

# Re: Unfreakingbelievable!

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.diseases.lyme/2005-12/msg00429.html>

---

- *From:* "Yukon King" <[derdrittemann2003@xxxxxxxxxx](mailto:derdrittemann2003@xxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* 3 Dec 2005 18:21:18 -0800
- 

rebecca wrote:

- > I agree...what frustrates me wrt lyme issues is, I actually know of
- > several lawyers who have chronic lyme or are involved in lyme activism
- > because of a family member. and more than one has mentioned
- > possibilities for legal action against the government, especially {US
- > DHHS}. but they never do a goddamned thing, and they could at least
- > help jump start this stuff.

Possibilities are one thing.

Viable theories are quite another thing.

Talk is cheap. Litigation is not.

hold forth on why he/she thinks various

- > types of civil action could be successful, and then they don't lift a
- > \*#%!@\$ finger to help out.

You are ASSuming that there is in fact, a viable legal theory available under which to proceed.

If there is, no one I know of has been able to figure one out.

You see, it is helpful before going to court, to actually have some sort of wrong or injury that can be addressed within the boundaries of the law.

Legitimate differences of scientific opinion are not something that courts address.

You have to start with a controversy that is "justiciable".

.

- *Follow-Ups:*

- ◆ **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: pmerv*
- ◆ **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: Mockingbird*
- ◆ **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: rebecca*

- *References:*

- ◆ **Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: Martijn*
- ◆ **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: Frank de Groot*
- ◆ **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**  
◇ *From: rebecca*

- Prev by Date: **Re: C. difficile resistance and clindamycin**
- Next by Date: **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**
- Previous by thread: **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**
- Next by thread: **Re: Unfreakingbelievable!**
- Index(es):
  - ◆ **Date**
  - ◆ **Thread**