SARS-CoV-2, a rapidly mutating virus and the regulatory processes were significantly relaxed in the name of a global pandemic.

In its report, the grand jury scrutinized the FDA's role in fast-tracking COVID-19 vaccines under Operation Warp Speed. While the urgency to combat the pandemic was understandable, the grand jury found that regulatory agencies became advocates rather than impartial overseers, prioritizing rapid deployment over thorough safety evaluations. This regulatory complacency led to delayed acknowledgment of critical safety signals, particularly concerning myocarditis and pericarditis linked to the mRNA vaccines.

Further complicating matters, the grand jury uncovered evidence that Pfizer and Moderna manipulated scientific

publications to suppress unfavorable data. Both companies delayed the disclosure of adverse events and selectively reported data to present a more favorable safety profile. This strategic presentation of data misled the public and hindered independent scientists from fully assessing vaccine risks.

Dissenting scientists who raised legitimate safety concerns faced professional retaliation, while those aligned with pro-vaccine narratives were elevated. This suppression of scientific debate created a climate where open discussion about vaccine safety and efficacy was stifled, further eroding public trust.

Media outlets amplified government and pharmaceutical messaging without adequate scrutiny. The report suggests that mainstream media failed to challenge official narratives, contributing to widespread misinformation and leaving the public ill-informed about the true risks and benefits of the vaccines.

Financial Incentives and Lack of Transparency

Combined, Pfizer and Moderna generated over \$128 billion in revenue from COVID-19 vaccines, driven by lucrative government contracts. The Grand jury believes these financial incentives may have motivated the companies to prioritize market dominance over safety. Researchers who carried out key studies also had ties to the pharmaceutical companies whose products they were brought in to study.

Pfizer representatives reportedly admitted during the investigation that the grand jury had not been granted access to all relevant safety data. This revelation, combined with the documented delays in acknowledging safety signals, deepened concerns about the transparency and accountability of both Pfizer and Moderna.

Grand Jury Recommends Sweeping Reforms

In response to these findings, the grand jury recommended sweeping reforms, such as stricter oversight of clinical trials, increased transparency in regulatory processes, and enhanced accountability for pharmaceutical companies.

They concluded that the risk-benefit balance of Pfizer and Moderna's mRNA COVID-19 vaccines shifted significantly over time and expressed concerns about their continued widespread use. The SARS-CoV-2 virus has mutated into strains that cause fewer infections, hospitalizations, and deaths. Additionally, most people have either been infected with the virus, vaccinated, or both, resulting in widespread natural and hybrid immunity.

Despite rapidly producing updated vaccine formulations, Pfizer and Moderna's vaccines frequently lag behind circulating variants, limiting their effectiveness and leading to waning immunity. Meanwhile, the vaccines' side effects remain, ranging from common reactions like headaches, fatigue, and muscle pain to more serious risks such as myocarditis and pericarditis.

The grand jury highlighted that for healthy young men, the risk of side effects from second doses of Pfizer's BNT162b2 and Moderna's MRNA-1273 vaccines outweighed the benefits, even at the pandemic's peak.

As COVID-19 has become less severe, this risk-benefit imbalance has likely expanded to include broader age groups and populations. The report questions how far this imbalance extends—whether it applies to individuals under 30, 45, or those recently infected with COVID-19—but notes that vaccine manufacturers and federal regulators have failed to acknowledge that a tipping point even exists. Instead, they

continue to rely on outdated 2020 data and observational studies lacking adequate covariate information to justify ongoing vaccine approvals.

Governor DeSantis is calling for transparency and accountability. He believes Floridians deserve to know whether they were misled about the vaccines' safety and efficacy. The grand jury's findings appear to validate these concerns and call for stronger oversight of pharmaceutical companies and regulatory agencies.