

From: Soul Legion <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on the review you flagged - Case #00718647
Date: Tue, 09 Dec 2025 03:04:50 +1100

You have been on full notice about the Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw reviews since 30 November 2025. This appeal is not new information. It is a recap that you already know the facts and are choosing to ignore them.

Your backend labels both reviews as "This review was written in response to an invitation you sent. Reviewer information is attached to this review" while my invitation status is 0/50 and the invitation history is empty.

The email and alias attached to Consumer / Hooded_saw show no subscriber at all in my Ko-fi membership system. I have sent you the Ko-fi screenshots.

The Discord ticket, public chat and DMs from 29–30 November show that:

- Hooded is an intermediary threatening to move "our server funds to one of your competitors". As far as I knew at the time, they were a random third party. The paying customer never confirmed any association and never responded in the ticket they opened to contact me in a support capacity. Without confirmation from the actual subscriber, providing them with assistance to access a server tied to another member is a seriously security violation.

I would be facing accusations of security violations if I was to take them at their word without a response from the actual paying customer who's servers Hooded was trying to get access to.

- A direct message or personal inbox is not an avenue where support is offered. All support is provided through the ticket system that is clearly advertised in my Discord.

- The actual subscriber ignored the support ticket they opened, refused to answer basic diagnostic questions, and then abused me while playing the victim when I repeatedly told them to use the ticket properly.

- The entire reason they are upset is because they weren't allowed to access someone's server, not because of my services, not because of my product and not because of me.

Your own system logs also show that:

- Kamy has been reinstated repeatedly, including 5/12, 5/12, 6/12 and 8/12.

- Consumer / Hooded_saw has been reinstated on 1/12/2025, 3/12/2025, 5/12/2025, 5/12/2025 again, and 6/12/2025.

Trustpilot itself flagged Hooded_saw to your Content Integrity Team for hate speech or discrimination, and I separately flagged it for "not based on a genuine experience". Both times you wrote "Investigation complete: the review does not breach our guidelines."

Despite all that, you have:

- Allowed a non genuine reviewer to publish a fabricated account.

- Allowed them to repeatedly edit and escalate that account, including adding new lies after my reply and calling my response "truely false".

- Reinstated the review at least five times for Hooded_saw and several times for Kamy.

- Rejected both your own flags and mine.

- Then blocked me from flagging again, locking the review with "Request information unavailable" while the reviewer can still edit. This effectively froze a disputed and evolving review in place over a weekend where nobody would deal with the consequences.

Your latest template email says you checked the review only for “harmful or illegal content, personal information, advertising or promotional content” and that it passes your guidelines. That is legally irrelevant. In Australia we do not rely on Trustpilot guidelines or AI tools that are designed to let most content slide. We rely on law.

Your guidelines and automated detection do not override:

- Australian defamation law, including the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) as amended; and
- Australian Consumer Law prohibitions on misleading or deceptive conduct and false representations.

This is not an isolated mistake. It is part of a documented pattern.

There are 494 emails between me and Trustpilot, with approximately 380 of those exchanged between 30 July and 1 September during the last review bombing episode, when I lost roughly 50 percent of my customers. During that episode you were given proof of competitors publicly brigading for fake reviews on Facebook. You ignored that evidence for weeks, repeatedly reinstated obviously coordinated reviews, then quietly removed them after about a month of damage, including reinstating one review two days after your legal department told me the matter was “closed”.

During that same episode you made and then refused to correct misrepresentations about your own ABN status. You initially told me Trustpilot did not have an ABN at all. Only after I pointed out the legal position did you provide an ABN. You have still never corrected the earlier misrepresentation. Those misrepresentations are serious enough that I have considered reporting them to the Australian Taxation Office. The only reason I have not done so yet is that, unlike the conduct I am seeing from Trustpilot, I do not act in bad faith. But if you continue to refuse to respond explaining why this misrepresentation was made and whether the first “We have no ABN” is true or is the later “Our ABN is” response I was given true? I have been asking this same question since August 20th. It is DECEMBER.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) is explicit that any “innocent dissemination” defence depends on you not knowing, and not reasonably being able to know, that the material is defamatory. A defendant relying on that defence must prove that “the defendant neither knew, nor ought reasonably to have known, that the matter was defamatory” and that the defendant’s lack of knowledge “was not due to any negligence on the part of the defendant”.([NSW Legislation][1]) Once I have flagged a review, sent you supporting documents and you have read them, you cannot seriously maintain that you neither know nor ought reasonably to know that the matter is defamatory or at least highly arguable.

Your own digital intermediary provisions also assume that you will act when a person uses an “accessible complaints mechanism” and gives you enough information to be aware of who is complaining, where the material is, and that they consider it defamatory.([NSW Legislation][1]) That is exactly what I have done, repeatedly, and you have deliberately chosen inaction and repeated republication.

