

From: Soul Legion <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]
Date: Wed, 03 Dec 2025 23:35:09 +1100

Hi Gowtham,

Thanks for your reply, but it still does not address the actual issue.

Your explanation of the internal flagging workflow does not change the simple facts:

- This review
"Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs profession help."
Reference: Hooded_saw

has been continuously visible on my profile to the public.
- You have already assessed it multiple times under different categories and decided, more than once, to keep it published.

For this single review, your own history now shows:

- 3 days ago: "Investigation complete: The review doesn't breach our guidelines for: hate speech or discrimination."
- Today: "Investigation complete: The review doesn't breach our guidelines for: being about a different business."

In other words, this is not a case where you are waiting for the right flag reason. You have already:

- rejected a flag that it is hate speech / discrimination (which is your own harassment category), and
- rejected a flag that it is even about the correct business, despite the text clearly targeting me personally by name ("Soul") and being attached to my listing.

On top of that, you have my emails explicitly stating that this is unlawful defamation and disability based harassment under Australian law. So in legal terms, you have already rejected it for harassment and defamation too. Your system history is now a clear record of repeated decisions to keep publishing it.

Whether you say "we never removed or republished it" is legally irrelevant. In defamation law, what matters is that you:

- know about the content,
- know that it has been alleged to be unlawful, and
- continue to host and display it to new readers.

Every time you conclude "investigation complete – no breach", you are confirming that publication with actual knowledge of the complaint. Your own email confirms that these are "one continuous moderation case", which means each refusal to act is part of a single, ongoing decision to keep it live.

You already know:

- I am an individual Australian small business owner (well under 10 employees).
- The words "Rude, unwilling to help" and "Soul needs profession help" are attached to my Trustpilot profile and presented as a trusted review to potential customers.
- They carry imputations that I am professionally incompetent and that I am mentally unwell or unstable and therefore unfit to operate my business.

Under the uniform Defamation Acts, that is classic defamation of an individual and an excluded corporation. Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth), using an imputed mental illness as an insult in the course of providing services to an Australian user is disability based harassment, not "robust opinion".

You also know this is not an isolated review. I have already told you that:

- I maintain a structured harassment dossier of more than 1,498 evidence files (emails, screenshots, PDFs, logs, payment records) across Discord, Facebook/Meta, Reddit and Trustpilot, covering 2019 to 2025.
- That dossier shows a coordinated, competitor driven campaign, with Trustpilot acting as a central amplification point through review bombing, quiet reinstatements, and refusal to act on clearly abusive content once notified.
- Your emails, ticket logs and the moderation history for this review are already indexed in that chronology and will form part of any eventual proceedings.

So you are not dealing with a simple guideline query. You are dealing with a review you have:

- been on notice about since the first flag,
- re assessed multiple times under different guideline categories, and
- nonetheless chosen to keep publishing, despite being told in plain language that it is unlawful defamation and disability based harassment and that it sits inside one of the most comprehensively documented multi platform defamation cases you are likely to see.

At this point, the position is straightforward:

- Your internal guideline labels do not override Australian law.
- Your "we only assess for the reason selected" rule does not protect you once you are on notice that the content is alleged to be illegal. You now have more than enough information to act without any further drop down selections from me.

Again, I require that you:

1. Reopen and overturn the decisions that the Hooded_saw review is acceptable, including your findings under both "hate speech or discrimination" and "being about a different business".
2. Remove the review in full on the basis that it is defamatory and constitutes disability based harassment, not merely as a discretionary removal "at the business's request".

3. Record on my internal file that Trustpilot has been expressly told it is already central to a potential multi platform defamation action supported by a 1,498 file evidence base.
4. Confirm, in writing, what concrete changes you will make so that reviews using mental health as an insult, in the context of a documented harassment campaign, are no longer treated by Trustpilot as compliant content.

You now cannot credibly say this is a misunderstanding about flag types. If you continue to publish this review in its current form, it will be treated as a deliberate decision to keep clearly abusive and unlawful material online with full knowledge of the consequences.

