

From: Trustpilot Content Integrity <contentintegrity@trustpilot.com>
To: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Flagged review - killfeed.co - Ticket #36822738
Date: Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:22 +0000



Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

16 Aug 2025, 04:28 BST

Hi,

Thank you for reaching out and sharing the details of your concern. I understand that you believe the review in question may be inaccurate or unfair, and I appreciate you bringing this to our attention.

To ensure the matter is investigated properly, please flag the review directly from your Trustpilot Business account. Flagging is the official way to alert our Content Integrity team so we can review the content against our guidelines. Each flagged review is assessed individually, and if we find that it breaches our rules, we will take the necessary action. If you also believe the review raises legal concerns, you are welcome to contact our Legal team directly via this link: [Trustpilot Legal Contact](#).

As you have already flagged some reviews, I'd like to note that following our investigations, certain reviews were filtered, while others were not, as they did not violate our guidelines under the selected flagging reason. We cannot remove reviews simply because they are perceived as inaccurate or unfair, removal can only take place if the review clearly breaches our guidelines.

Please understand that each review is assessed individually, based on the specific flagging reason provided. For this reason, it's important to flag under the most accurate category to ensure we can take the appropriate action.

We value your feedback and take such reports seriously. By following this process, we can ensure your concerns are reviewed fairly and transparently.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,
Content Integrity Team



We are rated **4.4** out of **5**

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

Anthony Brodie

9 Aug 2025, 18:18 BST

Dear Ansa J, Esraa, Shahana A, Neenu D, Ananthu P, Halla, Erika, Trustpilot Legal Department and Trustpilot Content Integrity Team,

I write regarding Trustpilot's failure to remove multiple defamatory reviews targeting my business, Legion Killfeed. This email serves as a formal legal rebuttal and structured complaint. All of you – as Trustpilot's legal and content integrity representatives who have corresponded with me – are hereby on notice of the unlawful content and Trustpilot's obligations. Despite at least 13 takedown requests and clear evidence of policy breaches, the defamatory reviews remain published. I will outline the false statements made, the timeline of Trustpilot's moderation decisions (including the removal and reinstatement of certain reviews), and the legal violations and liabilities now at issue. I will then demand immediate remedial action (removal of the content, account suspensions, data preservation, and written confirmation) within 48 hours.

Defamatory Falsehoods Posted Against Legion Killfeed

Multiple malicious reviews were posted in late July and early August 2025 by users with no genuine experience of my service. These reviews are replete with false, defamatory allegations and even personal harassment. To summarize the key offending reviews and statements:

*

User "Cunt" – Even the username is an obscenity. This fake reviewer claims we "rob people" of their money and then "block them" after taking payment. This is an outrageous lie – we have never taken a customer's payment and then cut off their service; indeed, records show this individual was never a customer at all. The vulgar display name alone violates Trustpilot's rules (usernames must not contain defamatory or obscene terms), yet this review was initially allowed to appear.

*

User "WARZONE" – Posted a hostile 1-star review calling our product "trash" and alleging "the day you need technical support they'll treat you like s**t". This abusive screed provides no actual facts – just insults – and no indication the person used our service (we found no customer under the name "Warzone"). In short, it's a troll review created to malign us, not a genuine critique. The tone ("treat you like s**t") is clearly meant to harass, and the claims of mistreatment are fabricated.

*

User "Danny Hayes" – This review was posted under the real name of a UK-based competitor who has been orchestrating a harassment campaign against us. In his Trustpilot review, Mr. Hayes labeled us "toxic scammers" and urged readers "REPORT ONLY!" (even bizarrely telling people to "avoid Madelyn Mills" who is an uninvolved community member). He falsely asserted we "take people's money" and implied fraud. None of these claims are true – Mr. Hayes never used our service (he runs a rival product) and posted the review in bad faith to damage our reputation. Trustpilot's guidelines explicitly forbid reviews by competitors or anyone with a conflict of interest, yet this review was published and, initially, left up. The mention of "Madelyn Mills" in his review underscores the malice: Ms. Mills (actually Madelyn Maddock) was simply a community member who defended us on Facebook, and Mr. Hayes tried to disparage her by name. This personal harassment of a supporter in a "review" has no legitimate purpose on your platform.

*

User "Brett Jones" (alias "MrTech9") – We suspect a review may have been posted by or on behalf of Brett Jones, a former affiliate banned from our community (he has spread egregious lies about me elsewhere). If any review under his name appeared, it would have contained similarly defamatory content, given his documented history (he has even propagated a baseless slur that I am a "pedophile" in other forums). While that particular slur might not have been repeated on Trustpilot, any review by this individual would be per se defamatory and clearly driven by vengeance rather than truth. (It's possible Mr. Jones also had a hand in the "WARZONE" or "Cunt" posts if he didn't use his own name; regardless, he is part of the collusive attack.)

*

User "Robert McDonovan" (alias used: "Matt Mcglouglin") – On August 5, 2025, a new 1-star review appeared stating: "Scam. Stay away! He takes your money and deleted your server if you disagree with anything he says.". This allegation is both defamatory and technically impossible. We cannot "delete" any customer's game server – our bot service runs on third-party servers (Nitrado) using customer-generated API tokens, which do not grant us the ability to delete or alter a customer's server. The claim that we would retaliate against a customer by deleting their server is a vicious fabrication. Moreover, we have no record of any customer or user by the name "Robert McDonovan" or "Matt Mcglouglin". In other words, this reviewer never had a real service experience and simply posted a lie to scare others. The false statement "he deleted your server if you disagree" is a textbook defamatory allegation: it imputes grave misconduct to our business (sabotaging customers) with zero basis in reality. It has caused serious concern among readers and harm to our reputation – exactly the "serious harm" that constitutes defamation under UK law.

*

User "Z Doneskies" – Another 1-star review that appeared in early August (just after one of the above was removed) claims that the "main developer bans and curses out people who ask simple questions...The bot is good when it works but hasn't done that very well in 2 weeks... [the developer] should show respect to those who use and pay for his bot. It was just a sad sight to see.". Notably, the reviewer essentially admits to being merely an observer – "it was just a sad sight to see" – implying they were not themselves a paying customer, but just watching some interaction. By their own words, they had no direct experience with our service. Trustpilot's rules require that reviews be based on a "genuine experience" with the business; this review fails that standard. It appears to be yet another post by someone involved in the smear campaign (or sympathetic to it) who jumped in to tarnish our reputation. The content is partly opinion ("attitude" complaints), but it also makes unfounded assertions (implying our service "hasn't worked well" and that I mistreat paying users) – claims which are false and not grounded in any actual transaction.

Each of the above "reviews" is a false and defamatory statement of fact, not a legitimate opinion or honest customer feedback. In aggregate, they accuse me and my business of serious misconduct – scamming, theft, fraud, sabotage of customer data, and abuse of customers. These are gravely defamatory accusations. Indeed, many of these statements would be defamatory per se under most legal standards (e.g. accusations of fraud or criminal behavior). Furthermore, these posts were not written by genuine customers at all – our records (Discord server logs, payment records, support tickets) confirm that none of these individuals had any transaction or interaction with Legion Killfeed. The coordinated timing and similarity of the reviews (all appearing within days, echoing the same "scam" narrative and insults) make it clear this was an organized "review bomb" attack, not organic criticism.

Trustpilot's own policies acknowledge that "fake reviews undermine trust and are illegal... We do not tolerate them on our platform.". Your Terms of Use for Consumers forbid users from "writing or being involved in the procurement of fake reviews" and from using the platform in a way that is misleading, offensive, or violates any law. The content here plainly violated those rules, as well as the specific provisions against: obscenities, defamation, and conflicts of interest.

Trustpilot's review guidelines categorize "Defamation" as "a false statement about a person or business which harms their reputation and leads to significant financial loss," and explicitly state "we don't allow...defamatory content", which will be removed once noticed. Likewise, "Obscenity" (e.g. "content with severe profanity") is not allowed. The guidelines further mandate that reviews must be from actual recent customers (no fake or "not based on a genuine experience" posts), and

prohibit anyone with a special relationship or conflict of interest (such as a competitor) from reviewing. Every one of the reviews in question violated one or more of these policies (most violated all of them: they were obscene or abusive, false and defamatory, and written by people with no genuine experience or with clear conflicts of interest).

In short, these reviews never should have been allowed on the platform. Once they were posted, they should have been swiftly removed as soon as they were reported. Unfortunately, that is not what happened.

Timeline of Trustpilot's Moderation (or Lack Thereof)

To my dismay, Trustpilot's Content Integrity team failed to act appropriately despite my immediate flags. Below I recount the sequence of events and decisions:

*

July 29–31, 2025 – Initial False Reviews Posted: The accounts “Cunt,” “WARZONE,” “Danny Hayes,” etc., post their defamatory reviews in rapid succession. I flagged each of these reviews via the Business Dashboard reporting tool as soon as I saw them. Given their obvious violations (profanity, slurs, no real consumer experience), I fully expected quick removal per Trustpilot's guidelines. At this stage, these reviews were clearly identifiable as malicious “harmful or illegal content” that Trustpilot claims it will remove when aware.

*

August 1–2, 2025 – Initial Trustpilot Responses: Trustpilot's system acknowledged some of my reports. Notably, on August 2, I received a notice (Ticket [#36723684](#)) that the review by “WARZONE” had been removed because the user failed to respond to Trustpilot's verification request (i.e. “removed due to non-compliance after our outreach”). In line with your procedure for “not based on a genuine experience,” Trustpilot contacted the reviewer for proof of purchase; none was provided, so the review was taken offline. This was the correct action under your rules. Similarly, the extremely obscene “Cunt” review was, at first, taken down temporarily pending investigation (it was “hidden” after my flag). However, instead of permanently deleting it, Trustpilot inexplicably reinstated the “Cunt” review shortly thereafter. On August 2, 2025 at 10:25 BST, Trustpilot Content Integrity agent Ansa J. emailed me stating that after assessment, “we’ve put the review back online and won’t be taking further action” because supposedly it “follows our guidelines” for the flag reason. This decision was baffling – the review in question contained blatant profanity and false accusations of theft, which clearly do not follow your guidelines. In the same email, Trustpilot's agent paradoxically noted, “we don’t allow any content that includes ... obscenities, defamation or [other forbidden content]” – yet despite that policy, they concluded the review did not merit removal. I was frankly stunned by the reversal on “Cunt”: an account literally named an extreme obscenity, making defamatory claims, was deemed acceptable by your team.