Australian courts are also clear that “every communication of defamatory matter gives rise to a separate cause of action (known as the ‘multiple publication rule’); particularly online. ([judcom.nsw.gov.au][2]) Once you are on notice and continue to publish the same material, or reinstate it, you are making a fresh decision each time, with full knowledge of the risk.

Put bluntly, I can technically do everything the law requires of me by flagging a review once and giving you proper notice. If the review is still online after that and the statements are not true, it is not the guidelines or the AI that are in breach. It is Trustpilot as the publisher choosing to keep untrue and non genuine material live in the face of clear notice.

You have been on notice since 30 November that:

- These reviewers are not genuine identifiable customers of Legion Killfeed.
- Your “invited review” labels are wrong or misleading for these reviews.
- The primary documents you hold (Discord tickets, public chat, DMs and Ko-fi records) directly contradict the story told in the reviews.
- Your own system has flagged the content for hate or discrimination and “not based on a genuine experience”.

Once you have that knowledge, you cannot hide behind “our guidelines are not breached”. From 30 November onward, every day you keep these reviews live and every reinstatement you log is a fresh publication in defamation terms. I will treat each of those days and each republication as separate harm when assessing aggravated damages, including for the earlier review bombing episode where you were on notice but left clearly coordinated content online for weeks. If flagging fast is used to punish me for reporting illegal content again, I will stop using the flagging system and just simply open a ticket, send defamation notice and wait and copy and paste the law back to you until you actually follow it. My use of your flagging system isn't because your system makes us, in fact, that's unfair contract terms because it punishes me for exercising my legal rights, I use the flagging system because I behave in good faith. But I can not stress this enough, I DON'T HAVE TO BEHAVE IN GOOD FAITH and punishing me for being review bombed (hence the need to flag fast) is itself a violation of my rights you have blatantly engaged in.

This appeal therefore asks for specific action:

1. Immediate and permanent removal of the reviews by Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw, with written confirmation that they will not be reinstated again.
2. Publication of a clear written apology by Trustpilot, pinned at the top of my Legion Killfeed profile for at least 30 days, acknowledging that these specific reviews were not from genuine identifiable customers, that the “invited” labelling was misleading, and that your handling of the matter fell below both your own standards and basic legal expectations.
3. Correction of the misleading “invitation” labelling, which currently suggests these are invited, verified customers despite zero invitations sent and zero matching subscribers in my records.
4. Restoration of full reporting functionality on my profile, including the ability to flag these and any future reviews, instead of disabling flagging while reviewers are still allowed to edit.
5. Preservation of all records relating to these reviews and your decisions, including:
 - all review versions and edits
 - all “documentation” provided by the reviewers
 - all timestamps for publication, removal and reinstatement
 - all internal decision logs, notes and flags raised by Trustpilot itself.
6. Escalation of this matter to a senior human decision maker or legal team, not another automated or junior guideline check.

For the avoidance of doubt, I will be putting your decisions, your repeated reinstatements, the removal of my ability to flag, and all attached evidence before Australian regulators and the court, including:

- The eSafety Commissioner – [<https://www.esafety.gov.au>] (<https://www.esafety.gov.au>)
- The Australian Competition and Consumer Commission – [<https://www.accc.gov.au>] (<https://www.accc.gov.au>)

Trustpilot is now continuing to publish and republish these reviews with full knowledge of the facts and of the legal risk. This appeal records that clearly and will be relied on when I quantify harm based on both the time each review has remained online after notice and the number of reinstatements you have chosen to make.

[1]: <https://legislation.nsw.gov.au/view/whole/html/inforce/current/act-2005-077> "View - NSW legislation"

[2]: <https://www.judcom.nsw.gov.au/publications/benchbks/civil/defamation.html>
"Defamation"



From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Monday, 8 December 2025 10:01 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on the review you flagged - Case #00718647

Hi Anthony,

We're following up about the [review](#) by Consumer, which you flagged for: Advertising or promotional.

Our decision

We've carefully checked the review against our guidelines, specifically looking for:

- Harmful or illegal content
- Personal information
- Advertising or promotional content

We didn't find any content in the review that goes against our guidelines for these reasons. That's why the review will remain online.

Tell your side of the story

We encourage you to [respond to the review](#) if you haven't already. Your reply appears right next to the review, offering a complete picture of the experience from both your side and the reviewer's. Replying can help build trust and credibility with potential customers.

If you have any questions or think we've made a mistake, please reply to this email.

Thanks,

Please note that depending on the situation, we may use automated detection technology, a team of experts, or a combination of both to assess content on the Trustpilot platform.

Email Headers (Raw)

[illegible]