

Re: [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqlVgYTI2NNAGA::]

From Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Date Fri 05-Dec-25 5:00 AM

To Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>; Trustpilot Legal <legal@trustpilot.com>; Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>

4 attachments (3 MB)

2025-11-29-lihou2451.pdf; 2025-11-29-lihou2451-hooded.png; 2025-11-29-lihou2451-TICKET.png; 2025-11-29-lihou2451-PUBLIC.png;

Subject: Case 00697534 – Notice of continuing publication of disability-based defamation (Hooded_saw review)

Hi Megha,

Thank you for your recent emails confirming that case **00697534** is considered "closed" and that the review:

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

Reference: **Hooded_saw**

will remain online.

This reply sets out:

1. Why that wording is disability-based harassment and plainly defamatory.
2. The full factual chronology from my Discord server (ticket, public chat and DMs), including timestamps and server status.
3. How your moderation history makes Trustpilot a knowing publisher.
4. What I am now requiring from Trustpilot.

For context I refer to three attachments I have already prepared:

- Attachment A: 2025-11-29-lihou2451-PUBLIC.png (public chat).
- Attachment B: 2025-11-29-lihou2451-TICKET.png (support ticket, screenshot captured 5 December 2025, 1:53am AEDT).
- Attachment C: 2025-11-29-lihou2451-hooded.png (DM with "Hooded_saw").

1. Why this is disability-based harassment, not a normal "opinion" review

In ordinary English, telling someone they "need professional help" is widely understood as claiming they are mentally ill or unstable and require psychiatric or psychological treatment. That is not a comment about product features or response times. It is a statement about my mental health. Under Australian law, mental illness, and even an imputed mental illness, is treated as a form of disability. Using mental health as an insult in the context of providing services to Australian users is disability-based harassment, not harmless "opinion".

Your platform is not just reporting neutral customer feedback. You are publishing a sentence that combines:

- a mental health slur ("Soul needs professional help"), with
- assertions about my conduct as a provider ("Rude, unwilling to help"),

and attaching it directly to my business listing.

2. Why the review is plainly defamatory

Australian defamation law asks whether words would tend to:

- lower a person in the estimation of ordinary members of the community, or
- cause others to shun or avoid them.

Attached to my Trustpilot profile, the review:

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

clearly carries these imputations:

- I am professionally incompetent and deliberately unwilling to assist customers; and
- I am mentally unwell or unstable and therefore unfit to operate my business.

These are serious, factual sounding allegations about both my competence and my sanity. They are presented to potential customers as a "trusted" review of a real business.

As the chronology below shows, there is no factual basis for these allegations in the actual interactions. They are neither substantially true nor honest opinion based on proper material. They are simply abusive and misleading.

3. The actual facts: ticket, public chat and DMs

3.1 Who the real customer is (and is not)

- The paying subscriber is **Z Company**, whose Discord account is "**lihou2451**".
- "**Hooded_saw**" (**Frank**) is not the subscriber. He describes himself as an "admin" and friend. He has never been verified as associated with the account holder, never opened his own support ticket, and the account holder never responded to confirm him.
- My support terms are clear: I deal with the **ticket owner** for a subscription, not unverified third parties, so that there is an auditable support history.

Trustpilot is currently treating a non-customer's retaliatory comment as if it were a straightforward customer review.

3.2 My support system and the no-DM rule

In my Discord support server (see Attachment B):

- All assistance is handled through structured **ticket channels** created by my bot.
- The support panel explicitly instructs users **not to DM staff or my personal account** for support.
- This keeps all support in one logged place, avoids disputes about what was said, and ensures consistent treatment for all customers.

Despite that, the friend repeatedly ignored this and tried to conduct the dispute via DMs instead of using the ticket like everyone else.

3.3 The ticket: server running, customer not responding

(Attachment B - ticket; screenshot taken 5 December 2025, 1:53am AEDT)

On **29 November 2025**, my bot opened **#lihou2451-ticket** for Z Company. The bot and I:

- asked for a detailed description of the issue,
- requested screenshots or error messages, and
- asked which server it related to.

My diagnostic command in that ticket shows:

- "Z Company Server is online", and
- all feeds configured and responding.

Immediately under that, my message asks:

"Do you have logs where you can show this?"