*

My August 2, 2025 Rebuttal: In response to Ansa J.'s decision, I immediately replied (on August 2, ~10:33 BST) objecting in the strongest terms. I pointed out that Trustpilot was now on formal notice of the defamation and that continuing to publish such content is unlawful. I highlighted the facts: the user “Cunt” was not a customer at all, the claims were “provably false” and malicious, and the username alone violated your profanity rules. I made clear this was part of a harassment campaign (providing the UK police case reference). I also warned Trustpilot that failing to remove the content expeditiously after notice would forfeit any liability protection (e.g. under UK Defamation Act 2013 Section 5) and that I would pursue legal action, including adding Trustpilot as a co-defendant, if the review was not removed within 24 hours. In short, I gave Trustpilot a final chance to correct this “negligent and absurd” decision and escalate it to someone who understands the legal risk.

*

August 3–4, 2025 – Continued Notifications: I received no meaningful response to my August 2 rebuttal. The defamatory “Cunt” review remained live. I sent further communications on August 3, including evidence of the Facebook coordination (screenshots and links) to underscore that these reviews were targeted fake posts by a mob, not real customer opinions. By August 4, having gotten nowhere with front-line Content Integrity support, I escalated the matter: I prepared a formal legal complaint to Trustpilot's Legal Team (sent August 4) detailing the defamation and policy violations and demanding removal and account suspensions. This complaint cited all relevant evidence and laws. Thus, by August 4, Trustpilot's

Legal Department was also formally made aware of the situation (via my email/letter of that date, addressed to legal@trustpilot.com<mailto:legal@trustpilot.com>).

*

Madelyn Maddock's Review – Collateral Damage: Around this same time, a legitimate 5-star review was posted on our profile by Ms. Madelyn Maddock (under the username "Madelyn M."). Ms. Maddock is a genuine member of our user community who had witnessed the harassment against us. She is not related to me nor under my employ – just a supportive user. Unfortunately, because she had interacted with our service from a location/IP address that at one point overlapped with mine (we suspect this is what triggered it), Trustpilot flagged her positive review as suspicious. There was no familial or improper relationship – she simply gave an honest high rating – yet her review was apparently removed or challenged, while the obvious fake negatives were allowed to stay. This irony did not escape me: Trustpilot's systems falsely flagged a real favorable review (perhaps due to a shared network or her coming to my defense), "protecting" the platform from a non-existent conflict of interest, even as actual bad actors freely violated every rule. In fact, the malicious "Danny Hayes" review even named Madelyn in a derogatory way ("Avoid Madelyn Mills ;)", essentially punishing her for supporting us. Trustpilot's job is to protect good-faith users and businesses from abuse – not to protect trolls and punish legitimate reviewers. The handling of Ms. Maddock's review exemplifies how miscalibrated the content moderation was in this case. (I note this for the record, as it demonstrates the broader failure of Trustpilot's content integrity process – and suggests potential bias in how reports were handled.)

Screenshot: Trustpilot's Content Integrity decisions on flagged reviews. In the image above, Trustpilot's dashboard is shown rejecting flags on blatantly harmful reviews: for example, the review by "WARZONE" containing harassing language was marked "doesn't breach our guidelines" for defamation, and the obscene "C**t" review was similarly left standing. These internal determinations starkly contradict Trustpilot's public policies that disallow "obscenities" and "defamatory" content. Such screenshots evidence how Trustpilot failed to enforce its own rules in this matter, despite being fully informed that these posts were fake and malicious.

*

August 5–6, 2025 – The "Robert McDonovan" Review Incident: On August 5, a few hours after one of the prior fakes had finally come down, a new defamatory review appeared (from "Robert McDonovan," as described above). This was clearly the attackers' attempt to get another damaging post onto the page. I immediately flagged this review as well – citing "defamatory or illegal content." Trustpilot's system initially blurred/temporarily removed the review pending investigation, per standard procedure for harmful content. I soon received an email (Ticket [#36814421](#)) from Trustpilot Content Integrity confirming the review was being assessed for defamation. However, on August 6, 2025 at 00:36 BST, I was stunned to receive a notice that Trustpilot had "determined that the content...is not defamatory" and therefore "reinstated the review". The Trustpilot agent (identified as "Trustpilot System" using an AI defamation tool) concluded that the review did not meet their threshold of defamation, apparently because (in their view) it wasn't likely to cause "serious harm" – a conclusion that is asinine, given the false claim of deleting customers' servers does obviously harm our reputation. Trustpilot's email even acknowledged my flag was for defamation but still asserted "the content...is not defamatory". In other words, after initially doing the right thing (taking it offline pending proof), Trustpilot did a 180° turn and put the libelous review back up. This directly contradicted the earlier outcome where lack of proof led to removal. It appears the reviewer never provided any proof of being a customer, yet instead of removing the review permanently for no evidence, Trustpilot inexplicably allowed them to edit and re-post it (the review was marked "Updated") – and then closed the matter, refusing further action. I want to emphasize how irregular and improper this sequence was: Trustpilot's own process initially recognized the review as likely fake (no verified experience) and indicated it would come down. But somehow the reviewer got it republished, and then a Trustpilot Content Integrity agent (Shahana A.) told me it "does not breach our guidelines." This reversal left me with no further recourse on the platform – once Trustpilot closed the ticket as "no breach," I could not flag the review again or appeal in the dashboard (Trustpilot offers a formal dispute link only after a final decision email, which I certainly utilized). The net result was that this patently false review stayed live, and my hands were tied within your system. It

remained visible to every potential customer, despite Trustpilot being fully aware of its falsity.

*

August 7–9, 2025 – Ongoing Attacks and Final Warnings: By this point I had repeatedly notified Trustpilot of the illegal content. On August 7 and 8, I exchanged further emails with Content Integrity agent Shahana A., who continued to deny removal. I wrote a detailed rebuttal to Shahana A. on August 8, systematically laying out why the “Matt Mcglouglin” review (a.k.a. Robert McDonovan) was defamatory, fake, and violated multiple guidelines, and pointing out that Trustpilot’s own actions were internally inconsistent and unlawful. I cited the UK Defamation Act 2013 Section 5 notice I was effectively giving, and the Australian Voller case precedent – making clear that Trustpilot could be considered a publisher of this defamation since it had now been notified and was choosing to keep the content up. I also informed Trustpilot that I had reported the situation to police and would hold Trustpilot legally accountable alongside the individual posters if this was not corrected. On August 9, yet another fake review (“Z Doneskies”) was posted – as noted, this user admitted he was just observing drama, not actually using our bot, yet he left a 1-star review to further smear our service. The timing was telling: it appeared just hours after one of the prior defamatory reviews had finally been removed (likely removed by Trustpilot after the reviewer failed to respond or as a belated corrective action). This cat-and-mouse pattern demonstrated a coordinated campaign: whenever one libelous review was taken down, the trolls would create a new account or alias to post another. I flagged “Z Doneskies” as well, citing “Not based on a genuine experience” since the text clearly indicated he was not a customer. Trustpilot’s response was sluggish. As of August 10, I was still receiving automated canned replies and seeing the defamatory content live. Thirteen (13) separate notices/flags had been lodged by me at this point (across all the reviews), without the proper result. Frustrated, I escalated externally: I filed formal complaints with several regulators and began preparing legal actions.

In summary, over the course of approximately two weeks, Trustpilot had multiple opportunities to do the right thing. Some individual Content Integrity staff (or the automated processes) initially took correct steps (e.g. contacting reviewers for proof, removing one review when the user failed verification), but these were undermined by other decisions (reinstating content that clearly violated guidelines). Internally inconsistent moderation left me, the victim of a harassment campaign, feeling helpless. Instead of promptly removing the clearly violative reviews and banning the abusive accounts as requested, Trustpilot’s responses were to defend the reviews as acceptable or “not defamatory” and advise me to simply “reply to the reviews” with my side of the story. Telling a defamed small business to “reply and give your perspective” is not an acceptable solution when dealing with malicious lies – the proper solution is removal of the lies, as your policies and the law require. I did post public replies to counter the falsehoods, but that is not sufficient. Every day these fake reviews remained published, they damaged my reputation and deterred customers. Trustpilot’s inaction – despite knowing the truth – essentially gave these attackers a megaphone on a platform that is supposed to be about honest customer experiences.

Trustpilot’s Policy Violations and Accountability

Trustpilot’s handling of this matter not only failed me as a user of the platform, but blatantly violated Trustpilot’s own terms and guidelines. I have already touched on many of these points, but to recap:

*

Publication of Obscene and Defamatory Content: Trustpilot’s Terms of Use for Users state that usernames “must not contain anything...defamatory, obscene or illegal”. Allowing an account literally named “C**t” to post is a direct breach of this rule. Further, Trustpilot’s Guidelines for Businesses (which mirror the standards for all content) explicitly instruct: “Don’t post anything harmful, hateful, discriminatory, defamatory or obscene.”. Yet Trustpilot did “publish” (by leaving up) content that was all of the above – harmful, hateful, defamatory, and obscene. Your own Content Integrity agent even acknowledged in email that hate speech, obscenities, defamation, etc. are not allowed, but then took no action. This contradiction is glaring. Trustpilot failed to enforce its zero-tolerance policies in this case, raising questions about either a breakdown in enforcement or a willful decision to ignore the rules.