Regards,
Anthony Brodie (Soul)
Legion Killfeed

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 03, 2025 11:30 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

Hi,

Thank you for your message. We appreciate you reaching out and we understand your concerns regarding the status of the flagged review.

To clarify, when a review is flagged, this **does not remove, hide, or republish the content** in any way. The review simply enters our **standard investigation process**, where our team assesses it according to the specific guideline category it was reported under.

All assessments made on the same flagged review are handled as part of **one continuous moderation case**. This means there is **no point in the process where Trustpilot republishes the review**—it remains in its original state while the investigation is ongoing.

If you believe the review should be evaluated under a **different guideline category**, or if you have **additional information** that may help support the case, please feel free to share it with us. We will ensure that any new details are reviewed carefully as part of the ongoing assessment.

If you have any further questions, we are always here to help.

Kind regard

Gowtham



See our reviews



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

----- Original Message -----

From: Soul Legion [Brodies@REDACTED.email]
Sent: 03/12/2025 13:18

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: OtherCompany-killfeed.co-Consumer [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

TO BE CLEAR, YOU HAVE BEEN ON NOTICE FOR THIS REVIEW SINCE THE FIRST TIME IT WAS FLAGGED AND EVERY RESPONSE AFTER THAT IS TREATED AS REPUBLICATION.

From: Soul Legion <Brodiess@REDACTED.email>

Sent: Wednesday, 3 December 2025 10:54 PM

To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>

Subject: Re: OtherCompany-killfeed.co-Consumer [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

I don't give a fuck about your flagging paths, for the third time, it breaks the law. Your guildlines can suck a dick they aren't superior to law.

Please treat this as a further escalation of your decision that the review:

"Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs profession help."

Reference: Hooded_saw

"doesn't breach" your guidelines for hate speech or discrimination.

I am an individual Australian small-business owner. You are not looking at this in isolation. By this point you already know:

- you have been repeatedly put on formal notice about false, defamatory reviews on my profile
- you have been provided with extensive legal context under Australian law
- you hold, on your own systems, a long history of removed and then quietly reinstated defamatory reviews about me and my business
- you have been given a detailed cross-platform chronology of the harassment campaign that your platform is actively amplifying.

You are therefore not making a naïve or first-time moderation error. You are continuing publication with actual knowledge of the wider defamation and harassment context.

1. You already have actual knowledge of the defamation and harassment

Over the last year you have:

- Removed and then reinstated demonstrably false "scam" and "deletes your server" reviews after I provided transaction logs and technical evidence.
- Received a formal cease and desist notice prohibiting republication of specific defamatory material, which you then ignored by reinstating that same content.
- Been given detailed references to how these reviews are coordinated with Facebook posts, Discord harassment, and Reddit threads, all tied to the same small group of competitors.

Separately from your internal records, I maintain a structured harassment dossier of 1,498+ evidence files (emails, screenshots, PDFs, logs, payment records) across Discord, Facebook/Meta, Reddit and Trustpilot that tracks this campaign from 2019 to November 2025. That material already documents your role as a central amplification point for this defamation and your repeated decisions to republish content you know has been challenged, disproven, or already removed. the-chronological-timeline

In other words, you cannot realistically claim you are unaware of the broader pattern or of the legal issues. You have constructive and actual knowledge and you keep choosing to continue publication.

2. Why this particular review is unlawful defamation and disability-based harassment

The words:

"Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs profession help."

are not a good-faith assessment of a transaction. They carry clear imputations that:

- I am professionally incompetent and deliberately "unwilling to help" customers.
- I am mentally unwell or unstable and therefore unfit to operate my business ("needs professional help"), using mental health as an insult.

Under the Australian uniform Defamation Acts, a publication is defamatory if it tends to lower a person in the estimation of ordinary members of the community or causes others to shun or avoid them. This is exactly what is happening when you attach that text to my business listing and present it as a trusted review to potential customers.

For a very small business (well under 10 employees), this is not shielded by "opinion" or "robust criticism". It is a damaging, factual-sounding attack on my competence and my mental health.