The embed below that message shows:

- "Last Processed Line: 18:22:53 | ####", and
- "Last Msg Sent at 6 days ago" with a hover that displays the exact datetime **"Saturday 29 November 2025 5:33 AM"**.

To be precise:

- The screenshot was captured on **5 December 2025**, which is why the Discord UI shows "6 days ago".
- The hover text in the screenshot confirms that my last ticket message was at **5:33am AEDT on 29 November 2025**.

By the time the later public chat messages occur that morning:

- I have already posted a detailed, logged response in their ticket at 5:33am, asking for logs and providing the last processed line.
- There is still **no reply at all** from the customer to those questions.

3.4 The public chat complaints instead of using the ticket

(Attachment A - public chat, same morning 29 November 2025)

Instead of replying in the ticket, **lihou2451** comes into my **public** channel and starts complaining that they have "lost the kill feed and hit feed again" and "just need a little help". The log in Attachment A shows that I:

- tell them directly that they **have not responded in the ticket**,
- paste a screenshot of that ticket showing my last unanswered message and the support embed, and
- repeatedly tell them to "just use the ticket" so I can help.

Crucially, in that public chat I **hyperlink the exact ticket channel** - the blue text **"#lihou2451-ticket"** - so all they need to do is click that blue link and type a reply in their own ticket.

They still do not do so.

Instead, they continue posting vague apologies and "I just wanted some assistance" messages in public, while still refusing to answer the specific questions that are sitting in their ticket.

This is happening at around **5 to 6am AEDT**. I had already been awake through the night working and supporting other customers. At that point my choices were:

- stay awake indefinitely moderating someone who refuses to use the proper channel, or
- temporarily stop the public disruption so I can sleep, while leaving the ticket open for a proper reply.

So, as shown in Attachment A:

- I **temporarily mute li hou2451 for one hour in public chat**, explicitly telling him "I'm gonna mute you for an hour and go back to sleep."
- The ticket itself remains open and unchanged, waiting for a substantive reply from him.

He is **not banned**, and I remain fully prepared to resume support as soon as he cooperates with the ticket process like every other customer.

3.5 The friend's DM, the ban, and when I replied

(Attachment C - DM)

Only after all of the above does the friend **"Hooded_saw"** come into the picture.

Attachment C shows:

- At **7:27am on 29 November 2025**, he sends a long DM to me introducing himself as "Frank" from the Netherlands, claiming to be an admin for Z Company, and saying his colleague is a "70-year-old British combat veteran" who loves DayZ.
- In that DM he **admits** that they "overlooked your request for clear information" and acknowledges that I cannot perform my role without the necessary details.
- He then says that if we "are unable to work together" they may move their server funds to a competitor.

At that stage:

- I do **not** reply to him.
- I focus instead on trying to get the actual subscriber, **lihou2451**, to respond in his ticket so I can even verify whether this "admin" is authorised to speak for the account.
- I still receive **no ticket reply at all** from li hou and no confirmation that the friend is staff.

Because the friend is:

- a non-customer,
- repeatedly ignoring the clearly posted no-DM rule, and
- trying to escalate privately while I still cannot verify his authority,

I ultimately ban **"Hooded_saw"** from my Discord **without engaging him in a DM conversation**. That ban is for rule breaches and disruption, not for asking for legitimate help.

Later, after all of this, and after **lihou2451 has left my Discord and cancelled his subscription**, I send **one blunt DM reply** to the friend - the message from me in Attachment C dated **30 November 2025 at 12:23am** - explaining that I cannot support people who repeatedly ignore the ticket system, choose public drama instead, and then send abuse.

Only after my customer has already left and the business relationship is over do I speak to the friend directly in DMs. His immediate response is:

"You are one sorry ass excuse
I'm laughing

Now block me"

That is the **end** of contact with him.

So the correct chronology is:

- I did not engage the friend before banning him.
- I tried repeatedly to get my actual customer to respond in his ticket so I could verify who this "admin" even was.
- Only once they had already left did I send a single DM explaining why I would not be continuing support.