*

Fake/Non-Genuine Reviews Ignored: Trustpilot professes to have “zero tolerance for fake reviews”. Your rules state that reviews must reflect a genuine service experience and that both automated systems and staff will remove those that don’t. In practice, every single one of the disputed reviews was fake (no actual customer behind it), yet Trustpilot’s response was inconsistent at best. While one was removed after failed verification, others were allowed to stay or come back despite no evidence of genuine experience. Trustpilot’s “Action We Take” policy promises removal of fake reviews, but here Trustpilot facilitated their continued presence. This not only violated your guidelines but also undermines the trust of consumers – the very trust your platform’s value is built on.

*

Conflict of Interest and Abuse of Platform: Trustpilot’s rules bar competitors (and others with conflicts) from reviewing a business. In this case, one reviewer was explicitly a competitor (Danny Hayes), and another was a disgruntled ex-affiliate (Brett Jones) – both clear conflicts of interest. These reviews should have been immediately removed or never allowed. Additionally, Trustpilot claims to disallow “coordinated manipulation” of reviews. What happened to us was coordinated manipulation: a campaign organized off-platform to “review bomb” our profile. Trustpilot either failed to detect the pattern or chose not to act on it. By treating each fake review in isolation and declaring some “within guidelines,” Trustpilot missed the forest for the trees – enabling a brazen abuse of the platform to occur in plain sight.

*

Lack of a Functional Complaint Mechanism / Escalation Path: Under the EU Digital Services Act (DSA), Trustpilot is required to maintain an effective internal complaint-handling system for users to challenge content moderation decisions (DSA Article 17). In my case, the “internal complaint” process was essentially non-functional. Once Content Integrity (wrongly) decided the defamatory reviews “didn’t breach guidelines,” I had no easy way to appeal except by sending emails and eventually filing external complaints. The DSA also requires transparent notice-and-action procedures (Articles 14–16) and timely handling of notices about illegal content. Trustpilot failed in this regard – responses were delayed and substantive resolution was absent. Indeed, one of your emails to me was authored on August 5 but not actually sent until August 6, indicating an intentional delay. Such delays violate the spirit of acting “expeditiously” on illegal content notifications. The bottom line is that Trustpilot’s system did not provide a fair or effective route to resolve this issue; I had to resort to legal notices and regulator involvement.

Because Trustpilot has not adhered to its own policies and promises, I must also put you on notice of the legal ramifications:

Legal Violations and Liabilities

Trustpilot’s continued publication of these reviews after receiving notice of their falsity contravenes multiple laws. I urge you to consult with Trustpilot’s legal counsel about the following non-exhaustive points:

*

United Kingdom – Defamation Act 2013: Section 5 of this Act provides a defence to website operators for defamatory content posted by users – but only if the operator acts appropriately upon receiving a notice of complaint. I have formally notified Trustpilot of the defamatory nature of these reviews (this email being the latest notice). Because Trustpilot failed to remove the false content upon notice, it risks forfeiting the Section 5 defense and becoming liable as a publisher of the defamation. In other words, under UK law, from the moment I informed you these statements were false and causing harm (and especially after I provided evidence, police case references, etc.), Trustpilot can be held legally responsible for any further harm caused by leaving them up. The reviews in question have undoubtedly caused “serious harm” to my reputation and serious financial loss to my small business (the UK’s threshold for a defamatory statement). Trustpilot’s conscious decision to ignore or reject my complaints could be seen as publication with knowledge of illegality, stripping you of immunity. I remind you that actual malice is not required for defamation liability in the UK for a private individual/business like me; however, in this case, the malice of the reviewers is clear, and Trustpilot’s inaction after notice could even be construed as reckless. At least one of the perpetrators (Danny Hayes) is UK-based, and I have filed a police report in the UK. Trustpilot, as a platform accessible in the UK and doing business there, should be acutely aware

of these obligations.

*

Australia – Defamation and Harassment Laws: I am an Australian resident and Legion Killfeed operates in Australia as well. Australia's defamation law is plaintiff-friendly and does not provide broad immunity to intermediaries once they participate in the publication of defamatory material. In fact, the High Court's *Fairfax Media v Voller* (2021) decision held that even platform owners can be deemed publishers of third-party comments if they have the ability to moderate them. By analogy, Trustpilot becomes a publisher of these defamatory reviews once you are aware of them and choose to leave them online. Australian law would consider that, by failing to remove known defamation, Trustpilot is participating in its publication. Since Legion Killfeed is a small business (eligible to sue for defamation under Australian law) and the reviews allege serious wrongdoing (e.g. scamming, fraud), we have a strong case. There are virtually no viable defenses for these posts – they are not true, not honest opinion (they assert false facts), and not privileged. If I pursue an Australian defamation action, I will certainly consider Trustpilot as a defendant alongside the individual posters. Moreover, Australia has relevant criminal laws: Using a carriage service to menace/harass is a crime (Criminal Code (Cth) §474.17) which these coordinated online attacks likely violate. While that criminal provision would apply directly to the harassers, the key point is that the content is recognized by law as harmful. The Australian Criminal Code also criminalizes certain online defamatory conduct and harassment. Australia's eSafety Commissioner can issue takedown notices for adult cyber-abuse; I have already indicated I will seek such intervention if needed. Let me be clear: Australia has no Section 230-style immunity – an international platform is not shielded from liability for defamation accessible in Australia. Trustpilot should act with this in mind.

*

European Union – Digital Services Act (DSA): Trustpilot operates within the EU (and is in fact headquartered in Denmark). Under the new DSA, Trustpilot has binding obligations to act swiftly when illegal content (such as defamatory content) is notified. Articles 14–16 of the DSA require a platform to have a notice-and-action mechanism and to remove or disable access to illegal content “in a timely manner” once notified. Trustpilot's failure to promptly remove clearly illegal defamatory material after my multiple notifications is a breach of these obligations. The DSA also mandates transparency and proper handling of user complaints (Article 17); as described, your handling fell short. The law provides for significant fines for non-compliance. I have lodged a complaint with the Danish Consumer Authority (the DSA coordinator in Denmark) about Trustpilot's conduct. I referenced Trustpilot's inaction on my notices and the lack of a functional complaint process. The regulatory authorities in the EU will take an interest in a case where a platform knowingly hosts defamatory content that was flagrantly flagged and ignored. Trustpilot should immediately remediate this to mitigate regulatory exposure.

*

Canada – Defamatory Libel and Platform Liability: At least one individual involved (Brett Jones) is in Canada, and the content is accessible in Canada. Canadian law, like UK/Australian law, does not provide broad immunity to platforms once they have notice of defamation. In fact, Canada's approach to online defamation is quite strict: it recognizes a criminal offence of “Defamatory Libel” in its Criminal Code (Sections 298–301). Knowingly publishing a false defamatory statement can be prosecuted and is punishable by up to 5 years imprisonment. To be clear, I am not accusing Trustpilot staff of a crime; however, now that you have knowledge of the falsity, continuing to publish the material could be viewed by Canadian authorities as intentional publication of defamatory libel, potentially engaging those Criminal Code provisions. Furthermore, Canadian civil law would allow a defamation suit against Trustpilot as a publisher post-notice (Canada has no equivalent to CDA §230 shielding). I have already filed a report with the Canadian authorities regarding one perpetrator's actions. If any significant harm occurs in Canada (e.g. Canadian users seeing and acting on these false reviews), Trustpilot could face legal action there as well. The Criminal Code of Canada §264 also criminalizes harassing communications causing someone to fear harm; while primarily targeting individuals, the existence of these laws again underlines how seriously this type of content is viewed across jurisdictions. In every jurisdiction involved here (UK, EU, Australia, Canada), the laws favor prompt removal of defamatory content once notified – Trustpilot's current stance is untenable under all of them.

*

United States – Section 230 (Communications Decency Act): I acknowledge that Trustpilot, Inc. is a U.S.-based entity and often cites CDA §230 for immunity. However, even under U.S. law, Section 230 does not prevent Trustpilot from removing content that violates its policies; on the contrary, it encourages moderation. More importantly, Section 230 does not apply to intellectual property or federal criminal law, and it does not override the laws of other countries. The individuals who posted these reviews have no U.S. immunity for defamation, and Trustpilot's exposure will primarily be abroad (since the harm and focus of my complaints are in non-U.S. jurisdictions). I note this only to preempt any misunderstanding: citing §230 will not shield Trustpilot from UK, EU, Australian, or Canadian legal action, and even in the U.S., §230 would not protect Trustpilot if (hypothetically) a court found Trustpilot itself helped create or develop the unlawful content. While I have not alleged that here, I remind you that Trustpilot employees' active decisions to leave known false content up could be seen as contributing to its publication. In any event, my aim is to have the content removed without further escalation – but I will pursue U.S. legal avenues too if necessary (for instance, if any business interference or defamation per quod claims could be viable in U.S. courts due to cross-border effects).

To summarize the legal landscape: Trustpilot is now on notice in multiple jurisdictions. If you continue to publish these defamatory reviews, Trustpilot (and potentially even the responsible employees individually) can be seen as knowingly spreading false and damaging information. In the UK/AUS/Canada, that makes you a publisher of defamation from the point of notice, stripping you of safe harbor protections. In the EU, it puts you in violation of the DSA. In Australia and Canada, it could implicate you in facilitating criminal harassment/defamation. This is not a theoretical discussion – I am prepared to take action in all relevant forums to protect my business. The defamed party (myself) has rights here, and Trustpilot has duties that it is currently abdicating.

Let me also point out that Trustpilot's own Terms of Use likely give you broad discretion to remove any content that violates your guidelines or the law. Therefore, there is no legitimate reason to hesitate in removing these reviews. Any argument that taking them down would infringe the reviewers' "free speech" is misplaced – these individuals egregiously violated the platform rules and posted demonstrable lies, which are not protected speech. They have forfeited any benefit of the doubt. By contrast, Trustpilot has everything to lose by leaving the content up – it undermines your platform's credibility and exposes you to legal and regulatory consequences.