You also cannot ignore the disability angle. The Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth) defines "disability" to include mental disorders and also disabilities that are imputed to a person. Saying or implying that someone "needs professional help" in a mental health context and using that as a way to disparage them is harassment based on an imputed mental disability in the course of you providing services in Australia. Treating that as acceptable "non-hate" content is not consistent with that framework.

3. Your ongoing publication after notice makes you a publisher in law

The High Court in *Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd v Voller* confirmed that a platform that facilitates and encourages third-party comments can be treated as a publisher for defamation once it has knowledge of the content and fails to remove it.

You:

- run the profile, solicit and display reviews, send review invites and monetise the traffic
- have been directly notified that the review is defamatory and discriminatory
- have detailed evidence of a wider, coordinated defamation campaign targeting me

- have been repeatedly notified that your decisions are already the subject of regulatory complaints and legal preparation.

The combination of those facts and your refusal to remove the review moves this firmly into “knowing publication” territory.

4. This is part of one of the most comprehensively documented multi-platform defamation cases you are likely to see

The harassment against me is not speculative or loosely recorded. It is documented in:

- over 1,498 catalogued evidence files spanning 2019–2025
- a fully cross-referenced chronology showing how Facebook posts, Discord messages, Reddit threads and Trustpilot reviews echo the same fabricated narratives
- financial records that show a nearly 50% revenue crash directly linked to the timing of your review bombing and reinstatements. the-chronological-timeline

Trustpilot is already at the center of this. Your emails, ticket logs and moderation decisions are preserved and will form part of any eventual court record. At this point, continuing to affirm that a mental-health-based personal attack “doesn’t breach our guidelines” despite all of the above looks less like error and more like reckless disregard.

When this proceeds as a multi-platform defamation and misleading conduct case, your ongoing publication after repeated notice will be a key focus. You are making that risk worse every time you double down on decisions like this one.

5. What I require from you now

Given all of this, I am asking you to:

1. Reopen and overturn the decision that the Hooded_saw review is acceptable.
2. Remove that review in full and record that it was removed for defamation and disability-based harassment, not merely “at the business’s request”.
3. Note explicitly on my internal file that Trustpilot has been put on notice that it is already central to a potential large-scale defamation action arising out of a coordinated cross-platform harassment campaign.
4. Confirm, in writing, what changes you will make to ensure that reviews which deploy mental health as an insult and form part of an abuse campaign are not treated as compliant in future.

For completeness, relevant law and guidance again:

- Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) – see sections 9 and 10A on who can sue and the serious harm requirement: <https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/html/inforce/current/act-2005-077>
- Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth) – definition of “disability” including imputed mental disability: <https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/C2022C00087>

- Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) and eSafety adult cyber abuse scheme:
<https://www.esafety.gov.au/key-topics/adult-cyber-abuse>
- Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd v Voller [2021] HCA 27 (publisher liability for third-party comments after notice):
https://www.hcourt.gov.au/cases/case_s192-2019

You now cannot credibly say you do not understand the legal issues or the scale of the evidence. If you continue to publish this review in its current form, you are doing so with your eyes open.

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 December 2025 10:53 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: OtherCompany-killfeed.co-Consumer [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

Hi Anthony Brodie,

Thanks for your inquiry about the review by Consumer.

We've assessed the review and found that it doesn't go against our [guidelines](#) for the reason you flagged it. Therefore, we won't be taking further action related to this reason.

If you don't recognize the reviewer or you don't think they've had a genuine experience with your business, please note that you need to request information from the reviewer before we can assess the review. Just follow these steps:

1. [Request information](#) from the reviewer via your Business account.
2. As soon as the reviewer replies, or if 3 days pass without a reply, a new flagging option will become available to you: "*Not based on a genuine experience*". You can flag the review for this reason.

As a reminder, we only assess a review for the reason it was flagged. And please keep in mind that [an experience](#) is not limited to purchasing a product or placing an order.

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

Thanks,

Trustpilot



Email Headers (Raw)

[illegible]