3.6 Subscription status and server runtime

A few more concrete facts:

- At the time of the dispute the **Z Company server is online and functioning**.
- The support embed in the ticket also shows the server's **remaining runtime**. At the time I prepared this evidence bundle the server has a little under **two days of runtime** left in its Nitrado billing period. In other words, they have had the benefit of the service for the period they paid for.
- After the abuse from the friend, I tell **lihou2451** in the ticket that I will **still continue their subscription** if he can respond appropriately within 24 hours with an apology and a proper reply in the ticket.
- I do not cancel his subscription at that point. The choice is left with him.
- Instead of replying or apologising, **lihou2451 leaves my Discord server without any response**. Any cancellation after that comes from their side, not mine.

Throughout the time they remained in my server, I was willing to help, on the simple condition that they use the same ticket system as every other customer.

3.7 Pattern of only using public communication

When you put everything together, a clear pattern appears:

- When invited to respond privately in a logged ticket, **they refuse**.
- Even when I hyperlink their ticket in blue text so it is literally a one click action, **they still refuse**.
- Instead, they prioritise public channels that create visible "evidence" of their complaints:
 - my public Discord chat; and
 - your Trustpilot review platform.

Given the broader harassment campaign I have already documented across Discord, Facebook, Reddit and Trustpilot, it looks very much as if they were primarily interested in **public validation of their grievances**, not fixing any genuine technical problem. If the complaint had truly been about getting their feed working, the simplest possible step would have been to reply once in the ticket that was opened specifically for them.

The way the friend leans on the story of a "70-year-old British combat veteran" also raises a concern. It is unusual for people in that age bracket to be personally renting and configuring private DayZ servers. If li hou is genuinely unable to click his own blue ticket link or type a basic reply, it suggests that the younger "friend" may in fact be the one controlling the account and the complaints, while using the older person's age to add emotional weight.

Either way, the behaviour shown in the logs is not that of a helpless customer ignored by a "rude" provider. It is the behaviour of people who:

- ignore the support system that is there to help them,
- break clear rules about DMs,
- become abusive when boundaries are enforced, and
- then use Trustpilot to retaliate with a disability-based slur.

4. Your moderation history makes Trustpilot a knowing publisher

For this single review you have:

- rejected a flag that it constituted **hate speech or discrimination**,
- rejected a flag that it was **about a different business**,
- stated repeatedly that you will not consider legal arguments about defamation or discrimination and will only act based on your internal guideline categories, and
- after receiving the evidence above, told me again that the review is compliant and that no further response will be given.

At the same time you now hold:

- detailed explanations that the wording is alleged to be **defamatory and disability-based harassment** under Australian law,
- concrete evidence from my Discord server (ticket, public chat, DMs) showing that:
 - the reviewer is a **non-customer**,
 - the "unwilling to help" claim is contradicted by the ticket history, and
 - the "needs professional help" phrase has no factual basis and is purely an insult about mental health, and
- my formal notices that this review sits inside one of the most comprehensively documented multi platform harassment dossiers you are likely to see, with over **1,498 catalogued evidence files**.

In defamation law, what matters is not whether you click a particular button labelled "republish". What matters is that you:

- know about the content,
- know that it is alleged to be unlawful, and
- choose to keep hosting and displaying it to new readers.

Every time you send an "investigation complete - no breach" email, you are confirming publication with actual knowledge of the complaint. Your own wording that these are "one continuous moderation case" means each refusal to act is part of a single, ongoing decision to keep this review live.

That is the situation in which a platform ceases to be an innocent disseminator and becomes a full publisher in law.

5. Wider context: Trustpilot's role in an ongoing harassment campaign

As I have already told you:

- I am an individual Australian small-business owner with well under 10 employees.
- I maintain a structured harassment dossier of more than **1,498 evidence files** (emails, screenshots, PDFs, logs, payment records) covering the period **2019 to 2025**, documenting coordinated attacks across Discord, Facebook, Reddit and Trustpilot.
- Your platform has already:
 - removed and then quietly reinstated demonstrably false "scam" and "deletes your server" reviews after I provided technical and transactional proof,
 - received a formal cease and desist concerning specific defamatory content, and
 - been given examples of how competitors use your reviews to amplify fabricated narratives.

Your emails, internal ticket logs and moderation decisions in this case are being indexed directly into that chronology and will form part of any eventual regulatory or court record.