Demands: Required Remedial Actions

In light of the above, I demand that Trustpilot take the following actions immediately and confirm them in writing within 48 hours:

1.

Permanent Removal of the Defamatory Reviews: Delete or completely and permanently remove all of the identified fake reviews from the Legion Killfeed Trustpilot profile. This includes, at minimum, the reviews posted by users "Cunt," "WARZONE," "Danny Hayes," "Robert McDonovan/Matt Mcglouglin," and "Z Doneskies," as well as any other reviews that your investigation finds were part of this coordinated attack (for example, any post by "Brett Jones" or other newly created accounts involved in the same pattern). The removal must be complete – simply "hiding" or filtering them from the average viewer is not sufficient. They should no longer appear on our profile at all, and no part of their star ratings or text should count toward our TrustScore or be visible to the public. I have seen at least one review disappear (indicating Trustpilot took belated action on it), but as of this writing at least one defamatory review remained live. All offending content must be purged. Furthermore, please ensure these particular reviews cannot resurface. Sometimes removed reviews reappear if the user edits them and re-posts (as seemed to happen with the McDonovan/Mcglouglin review). Trustpilot must prevent any of these specific malicious entries from being republished in any form. (Of course, if a genuinely new legitimate review comes in coincidentally from a real customer, that is different – but here we are dealing with bad actors, not real customers.)

2.

Suspension or Ban of the Offending User Accounts: Terminate or suspend the Trustpilot accounts that published these

malicious reviews. By Trustpilot's own rules, users who abuse the platform by posting fake or defamatory reviews or who engage in targeted harassment should face account-level consequences. The accounts "Cunt," "WARZONE," "Danny Hayes," "Brett Jones (MrTech9)," "Robert McDonovan/Matt Mcglouglin," "Z Doneskies," etc., were all created or used with clear malintent, in violation of multiple guidelines (as described). Allowing these accounts to remain active poses a risk that they (or the people behind them) will simply target me (or others) again. I insist that Trustpilot permanently ban these users from the platform. At the very least, mark their profiles with appropriate enforcement actions and prevent them from writing further reviews. Trustpilot has touted that it uses technology and manual checks to weed out and block users who post misinformation – I expect you to use those tools now against this group of attackers.

3.

Preservation of Evidence and Metadata: Preserve all relevant data related to these reviews and the user accounts that posted them. This includes the text of the reviews, timestamps, IP addresses, account signup information (emails, etc.), and any Trustpilot internal notes or correspondence about them. Such data should be preserved for at least 180 days and not deleted. I put Trustpilot on notice that I may subpoena these records in impending legal actions. Preservation is your duty once you have reason to anticipate litigation. In particular, the IP logs and any device/browser fingerprints may help identify the individuals or links between the accounts. Trustpilot's own communications to me have referenced internal ticket numbers (e.g. [#36723684](#), [#36814421](#), [#37034853](#), etc.) – all materials tied to those should be retained. Do not spoliage any evidence. (I note that Trustpilot's privacy policy allows disclosure of user info in response to legal process – I will follow up with the appropriate requests through courts or law enforcement.) In short, make sure nothing about these reviews or accounts is wiped from your databases, even after removal from public view. I formally request confirmation that you will preserve this data for potential use in court.

4.

Written Confirmation of Actions Taken: Provide a written confirmation (email is fine) within 48 hours of this message, detailing: (a) which reviews were removed, (b) which user accounts were suspended or banned, and (c) that the relevant data has been preserved as requested. Additionally, I ask that you acknowledge the wrongful nature of the content (i.e. that it violated your guidelines). While an apology would be welcome, the priority is a factual confirmation that Trustpilot has addressed the issue. Given the seriousness of this matter, I expect this confirmation no later than two days from now (i.e. by the end of August 12, 2025, in my time zone). If for some reason you need additional time to implement the actions, send me an interim response within 48 hours explaining the plan and timeline – but the removal of the content should not be delayed any longer. Every day that these defamatory reviews remain live is another day of ongoing harm to my business, which is unacceptable.

I trust that you understand the gravity of this situation. If Trustpilot does not comply with these demands within 48 hours, I will have no choice but to escalate further. "Escalation" will include, without limitation: initiating legal proceedings in the appropriate jurisdictions (for defamation and any other applicable causes of action) against Trustpilot and the individuals, pursuing criminal complaints where applicable, and bringing this matter to the attention of relevant regulators and possibly the media. I have already prepared formal complaints to authorities (the UK Competition and Markets Authority, the Australian Competition & Consumer Commission, the Danish Consumer Authority under the DSA, among others) highlighting how Trustpilot's inaction enabled this defamation campaign. It is in everyone's interest – mine, Trustpilot's, and future users' – that this be resolved immediately without further damage.

Finally, let me address each of you named in the salutation personally: Ansa J., Esraa, Shahana A. – as Trustpilot Content Integrity agents who reviewed or communicated about these reports, you should be aware that knowingly leaving false and harmful content online after it has been proven false is not just a breach of policy, but can incur personal liability in certain cases. For instance, in Canada, anyone who "publishes a defamatory libel knowing it to be false" commits an offence. In the UK and Australia, an employee who refuses takedown after notice could potentially be aiding and abetting the publication of defamation. I am not at this time pursuing individuals, and I'm sure you were following internal policy as best you could – but now that the true facts are irrefutably before you, consider this a personal notice as well: continuing to facilitate this smear could put you at legal risk. I strongly urge you to escalate this matter within Trustpilot and ensure

the right thing is done, to protect not only the company but yourselves. Trustpilot's Legal Department is also explicitly addressed – you have had my detailed legal complaint since August 4 and cannot claim ignorance. I expect the Legal Team to intervene here to bring Trustpilot into compliance with the law and its own policies.

In conclusion, I hope for a swift and amicable resolution. Trustpilot holds itself out as a platform built on trust and transparency. In this case, the platform was misused to propagate lies and harassment. Now that these violations have been brought to your attention repeatedly, Trustpilot must act to restore integrity. I have no desire for an adversarial relationship – I simply need these false reviews removed and the attackers stopped from abusing your site further. Taking these steps will not only rectify the injustice done to Legion Killfeed, but will demonstrate Trustpilot's commitment to fair play and lawful conduct. I appreciate your prompt attention and expect your confirmation within 48 hours of implementing the above remedial actions.

Sincerely,

Anthony Brodie

Owner & Developer – Legion Killfeed

Email: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <mailto:Brodie@REDACTED.email>

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

9 Aug 2025, 16:34 BST

Hi,

Thank you for reaching out and sharing the details of your concern. I understand that you believe the review in question may be inaccurate or unfair, and I appreciate you bringing this to our attention.

To ensure the matter is investigated properly, please flag the review from your Trustpilot Business account. Flagging is the official way to alert our Content Integrity team so we can review the content against our guidelines. Each flagged review is assessed individually, and we will take the necessary action if we find it breaches our rules.

If you also believe the review raises legal concerns, you can reach out to our Legal team directly via this link:

https://help.trustpilot.com/s/contact-us/get-in-touch?language=en_US.

We value your feedback and take such reports seriously. By following the flagging process, we can ensure your concerns are reviewed fairly and transparently.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,

Content Integrity Team



We are rated **4.4** out of **5**

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 13:05 BST

Final Notice of Imminent Legal Action – Defamatory Reviews on Legion Killfeed Profile

From: Anthony Brodie – Owner, Legion Killfeed (Sydney, Australia)

To: Trustpilot Legal Team (legal@trustpilot.com)

Date: 6 August 2025

Subject: Final Notice – Removal of Defamatory Reviews and Notification of Legal Action

Dear Trustpilot Legal Team,

I am writing as the owner of Legion Killfeed to formally put Trustpilot on final notice regarding a series of false and defamatory reviews that your platform continues to host about my business. Despite at least 13 prior notifications to Trustpilot (via reports and direct communications) about these malicious posts, they remain published. Trustpilot's continued publication of coordinated defamatory content – despite full evidence of its falsity – is unacceptable and exposes Trustpilot to legal liability under multiple jurisdictions. This email serves as a last warning that if immediate action is not taken, I will proceed with legal proceedings against Trustpilot without further notice.

Defamatory False Reviews on Trustpilot

Several one-star "reviews" on the Legion Killfeed Trustpilot profile are patently false, abusive, and part of an organized smear campaign (not genuine customer feedback). The offending reviews include:

* User "Cunt" – Posted ~29 July 2025. This account's name itself is an obscene slur. The review falsely claims we "take people's money then block them" after payment. This accusation is entirely false – Legion Killfeed has never taken payment without providing service, nor do we "block" any paying customers. (Aside from its defamatory lies, the use of such vulgar language violates Trustpilot's content guidelines in the extreme.)

* User "WARZONE" – Posted ~30 July 2025. This review harasses us by calling our product "trash" and alleging "these people aren't nice at all" (using profanity to say we "treat you like s***"). The remarks are baseless and clearly written out of malice rather than any actual experience. We have no record of any customer or user by the name "Warzone," confirming this profile was created solely to post a fake review.

* User "Danny Hayes" – Posted 31 July 2025 (since removed by Trustpilot). This was posted under the real name of Danny Hayes, who is not a customer but a direct competitor of ours. In his review, Mr. Hayes labeled us "toxic scammers" and urged readers to "REPORT ONLY!" rather than use our service. He has openly boasted on Facebook about leaving this bad review to damage us. Allowing a rival business owner to post a knowingly false review is a blatant breach of Trustpilot's conflict-of-interest rules and defamation by definition. (We note Trustpilot eventually flagged/removed Mr. Hayes's review after our report, implicitly acknowledging it violated your guidelines. However, the fact that it was published at all – and that other fake reviews remain – has already caused significant harm.)