6. What I now require from Trustpilot

Given all of the above, I again require that you:

1. **Reopen case 00697534** and overturn the decisions that the "Hooded_saw" review is acceptable, including your prior findings under both "hate speech or discrimination" and "reviewing the wrong business".
2. **Remove the review in full**, on the basis that:
 - it is defamatory,
 - it constitutes disability-based harassment, and
 - it is not a genuine customer experience, but a retaliatory comment from a non-customer who breached my support rules and then left.
3. Record on my internal file that Trustpilot has been **explicitly told** it is already central to a potential multi platform defamation and (now) disability harassment action supported by a 1,498 file evidence base.
4. Confirm, in writing, what **concrete changes** you will make so that:
 - are no longer treated by Trustpilot as compliant "freedom of expression".
 - reviews using mental health as an insult,
 - in the context of documented harassment campaigns,
 - and posted by non-customers,

If, after all of this, you still refuse to act, then I require you to confirm in writing that:

- you understand the review targets a named Australian small-business owner,
- you have been given detailed evidence that the wording is alleged to be unlawful defamation and disability-based harassment, and
- you are nonetheless choosing, as a deliberate policy decision, to keep publishing it.

That confirmation, together with this email chain and the attached evidence, will be preserved and may be relied upon in any future complaint to regulators or in any proceedings in which Trustpilot is joined as a publisher.

All rights are reserved.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie ("Soul")

Owner / Developer - Legion Killfeed

P.S. For completeness, I will also note that this is not happening in isolation. In August 2025 your own staff wrote to me stating that Trustpilot did **not** operate under an Australian Business Number, then within days reversed position and claimed to have an ABN and Australian entity all along. You have never properly explained that contradiction. In the same period you threatened to "defend and seek to recover costs" if I issued defamation proceedings, while quietly reinstating and then later removing the "WARZONE" review after previously insisting it would not be taken down – another clear example of republication after notice.

When I offered you a comprehensive evidence archive, you refused to access it, yet you continue to force my business to appear on your platform and demand internal proof that risks exposing customer information. That is why I have been careful about how much context I provide about who individual reviewers claim to be. You are compelling participation, publishing defamatory content, and at the same time asking for material that could compromise my customers' privacy, all against the backdrop of your own unresolved misstatements about your legal status in Australia.

To avoid any further suggestion that "format" or file-type limitations prevent proper review, I am providing the Discord chat logs both as a text-searchable PDF and as the original PNG screenshots, so your team can search the text directly and verify the timestamps for itself.

From: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 11:26 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqIVgYtI2NNAGA::]

Subject: Case 00697534 – Notice of continuing publication of disability-based defamation

Hi Megha,

Thank you for your email regarding case 00697534.

Your response again states that the review:

"Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs professional help"

is neither defamatory nor discriminatory and that it aligns with Trustpilot's guidelines.

At this point you are not simply applying internal guidelines. You are choosing to continue publishing content that:

- targets me by name as a small business owner, and
- links my professional competence to an asserted mental illness ("Soul needs professional help").

1. Why this is disability-based harassment, not a normal "opinion" review

In ordinary English, telling someone they "need professional help" is widely understood as saying they are mentally ill or unstable and need psychiatric or psychological treatment. That is a statement about my mental health, not about your user's experience with my product.

Under the Disability Discrimination Act 1992 (Cth), mental illness is a form of disability, and harassment on the ground of disability in the context of goods, services and facilities is unlawful. The Act specifically makes harassment connected with the provision or use of services unlawful, including online services such as review platforms. ([Australian Human Rights Commission](#))

Your site is not simply recording neutral customer feedback here. It is hosting and republishing a personal attack about my supposed mental state, attached directly to my business listing.

2. Why the review is plainly defamatory

Australian defamation law uses a simple test: would the words tend to lower the person in the estimation of ordinary members of the community or cause others to avoid them. ([Judicial Commission of NSW](#))

Saying that a named sole trader "needs professional help" and is "rude" and "unwilling to help" clearly goes to my fitness to run my business. It suggests I am emotionally or mentally unfit to deal with customers and therefore unsafe or unsuitable to engage.

You have been shown the only communication that ever occurred with this person: the Discord direct messages in my previous email. Those messages contain nothing about mental health, diagnosis, treatment, or anything that could plausibly justify calling me mentally ill. The "professional help" allegation is not criticism based on disclosed true facts; it is an insult about my mental condition.

That means it cannot be justified as:

- a substantially true statement, or

- an honest opinion based on proper factual material,

because there is no factual basis at all for the suggestion that I have a mental illness that requires treatment. It is simply disability-based abuse tied to my business.

3. Why Trustpilot is now legally exposed as a publisher

In Australia, operators of pages and platforms that host third-party comments are treated as publishers for defamation purposes, even when someone else writes the words. The High Court has confirmed that opening a space for user comments can make you liable for any defamatory material in those comments. ([Gilbert + Tobin](#))

Platforms usually rely on the “innocent dissemination” defence. That defence requires that the intermediary:

- did not know the material was defamatory, and
- was not negligent in failing to remove it.

Australian commentary on that defence is clear: once a platform is put on notice that a review may be defamatory, it must act promptly or it risks losing that protection. ([Pentana Stanton Lawyers](#))

In my case, Trustpilot has now:

- received multiple flags and emails expressly identifying this review as both defamation and disability-based harassment;
- been given the full context of my interaction with the reviewer, showing there is no factual basis for the allegation about my mental health;
- repeatedly replied that the review is acceptable “freedom of expression” and that it will remain online; and
- issued “case closed” notices while continuing to display the review to new readers.

In other words, Trustpilot is now publishing this material with actual knowledge of the complaint and after being told that it is unlawful. That makes it very difficult for Trustpilot to argue that you lacked knowledge or acted reasonably if a court later finds that the review is defamatory and discriminatory.

4. Wider context and evidence

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

- I am an individual Australian small-business owner, well under 20 employees.
- I maintain a structured harassment dossier of more than 1,400 evidentiary files across Discord, Facebook/Meta, Reddit and Trustpilot documenting a coordinated competitor-driven campaign.
- Your emails, ticket logs and moderation history around this specific review are being indexed into that chronology and will form part of any eventual regulatory complaint or civil proceedings.

Trustpilot is already at the centre of what is likely to become one of the most comprehensively documented multi-platform defamation and disability-harassment matters in Australia.

5. What I am now requiring

I again require that Trustpilot take one of the following steps:

1. Remove the review in full; or
2. At the absolute minimum, remove the words “Soul needs professional help” so that disability-based abuse is not being broadcast under your brand.

If Trustpilot refuses to do either, then I require you to confirm in writing that:

- you understand that the review targets a named Australian business owner;
- you have been expressly told that the wording is alleged to be unlawful defamation and disability-based harassment; and
- you are nonetheless choosing, as a deliberate policy decision, to keep publishing it.

That confirmation, together with this email chain, will be preserved as evidence and may be relied on in any future complaint to regulators or in any defamation proceedings in which Trustpilot is joined as a publisher.

All rights are reserved.

Regards,

ANTHONY BRODIE 
Owner/Developer - Legion Killfeed

From: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 11:01 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqIVgYTI2NNAGA::]

Using DO NOT REPLY to avoid your legal responsibilities violates the law aswell, keep digging that hole, I'm coming with lawyers cunt.

From: Do not reply <donotreply@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 10:59 PM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: Update on your request #00697534 [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqIVgYTI2NNAGA::]

Hi,

Thank you for getting back to us. We would like to inform you that we have completed the assessment of your appeal.


After carefully reassessing the content, we found that the review is not defamatory. It reflects the reviewer's personal experience and opinion without making any unverified allegations of illegal or harmful conduct. As this falls within acceptable freedom of expression and does not violate our [Guidelines](#), the review will remain online.

We have concluded the investigation and we won't be responding further as we consider this case as closed .

Thank you for your understanding.

Kind Regards,

Megha



[See our reviews](#)



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

From: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 10:36 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqIVgYTI2NNAGA::]

I don't give a flying fuck about your external fucking evidence because this is the only communication that has taken place with this person, nothing about that implies I have a mental disability and you refusing to remove a post implying I need to seek professional help is unlawful. Now fucking remove it cunt.

Hooded

hooded.saw

This is the beginning of your direct message history with Hooded.