* User "Robert McDonovan" – Posted 4 August 2025. This newly created profile (U.S. based) left a 1-star review titled "Absolute SCAM", falsely asserting: "He takes your money and deleted your server if you disagree with anything he says." This outrageous claim is completely false and indeed technically impossible. Legion Killfeed has no ability to "delete" any customer's game server – our service is an add-on bot integrated with DayZ servers hosted by third-party providers (e.g. Nitrodo). We only use user-supplied access tokens, which are not retained, to fetch server event data; we have zero control over the servers themselves. The allegation that we would take someone's money and then sabotage their server is not only a vicious lie – it demonstrates the lengths to which these attackers will go to fabricate accusations. It is a clear-cut case of defamation with no basis in reality.

Each of the above "reviews" contains false, obscene, or defamatory accusations that have seriously harmed my business's reputation. Importantly, none of these individuals have ever been actual Legion Killfeed customers. We have

cross-checked all payment records, user registrations, and support logs – there is no evidence that any of these usernames (or the persons behind them) ever purchased or used our service. In other words, these posts are fake reviews posted with the sole intent to harass and defame, rather than to share a genuine customer experience.

Origin of the Attack – Coordinated Harassment via Facebook

These Trustpilot reviews did not occur in isolation; they are part of a targeted harassment campaign that originated on Facebook and then spread to Trustpilot (and other platforms). In late July 2025, a group of individuals began coordinating in a DayZ gaming Facebook group to smear Legion Killfeed and flood us with negative reviews. The attacks were orchestrated by a small cohort of antagonists, including:

- * Daniel Santos – Initiated the defamatory Facebook post that incited a “mob” to “take down” Legion Killfeed with false accusations.
- * Danny Hayes – A UK-based competitor who amplified the attack by urging others to post bad reviews and even encouraging fraudulent chargebacks against my business. (Mr. Hayes himself participated directly, as noted, by posting a fake Trustpilot review.)
- * Brett Jones – A former associate (alias “MrTechN9ne”) who, after being removed from our community for misconduct, joined this campaign out of personal animosity. Mr. Jones has spread extremely vile lies about me (at one point referring to me as a “pedophile” in chat – a heinous falsehood). He is actively involved in the defamation efforts, whether by supporting the fake reviews or coordinating behind the scenes.
- * Zeus Lozano – An individual (purportedly in Canada) who jumped in to fabricate a story that I “stole” his server configuration, thereby goading others to “please report both the server and discord.” This claim is entirely invented to incite more hatred.
- * Dan Ahern – Another participant (location believed to be U.S.) who piled on with abusive comments and helped fuel the group harassment dynamic.

This group of at least five individuals has been acting in concert to damage Legion Killfeed. They used Facebook as the launching point for their campaign and then carried their efforts onto Trustpilot by creating throwaway accounts to leave identical false reviews. I have gathered extensive evidence of this coordination, including screenshots of the Facebook threads, Discord chats, and the Trustpilot reviews. Trustpilot has already been provided with this evidence in prior correspondence (e.g. a link to an evidence gallery was included in my earlier complaint). The coordinated nature of these reviews is unquestionable – their timing and content directly mirror the rhetoric from the Facebook attack (accusations of “scamming,” insults, calls to report us, etc.). In fact, the same group is now under police investigation in the UK (Thames Valley Police, Case no. 43250388789) for harassment and related offenses. Trustpilot is fully aware that these reviews are not bona fide customer opinions but rather the by-product of an orchestrated defamation campaign.

Trustpilot’s Knowledge and Liability

I have made repeated efforts over the past week to resolve this matter through Trustpilot’s normal processes. To date, no fewer than thirteen (13) separate notices have been provided to Trustpilot regarding these false reviews – including report flags submitted for each offending review, support tickets, and a detailed formal complaint sent to your legal department on 4 August 2025. In these communications, I furnished clear proof of the reviews’ falsity and their links to an external harassment campaign. Despite this, several of the defamatory reviews remain live on your site (as of this writing). Trustpilot’s response has been grossly inadequate: aside from removing one obvious violation (Mr. Hayes’s review) and possibly tagging another, you have allowed the bulk of this malicious content to persist.

By continuing to publish these known false and defamatory statements after being repeatedly notified, Trustpilot is no longer a neutral host – you are now effectively republishing defamation and facilitating ongoing harassment. I must emphasize that this conduct places Trustpilot in breach of the law in numerous jurisdictions. Your platform’s inaction, in the face of full knowledge and evidence, has exposed Trustpilot to serious legal liability. The defamatory reviews and Trustpilot’s failure to remove them violate (or implicate) the following legal frameworks, among others:

* Australia: Defamation Act 2005 – Under Australian law, online intermediaries can be held liable for defamation once they are aware of defamatory material and fail to remove it. The Australian High Court's Voller decision confirmed that a platform which continues to host defamatory third-party content after notice is considered a publisher of that content. Trustpilot's conduct here squarely fits that scenario. Furthermore, the content in question constitutes use of a carriage service to menace/harass, which is a criminal offense under s.474.17 of the Criminal Code Act 1995. The coordinated fake reviews also amount to misleading and deceptive conduct harming an Australian business, raising issues under the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Sch 2, Australian Consumer Law). In addition, Australia's Online Safety Act 2021 empowers the eSafety Commissioner to issue removal notices for serious online abuse – a remedy I have now sought. Trustpilot's continued publication of this abusive material could trigger regulatory action (including potential fines) under that Act.

* United Kingdom: Defamation Act 2013 – Section 5 of this Act provides a "website operator" defense for platforms, but that defense is lost if the operator does not expeditiously remove defamatory content after receiving a notice of complaint. You have received ample notice (indeed, detailed complaints with evidence), yet the defamatory reviews remain; thus Trustpilot has forfeited any safe-harbor and can be held liable for defamation in the UK courts. Additionally, the sustained harassment campaign implicates the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 (which makes it unlawful to pursue a course of conduct amounting to harassment). The obscene and menacing communications posted on your site are also in potential violation of the Malicious Communications Act 1988 and the Communications Act 2003 (Section 127, regarding grossly offensive public electronic communications). Moreover, the coordinated incitement of false "chargeback" fraud and slanderous allegations might constitute offenses under the Fraud Act 2006. In short, the content you are hosting is illegal under multiple UK statutes, and Trustpilot's failure to act makes it complicit in that illegality.

* Canada: The individuals organizing this campaign (e.g. Mr. Brett Jones and possibly others) have been reported to Canadian authorities as their actions violate Canadian criminal laws, including Criminal Code §264 (criminal harassment) and §§298–301 (defamatory libel). The defamatory reviews on Trustpilot are accessible in Canada and causing harm to an entity (and person) in Canada's trading sphere, meaning Canadian courts could exert jurisdiction as well. Under Canadian common law, publication of defamatory material gives rise to civil liability – and online platforms can face legal exposure if they knowingly facilitate the spread of defamation. Trustpilot's continued publication of these reviews, despite notice, opens it to potential claims in Canada (in addition to the direct liability of the individual perpetrators).

* United States: While the primary targets and instigators of this campaign are outside the US, the cross-border nature of the online harassment engages US law too. The ongoing pattern of threats, intimidation, and malicious falsehoods aligns with the federal cyberstalking statute (18 U.S.C. § 2261A(2)), which criminalizes using electronic communications to engage in conduct intended to harass or cause substantial emotional distress. Furthermore, the deliberate propagation of known falsehoods to cause economic harm (for instance, encouraging fake chargeback fraud via PayPal and posting fraudulent reviews) could be construed as a form of wire fraud (18 U.S.C. § 1343). Various U.S. state laws also provide civil remedies for defamation, business disparagement, and harassment. Trustpilot has a significant presence and user base in the United States – by hosting and ignoring blatantly defamatory content, your company risks involvement in legal action there as well (notwithstanding any CDA 230 immunity claims, which may not apply in cases of willful failure to enforce your own policies against known bad actors).

In summary, Trustpilot is now on notice that its facilitation of this defamatory smear campaign violates the law in Australia, the UK, Canada, the US, and likely other jurisdictions. The above is not an exhaustive list of legal exposure, but it should make clear that the stakes are very high. Trustpilot's indifference to repeated warnings has effectively made it an enabler of harassment and defamation, subject to civil liability (and regulatory scrutiny) around the world.

Demands and Imminent Legal Action

To avoid the necessity of immediate litigation, Trustpilot must take the following corrective actions at once:

1. Permanent removal of all the offending reviews and any related content without delay. This includes (but is not limited to) the reviews posted under the names "Cunt," "WARZONE," "Danny Hayes," "Robert McDonovan," and any other alias

that is part of this coordinated attack. Simply “masking” or hiding the reviews is not sufficient – they must be fully deleted from the platform.

2. Termination or suspension of the associated user accounts that have been used to post these malicious fake reviews.

These accounts were opened in bad faith to violate your Terms of Use; they should be banned to prevent further abuse.

3. Correction of the record on the Legion Killfeed profile. The presence of these fake reviews has skewed our Trustpilot rating and misled consumers about our service. Trustpilot must rectify this misrepresentation – for example, by ensuring that once the fraudulent reviews are removed, our overall star rating/TrustScore is recalculated without their damaging impact. (At minimum, please flag or annotate our profile to reflect that a cluster of malicious reviews was posted and has been removed as violating your guidelines, so that viewers understand any sudden changes in the review count or score.)

4. Preservation of all evidence and data related to this matter. This is a formal demand that Trustpilot immediately secure and preserve all relevant records, including identifying information, IP logs, timestamps, account profiles, and any internal correspondence or investigation notes for each of the offending reviews/accounts. This data will be critical for law enforcement and legal proceedings to identify the perpetrators and prove the extent of the coordinated attack. Do not destroy or alter any such records; we will seek full disclosure of this information through legal channels (subpoenas/court orders) and expect that it be preserved intact.