No servers in common [Add Friend](#) [Block](#) [Report Spam](#)

November 29, 2025

Hooded Sat 29 Nov 2025 7:27 AM

Good morning Soul,
I hope this message finds you well.
My name is Frank, writing from the Netherlands. I currently hold the admin position at Z Company. I understand you must be very busy operating such a large site, but I hope I can trouble you for a moment to clear the air.
You were recently in contact with my colleague, Lihou, and I'd like to provide a bit of background. Lihou is a 70-year-old British combat veteran who greatly enjoys playing DayZ it's his hobby. We're not experts in coding, but we are learning each day. At the moment, we are growing an active community and we rely on your support to maintain that growth.
After reading through the communication you had with my colleague today, I can see that things may have gotten off on the wrong foot. It seems we overlooked your request for clear information, and I fully understand that you can't perform your role properly without the necessary details.
With that said, I kindly ask that we continue the good service and cooperation we've enjoyed over the past months. To keep it brief: please let me know exactly what you require from us to get the feedback system back up and running.
If we are unable to work together on this, we may unfortunately have no choice but to consider moving our server funds to one of your competitors.
There will be no further communication regarding the points mentioned above from my end. The ball is in your court.
Kind regards,
Frank
Z Company

November 30, 2025

Soul LEGION Sun 30 Nov 2025 12:23 AM

I can't provide support to imbeciles who blatantly refuse to accept the help, using the internal ticket system and decided to throw a tantrum and have a scene.
This is the 5th time I've had this clown carry on and ignore tickets.

Hooded Sun 30 Nov 2025 2:36 AM

You are one sorry ass excuse
I'm laughing
Now block me

 Message @Hooded

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 10:21 PM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: [thread::HUNjgfNQfSqIVgYTI2NNAGA::]

Case number: 00697534

Hi Anthony,

Thanks for your message. After further review of all communication regarding this issue, I can see that we've already come to a decision in an appeal previously raised in case **00697534**. I understand your frustration and I'm sorry that this is not the outcome you had hoped for or expected.

As part of the appeal process, your case was thoroughly investigated using all of the evidence that was available to us, or that we obtained from you or another party.

If you believe the review is against any other guidelines, you can flag it for the relevant reason. You can also refer to our Help Center article: "[For which reasons can businesses flag service reviews?](#)" This article provides further guidance on how and when to report reviews based on concerns.

In alignment with Trustpilot's guidelines, we arrived at the decision as stated in our previous message within the case **00697534**, and we won't be taking further action on this matter. This case is now closed.

Best regards,

From: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 04, 2025 6:01 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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."

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: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 6:01 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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."

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: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 6:00 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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."

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: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, 4 December 2025 6:00 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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."

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: Thursday, 4 December 2025 1:44 AM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

Hi,

Thank you for your message and for taking the time to share your concerns. I understand how important this matter is to you, and I want to clarify a few key points about how our moderation systems and assessments work.

1. Our moderation decisions and legal assessments

Trustpilot is not able to make legal determinations regarding defamation, harassment, or unlawful conduct. Our moderation team can only assess reviews against our published guidelines. This means that even if a reviewer's comments feel offensive, unfair, or legally problematic, we are only able to remove them if they clearly breach one of the guideline categories.

2. Each assessment is based strictly on the guideline category selected

I understand this process can feel frustrating. However, our system requires that each flagged review be evaluated only under the specific guideline reason selected during the flagging process.

This is why you may see separate outcomes for "Hate Speech or Discrimination" and "Reviewing the Wrong Business." Each flag is assessed independently, and only for the criterion chosen.

3. We cannot remove content based on legal arguments

While we appreciate the concerns you raised regarding Australian defamation or harassment legislation, Trustpilot cannot adjudicate legal claims. We can only take action when a review clearly violates our internal guidelines, not based on external legal standards.

If you believe the review should be assessed under a different guideline category, or if you have additional information that may assist our investigation, please feel free to share it. We will be happy to review it as part of the ongoing moderation process.

Kind regards,

Gowtham



See our reviews



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

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

From: Soul Legion [legionkillfeed@outlook.com]
Sent: 03/12/2025 13:35
To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00695808 [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
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 [legionkillfeed@outlook.com]

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 <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

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: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
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

From: Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Sent: Wednesday, 3 December 2025 10:47 PM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: OtherCompany-killfeed.co-Consumer [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

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, December 03, 2025 10:46 PM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: OtherCompany-killfeed.co-Consumer [thread::SnAaDH8GdHu_wkCZLRsXNmA::]

Hi Anthony Brodie,

Thanks for your inquiry about the review by Consumer , 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,

[Appeal our Decision](#)