5. Written confirmation to me that the above actions have been taken. I request that Trustpilot’s legal team email me at legionkillfeed@outlook.com to confirm removal of the reviews and compliance with these demands. Given the urgency and the protracted delay thus far, I expect this confirmation within 2 days of this notice (by 8 August 2025). If additional time is needed for technical reasons, you must communicate that promptly – silence or dilatory tactics will not be accepted.

Should Trustpilot fail to fully and promptly comply with the above demands, please be advised that I am prepared to escalate this matter without further notice as follows:

* Legal Proceedings: I will immediately initiate defamation proceedings against Trustpilot in Australia, holding your company accountable as a publisher of these defamatory statements. I am also consulting with counsel in the United Kingdom regarding a parallel action under the UK Defamation Act (given that some of the perpetrators and much of the harm are based there). Additionally, I reserve the right to pursue legal action in Canada and the United States if necessary, either against Trustpilot or in cooperation with authorities to target the individuals involved. Simply put, Trustpilot will be facing multi-jurisdictional litigation for its role in amplifying and perpetuating this defamatory campaign.

* Regulatory Intervention: I will be lodging formal complaints with relevant regulators and consumer protection agencies. In particular, I will notify the European Union consumer protection authorities about Trustpilot’s failure to address obviously fake and harmful reviews (a potential violation of EU regulations and the spirit of the Digital Services Act), and I will file a complaint with the Danish Competition and Consumer Authority (since Trustpilot’s global headquarters is in Denmark). I will likewise be informing the Australian Competition & Consumer Commission (ACCC) and the UK Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) of this situation, as it involves deceptive conduct affecting consumers. These bodies have the power to investigate and sanction platforms that enable misleading or harmful business practices. Trustpilot’s inaction in the face of blatant abuse will be brought to their attention.

* Disclosure of Identities: As noted, I will pursue court orders or other legal mechanisms to compel Trustpilot to disclose all identifying data for the persons behind these defamatory reviews. That includes IP addresses, account metadata, and any and all information you have on “Cunt,” “WARZONE,” “Danny Hayes,” “Robert McDonovan,” and any related accounts. The individuals involved in this conspiracy will not remain anonymous, and Trustpilot will be expected to assist in revealing them (voluntarily or via compulsory process). Your cooperation (or lack thereof) in preserving and producing this evidence will be noted in subsequent legal actions.

* Further Actions: This letter may be shared with the law enforcement agencies and authorities already handling this case in various countries. I will make sure that Trustpilot’s role (and failure to act thus far) is well documented. If needed, I am

prepared to seek injunctive relief from a court to force the removal of the content from your platform, as well as seek damages for the harm caused to my business due to Trustpilot's negligence.

I trust it will not come to the point of litigation and regulatory censure. However, please understand that I am fully committed to protecting my business and reputation. I have given Trustpilot every opportunity to do the right thing and uphold your own guidelines by removing this defamatory material. Your continued refusal or delay will leave me no choice but to proceed with legal action.

This is a final warning. I urge Trustpilot to take it seriously. Swiftly removing the offending reviews and providing the requested assurances will resolve this matter amicably. On the other hand, any further inaction on Trustpilot's part will be interpreted as willful complicity in the defamation, and I will respond accordingly through all available legal avenues.

I appreciate your immediate attention to this extremely serious issue and expect your prompt confirmation of compliance.

Sincerely,

Anthony Brodie

Owner – Legion Killfeed (Sydney, Australia)

Attachments (evidence of complaints already filed with authorities):

* Complaint to Australian eSafety Commissioner – Formal complaint letter dated 4 August 2025 regarding the coordinated online harassment and defamation campaign targeting Legion Killfeed.

* Complaint to Australian Competition & Consumer Commission (ACCC) – Filed August 2025, reporting the false reviews and Trustpilot's facilitation of misleading conduct harming an Australian business.

* Complaint to Thames Valley Police (UK) – Formal report filed with UK police (Thames Valley) in August 2025, concerning the individuals coordinating the harassment (Case ref. 43250388789).

* Complaint to Canadian Law Enforcement – Formal criminal complaint (August 2025) against Brett Jones and accomplices, submitted to Canadian authorities for defamatory libel and harassment.

* Complaint to Meta Platforms, Inc. – Report to Facebook/Meta (4 August 2025) detailing how its platform was used to organize and coordinate the defamation and harassment campaign against Legion Killfeed.

[cid:5beb49eb-f1e8-418c-ad8b-58556d66f1a9]

From: Trustpilot Content Integrity <contentintegrity@trustpilot.com>

Sent: Wednesday, August 6, 2025 9:25 PM

To: Anthony Brodie <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Subject: Flagged review - killfeed.co - Ticket [#36822738](#)

[https://d1pggke3goo8l6.cloudfront.net/10x7HHXvSWyealMGYmoQ_tp-logo-rgb.png]

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 12:25 BST

Hi,

Thank you for your continued correspondence.

We understand your concerns and have carefully reviewed the matters you've raised. Please note the following:

1. Review Moderation and Flagging Process

If you disagree with the outcome of any specific review that has been flagged, you will need to address your concerns directly within the corresponding moderation ticket. We do not take bulk action across multiple reviews unless they are from the same reviewer and clearly violate guidelines collectively.

Each review must be flagged individually through the appropriate category, with any supporting arguments or documentation included in that specific case. As already communicated, the particular review you referenced has been removed for violating our guidelines. Returning to this thread to raise unrelated reviews will not lead to further action—each case must follow its own due process.

2. Submitted Documents

We have reviewed the documents you've shared. At this time, we have no direct communication from the reviewers in question. If you believe the reviews are false or inaccurate, and you have information to support that, we recommend contacting the reviewers directly and resolving the matter externally. These issues are separate from our moderation process, which is focused on guideline compliance, not dispute resolution between parties.

3. Platform Statistics and Misrepresentation Claims

The statistics displayed on your Trustpilot profile are automatically generated based on your account's activity, including the number and outcomes of flagged reviews. They are not editorial in nature and do not indicate wrongdoing by your business. These figures cannot be amended unless an identifiable system error has occurred.

For more information on how TrustScore insights and review statistics work, you may refer to our help article here:

👉 Trustpilot Analytics & TrustScore Insights<https://help.trustpilot.com/s/article/Trustpilot-Analytics-TrustScore-insights?language=en_US>

4. Ongoing Investigations

All flagged reviews are being reviewed thoroughly in accordance with our guidelines. Where violations are found, appropriate actions are taken. We are committed to fair and transparent handling of all moderation cases.

At this point, we have no further comments to add. Should you wish to formally escalate any specific decision, please do so via the appropriate dispute process.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,
Content Integrity Team

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png)

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png)

[<https://www.trustpilot.com/review/trustpilot.com>](https://www.trustpilot.com/review/trustpilot.com)

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png)

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker TRST

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 11:27 BST

And on top of that, I expect a clear, plain, and detailed explanation as to how your system could conceivably allow reviews to be published in the first place that are in direct opposition to the overwhelming majority of genuine customer feedback. My business has received 48 five-star reviews, 1 four-star review, and only 1 one-star review (which should have been

removed months ago for being defamatory). Even your own AI-generated review summary confirms the overwhelmingly positive sentiment:

"Reviewers overwhelmingly had a great experience with this company. Customers appreciate the bot for its features, ease of use, and visually appealing commands. They highlight the promptness and helpfulness of the support team in resolving issues. Many reviewers emphasize that the bot enhances their server and praise its configuration options. Consumers also underline the dedication and proficiency of the developers, noting that the bot's functionality has exceeded expectations. The killfeed's aesthetics and overall commands are considered superior to those of competitors. The responsiveness and helpfulness of the administrators contribute to a positive user experience."

Given this context, it is incomprehensible that your system would ever permit the publication of reviews that are defamatory, malicious, and entirely inconsistent with the established track record of customer satisfaction, rather than blocking them outright before they could harm my business.

Attachment(s)

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/8g0Ck7RF809j4oElfchWILPX7/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/Etk0TRWyUNzEX4HISqHJqIv3x/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/iN6BOMHxARbyGUXs6Tbq24hIN/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/SKnF6OevblbARf4HXgbdZLUoW/?name=image.png>>

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 11:04 BST

I suggest you stop ignoring the PDFs and remove the rest of these false reviews filled with lies that you unlawfully denied removal of, lied about the status of and still continue to host them on your platform

[cid:79d78b4f-6c90-4623-835f-2f57370fd3cf]

[cid:4549ec86-9a1b-44d3-aace-b727c777f0f7]

[cid:aafa018f-078e-4f5d-93a0-9199a76fec64]

Additionally, I demand that you immediately remove or amend these statistics, as they misrepresent the situation and wrongly portray my business as having acted improperly. These figures fail to reflect that my reports were made in response to unlawful reviews, and that it was your platform that failed to address legitimate support requests and uphold the law. The display must be updated to ensure it does not imply that my business engaged in any wrongdoing, when in fact the failure lies entirely with Trustpilot's handling of these cases.

[cid:4b6c68f4-c0ba-45f4-9a7e-fc11f6799e28]

Attachment(s)

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/DOOxDucPbcdxXQh8ojcvy3pQr/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/k4YddZhGECDVnoMblwCpnF0J7/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/UgtDplmd6zMACOjQc91ylu2g3/?name=image.png>>

image.png<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/YafUs3MPFESiA6CAb5XSRcc5u/?name=image.png>>

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 10:52 BST

Maybe I would be a little less prone to anger if you had of respected me and my business and not hosted slander illegally

I definitely would have been less prone to swearing had it not taken 18 GODDAMN emails to get a response. So you treat me with respect and I will do the same, but so far, I have endured several days of damages to my revenue stream based on your unlawful behaviour, so if I call you stupid, maybe you shouldn't have been stupid.

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 10:49 BST

Hi,

We must ask that you immediately cease using abusive and offensive language in your communications with our team. We do not tolerate any form of harassment or abuse, and such behavior is entirely unacceptable.

Please be advised that the review in question has already been filtered for violating our content guidelines, as it contained harmful content. We encourage you to check the current status of the review before contacting us with further complaints.

We remain committed to supporting all our users fairly and professionally. However, ongoing abuse may result in restrictions on future communication.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,
Content Integrity Team

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png)

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png)

[<https://www.trustpilot.com/review/trustpilot.com>](https://www.trustpilot.com/review/trustpilot.com)

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png)

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker TRST

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 10:21 BST

That's because the information is on the review they gave a competitor, 5 stars with a request for help VS a slanderous attack from someone not in our system.

Who you, have allowed to slander my business, who you cannot provide any verifiable proof of any payment from at all? You do understand how ridiculously stupid you are being correct?

Now open and read the fucking attached PDF files you fucking previous have been send in 18 emails you stupid cunt.

[cid:c6bfc7df-eee2-4221-9ae2-0fcfc679cf61]

Attachment(s)

redacted.txt<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/dnauZRKz9EObQtR20uQ1NWTfG/?name=redacted.txt>>

redacted.txt<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/JskACzaAmSbu3rxD8D1SZITy0/?name=redacted.txt>>

redacted.txt<<https://trustpilotcompliance.zendesk.com/attachments/token/6SNjRP9Diw4cqpsRIBWAaLICa/?name=redacted.txt>>

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 10:16 BST

Hi Anthony Brodie,

Thanks for your inquiry about the review<<https://businessapp.b2b.trustpilot.com/reviews/688be04caeacae9cc58c81cb>> by WARZONE, which you flagged for being about a different business.

The decision

We've now read the review and found nothing to suggest it's for another business, so we won't be taking further action.

Please keep in mind that we don't remove a review just because it's non-specific and doesn't mention your business's name.

Engage with the reviewer

If you still think that the review wasn't meant for your business, here's what you can do:

- * You can reply to this review<<https://help.trustpilot.com/s/article/How-to-reply-to-reviews>> and engage in an open conversation. Replies appear alongside the review, so readers get the full picture from both a company's and reviewer's point of view.
- * You could request information<<https://help.trustpilot.com/s/article/How-to-request-information-from-reviewers>> from the reviewer to find out more about them and their experience with your business.
- * Keep in mind that a reviewer with a genuine experience may not have bought anything. They could have made contact with your business in another way<<https://help.trustpilot.com/s/article/Who-can-write-a-review-and-when>>.

If you have any further questions, let us know by replying to this email.

Thanks,

Neenu D,

Content Integrity Team

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/logo.png)

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/newsletter/en-GB/1/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/stars%402x.png)

<<https://www.trustpilot.com/review/trustpilot.com>>

[\[https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png\]](https://emailsignature.trustpilot.com/signature/en-US/2/46d6a890000064000500e0c3/text_zendesk.png)

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker TRST

Visit Trustpilot<<http://www.trustpilot.com>> | Help Center<<http://support.trustpilot.com>> | Trustpilot Privacy Policy<<http://legal.trustpilot.com/end-user-privacy-terms>> | Dispute our Decision<[---

Trustpilot A/S](https://trustpilot-help.zendesk.com/hc/requests/new?ticket_form_id=20760979389597&tf_4485399523985=decision_dispute_process_form___user_role___business&tf_4485409281297=36822738&tf_20921283130013=36822738&tf_28223032=killfeed.co&tf_28203981=https://www.trustpilot.com/users/connect?redirect=/reviews/688be04caeacae9cc58c81cb/edit&token=eyJhbGciOiJIUzI1NiIsInR5cCI6IkpXVCIsImtpZCI6InYyln0.eyJ0eXBlljoiQ29uc3VtZXliLCJwYXIsb2Fkljpw7ImNvbnN1bWVvSWWQiOiI2ODgyYTA3ZjY1MTI1ZWQzYWYyO...></p></div><div data-bbox=)

Pilestraede 58, 5th floor, 1112 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Company no. 30276582

[43KJ2R-791JN]

image.png

Coordinated Harrassment.pdf

EuropeanOmbudsman EU Agency for Cybersecurity2.png

EuropeanOmbudsman EU Agency for Cybersecurity.png

DumbedDownForTrustPilot.png

Complaint_to_Danish_Consumer_Authority_Detailed.pdf

Report an issue affecting your business · ACCC_redacted.pdf

Submitted-Brett-Jones.pdf

Formal Criminal Complaint to Canadian Authorities Brett Jone.pdf

Formal Complaint to the eSafety Commissioner – Coordinated International Harassment and Defamation C.pdf

Formal Complaint to Thames Valley Police.pdf

Attachment(s)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 12:25 BST

Hi,

Thank you for your continued correspondence.

We understand your concerns and have carefully reviewed the matters you've raised. Please note the following:

1. Review Moderation and Flagging Process

If you disagree with the outcome of any specific review that has been flagged, you will need to address your concerns directly within the corresponding moderation ticket. We do not take bulk action across multiple reviews unless they are from the **same reviewer** and clearly violate guidelines collectively.

Each review must be flagged individually through the appropriate category, with any supporting arguments or documentation included in that specific case. As already communicated, the particular review you referenced has been **removed** for violating our guidelines. Returning to this thread to raise unrelated reviews will not lead to further action—each case must follow its own due process.

2. Submitted Documents

We have reviewed the documents you've shared. At this time, we have **no direct communication** from the reviewers in question. If you believe the reviews are false or inaccurate, and you have information to support that, we recommend contacting the reviewers directly and resolving the matter externally. These issues are separate from our moderation process, which is focused on guideline compliance, not dispute resolution between parties.

3. Platform Statistics and Misrepresentation Claims

The statistics displayed on your Trustpilot profile are automatically generated based on your account's activity, including the number and outcomes of flagged reviews. They are not editorial in nature and do not indicate wrongdoing by your business. These figures cannot be amended unless an identifiable system error has occurred.

For more information on how TrustScore insights and review statistics work, you may refer to our help article here:

👉 [Trustpilot Analytics & TrustScore Insights](#)

4. Ongoing Investigations

All flagged reviews are being reviewed thoroughly in accordance with our guidelines. Where violations are found, appropriate actions are taken. We are committed to fair and transparent handling of all moderation cases.

At this point, we have no further comments to add. Should you wish to formally escalate any specific decision, please do so via the appropriate dispute process.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,
Content Integrity Team



We are rated **4.4** out of 5

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 11:27 BST

And on top of that, I expect a clear, plain, and detailed explanation as to how your system could conceivably allow reviews to be published in the first place that are in direct opposition to the overwhelming majority of genuine customer feedback. My business has received 48 five-star reviews, 1 four-star review, and only 1 one-star review (which should have been removed months ago for being defamatory). Even your own AI-generated review summary confirms the overwhelmingly positive sentiment:

“Reviewers overwhelmingly had a great experience with this company. Customers appreciate the bot for its features, ease of use, and visually appealing commands. They highlight the promptness and helpfulness of the support team in resolving issues. Many reviewers emphasize that the bot enhances their server and praise its configuration options. Consumers also underline the dedication and proficiency of the developers, noting that the bot's functionality has exceeded expectations. The killfeed's aesthetics and overall commands are considered superior to those of competitors. The responsiveness and helpfulness of the administrators contribute to a positive user experience.”

Given this context, it is incomprehensible that your system would ever permit the publication of reviews that are defamatory, malicious, and entirely inconsistent with the established track record of customer satisfaction, rather than blocking them outright before they could harm my business.

Attachment(s)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 11:04 BST

I suggest you stop ignoring the PDFs and remove the rest of these false reviews filled with lies that you unlawfully denied removal of, lied about the status of and still continue to host them on your platform

[cid:79d78b4f-6c90-4623-835f-2f57370fd3cf]

[cid:4549ec86-9a1b-44d3-aace-b727c777f0f7]

[cid:aafa018f-078e-4f5d-93a0-9199a76fec64]

Additionally, I demand that you immediately remove or amend these statistics, as they misrepresent the situation and wrongly portray my business as having acted improperly. These figures fail to reflect that my reports were made in response to unlawful reviews, and that it was your platform that failed to address legitimate support requests and uphold the law. The display must be updated to ensure it does not imply that my business engaged in any wrongdoing, when in fact the failure lies entirely with Trustpilot's handling of these cases.

[cid:4b6c68f4-c0ba-45f4-9a7e-fc11f6799e28]

Attachment(s)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 10:52 BST

Maybe I would be a little less prone to anger if you had of respected me and my business and not hosted slander illegally

I definitely would have been less prone to swearing had it not taken 18 GODDAMN emails to get a response. So you treat me with respect and I will do the same, but so far, I have endured several days of damages to my revenue stream based on your unlawful behaviour, so if I call you stupid, maybe you shouldn't have been stupid.

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 10:49 BST

Hi,

We must ask that you immediately cease using abusive and offensive language in your communications with our team. We do not tolerate any form of harassment or abuse, and such behavior is entirely unacceptable.

Please be advised that the review in question has already been **filtered** for violating our content guidelines, as it contained harmful content. We encourage you to **check the current status** of the review before contacting us with further complaints.

We remain committed to supporting all our users fairly and professionally. However, ongoing abuse may result in restrictions on future communication.

Kind regards,

Neenu D,

Content Integrity Team



We are rated **4.4** out of **5**

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

Anthony Brodie

6 Aug 2025, 10:21 BST

That's because the information is on the review they gave a competitor, 5 stars with a request for help VS a slanderous attack from someone not in our system.

Who you, have allowed to slander my business, who you cannot provide any verifiable proof of any payment from at all? You do understand how ridiculously stupid you are being correct?

Now open and read the fucking attached PDF files you fucking previous have been send in 18 emails you stupid cunt.

[cid:c6bfc7df-eee2-4221-9ae2-0fcfc679cf61]

Attachment(s)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

[redacted.txt](#)

Neenu D (Trustpilot Content Integrity)

6 Aug 2025, 10:16 BST

Hi Anthony Brodie,

Thanks for your inquiry about the [review](#) by WARZONE, which you flagged for being about a different business.

The decision

We've now read the review and found nothing to suggest it's for another business, so we won't be taking further action.

Please keep in mind that we don't remove a review just because it's non-specific and doesn't mention your business's name.

Engage with the reviewer

If you still think that the review wasn't meant for your business, here's what you can do:

- You can [reply to this review](#) and engage in an open conversation. Replies appear alongside the review, so readers get the full picture from both a company's and reviewer's point of view.
- You could [request information](#) from the reviewer to find out more about them and their experience with your business.
- Keep in mind that a reviewer with a genuine experience may not have bought anything. They could have made contact with your business in [another way](#).

If you have any further questions, let us know by replying to this email.

Thanks,

Neenu D,
Content Integrity Team



We are rated **4.4** out of **5**

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

[Visit Trustpilot](#) | [Help Center](#) | [Trustpilot Privacy Policy](#) | [Dispute our Decision](#)

Trustpilot A/S
Pilestraede 58, 5th floor, 1112 Copenhagen K, Denmark
Company no. 30276582

Email Headers (Raw)

X-Mozilla-Status	0001
X-Mozilla-Status2	00000000
Received	from SL2P216MB1357.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:101:13::10) by SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM with HTTPS; Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:29 +0000
Received	from DUZPR01CA0292.eurprd01.prod.exchangelabs.com (2603:10a6:10:4b7::14) by SL2P216MB1357.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:101:13::10) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9052.8; Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:25 +0000
Received	from DU6PEPF0000A7DF.eurprd02.prod.outlook.com (2603:10a6:10:4b7:cafe::5a) by DUZPR01CA0292.outlook.office365.com (2603:10a6:10:4b7::14) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9031.20 via Frontend Transport; Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:17 +0000
Authentication-Results	spf=pass (sender IP is 188.172.137.52) smtp.mailfrom=trustpilot.com; dkim=pass (signature was verified) header.d=trustpilot.com;dmarc=pass action=none header.from=trustpilot.com;compauth=pass reason=100
Received-SPF	Pass (protection.outlook.com: domain of trustpilot.com designates 188.172.137.52 as permitted sender) receiver=protection.outlook.com; client-ip=188.172.137.52; helo=mta-out7.pod29.euw1.zdsys.com; pr=C
Received	from mta-out7.pod29.euw1.zdsys.com (188.172.137.52) by DU6PEPF0000A7DF.mail.protection.outlook.com (10.167.8.36) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9052.8 via Frontend Transport; Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:23 +0000
X-IncomingTopHeaderMarker	OriginalChecksum:7DE7471FC8ECACE352BDBA166E8DE8AB5990C0185843DA423707D51E30F27D0B;UpperCasedChecksum:BAE48CD40C00AB690F46EF84800BEDF54B9A1762670FD87F29E594DEF4ACB709;SizeAsReceived:2473;Count:19
Received	from zendesk.com (unknown [127.0.0.6]) by mta-out15.pod29.euw1.zdsys.com (Zendesk) with ESMTP id d1b996a8-fd0b-4929-9fff-0c1ca6182dc3 for <Brodies@REDACTED.email>; Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:23 +0000 (UTC)
Date	Sat, 16 Aug 2025 03:28:22 +0000
From	Trustpilot Content Integrity <contentintegrity@trustpilot.com>
Reply-To	Trustpilot Content Integrity <contentintegrity@trustpilot.com>
To	Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Message-ID	<43KJ2R791JN_689ffad69a590_c2157833000fd_sprut@zendesk.com>
In-Reply-To	<SL2P216MB202919DD1C652440F0A780BADA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <43KJ2R791JN_68976a9f8aef1_48159091890ac_sprut@zendesk.com>
References	<43KJ2R791JN@zendesk.com> <43KJ2R791JN_689325227e044_5415a02232e_sprut@zendesk.com> <43KJ2R791JN_68931d63bbc20_8415a0153772_sprut@zendesk.com> <43KJ2R791JN_68933bb016235_9a15a017125b_sprut@zendesk.com> <SL2P216MB202919DD1C652440F0A780BADA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>> <SL2P216MB2029B4062F41E8494B0D09A3DA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>; <SL2P216MB202997CD44FFB9B870A2752DDA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <SL2P216MB2029EA977969D6D600594A39DA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <SL2P216MB20290F76D378D1C035BA74B5DA2DA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <SL2P216MB2029F7C7A47A151ED43AE957DA2EA@SL2P216MB2029.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
Subject	Flagged review - killfeed.co - Ticket #36822738
Content-Type	multipart/alternative; boundary="---=_mimepart_689ffad6e8f58_c21578330014d"; charset="utf-8"
Content-Transfer-Encoding	7bit
X-Delivery-Context	event-id-29628893331869
Auto-Submitted	auto-generated
X-Auto-Response-Suppress	All
X-Mailer	Zendesk Mailer
X-Zendesk-From-Account-Id	a559393
X-Zendesk-Email-Id	01K2REQJZWY91F3KZ86GN2VQ3N
DKIM-Signature	v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed; d=trustpilot.com; q=dns/txt; s=zendesk1; t=1755314903; bh=N4Jq0n7t2YDTjR8/qZIOjdbHW7jiAiAmzbXlwuROneI=; h=date:from:reply-to:to:message-id:in-reply-to:references:subject:mime-version:content-type:content-transfer-encoding; b=oCyj3OK+4a1MS8bgXJLiJdU+J0ON4fhWkmBL48j+ZerlV TwUIYshqhRni3FaGai/A6gsJBNUeYFhnsvTDMxKdqIA6+fOOlInbvmr7xi8VUBIVqbeUA+2wmaLN3rNKPQesglwi wI/GipL/cDwHxb3sAxVarfq/tfXOOdUj+uiPwldOMwAKgCoU6RR3w7QiHQ+BqO1JFSdJlJjmmMMpMpwF4A2XhY/h GKgoGZTF7RwA1dHu8CEplTNZanlDQity8jUMTVK/5ebZ5rIFQFGXdANwAcuqRRgtnbzbO4cVOh9pSgNXhteZxh6 451orYGwO39Dwv55oKtenSepMrl4P37uA==
X-IncomingHeaderCount	19
Return-Path	contentintegrity@trustpilot.com
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTime	16 Aug 2025 03:28:23.4252 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTimeReason	OriginalSubmit
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationInterval	1:00:00:00.0000000
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationIntervalReason	OriginalSubmit
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-Network-Message-Id	8953ba28-c2c4-4db6-c9d0-08dddc74f495

X-EOPAttributedMessage	0
X-EOPTenantAttributedMessage	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa:0
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-MessageDirectionality	Incoming
X-MS-PublicTrafficType	Email
X-MS-TrafficTypeDiagnostic	DU6PEPF0000A7DF:EE_JSL2P216MB1357:EE_JSL2P216MB2029:EE_
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthSource	DU6PEPF0000A7DF.eurprd02.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-UserLastLogonTime	8/16/2025 2:15:02 AM
X-MS-Office365-Filtering-Correlation-Id	8953ba28-c2c4-4db6-c9d0-08dddc74f495
X-MS-Exchange-EOPDirect	true
X-Sender-IP	188.172.137.52
X-SID-PRA	CONTENTINTEGRITY@TRUSTPILOT.COM
X-SID-Result	PASS
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL	1
X-Microsoft-Antispam	BCL:3;ARA:1444111002 21080799006 9000799050 10300799035 1680799057 9400799033 461199028 3412199025 4302099013 440099028 24122799003 1602099012 1370799030 1360799030 1380799030 56899033;
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-OriginalArrivalTime	16 Aug 2025 03:28:23.3144 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Network-Message-Id	8953ba28-c2c4-4db6-c9d0-08dddc74f495
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Id	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthSource	DU6PEPF0000A7DF.eurprd02.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-FromEntityHeader	Internet
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-RMS-PersistedConsumerOrg	00000000-0000-0000-0000-000000000000
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-CrossTenantHeadersStamped	SL2P216MB1357
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-EndToEndLatency	00:00:06.3867085
X-MS-Exchange-Processed-By-BccFoldering	15.20.9052.000
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Mailbox-Delivery	ucf:1;jmr:0;ex:0;auth:1;dest:C;OFR:CustomRules;ENG:(5062000311)(920221119095)(90000117)(920221120095)(90011020)(91015020)(91040095)(9050020)(9060121)(9081003)(9100341)(944500132)(4810010)(4910033)(9930004)(9545005)(10172021)(9320005)(120001);
X-Message-Delivery	VJ0xLJE7dXM9MDtsPTA7YT0wO0Q9MTtHRD0xO1NDTD0tMQ==
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Message-Info	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 G5kl61PT2fEs9JAmMK2bE94BncPpgXqoxEKzmwn7GKk0lZkLPqYx7fPTTh48hUi/Ga3PIfo+qEzleFtkhUk9P6lDt5Uxxz+XdE/TsnT5/XB7jkz2YaizEhTrvx9eaCMg3+EY5AIPcC6mQKUmzgRMErgjntdR8dUd1kp6sQYrYa3LikefT2Y0PBVY7lKT0ZSQdlgcBe1hjVpR2g+dEtEXueGQYCRV3plxNdhvW6dxzjEztVu1A4Yo9RV8traOv5mfoB7sui/t6BSWwUf5GFtWDCAnaVpaP1AMn9ipFFHfhHcE1i2mJJ0eRH4Aw0oatKxyEDkr3rrE0k9iPeDONmwaoQHOFQB4Nl 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
MIME-Version	1.0