

From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
To: TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>, "legal@trustpilot.com" <legal@trustpilot.com>
Subject: RE: Further complaint – false “Verified” review for DayZ Multi Tool (Kyle) and your legal obligations after notice #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IdnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]
Date: Tue, 09 Dec 2025 03:43:42 +1100

Hi Trustpilot,

You have been on notice since at least **25 August 2024** that the “Verified” review titled *“This bot was used to wipe my server”* by **Kyle** is objectively false, technically impossible and malicious. This email is not “new information”; it is a formal record that you **already know** the facts and are choosing to continue publishing the review.

1. You have locked my ability to flag while leaving the review online

Your own case history for this review shows a long sequence of flags and investigations, including:

- “Not based on a genuine experience”
- “Being about a different business”
- “Advertising or promotional content”
- “Terrorism”
- “Personal information”

Each time you wrote some version of: *“Investigation complete: the review doesn’t breach our guidelines.”*

The latest state is *“Investigation complete – There’s a different issue”* and the interface no longer allows me to flag the review at all, even though the reviewer can still edit it. In other words, my access to your “complaints mechanism” is effectively switched off while you keep the review live.

2. The review describes something that cannot happen with this bot

The review claims that:

“This bot was used to wipe my server and all its channels, messages and roles. The Admin/Owner of this bot used a command to do this.”

That is simply not possible:

- **No destructive commands** – The DayZ Multi Tool bot has never contained any commands to delete channels, messages or roles. The source code has been inspected repeatedly and no such functionality exists.
- **No relevant Discord permissions** – Discord’s public *App Directory* page for this bot clearly shows the bot’s data access: it can see members and roles; it does **not** request “Manage

Channels”, “Manage Roles”, “Administrator” or any permission required to delete channels or messages.

- **Audit log proof** – Discord’s audit log records every channel/role deletion with 100% certainty and identifies the actor. The audit logs from the relevant period show only normal moderation actions (kicks/bans and role changes) and **no** mass deletions by the bot. If the alleged wipe had happened, there would be screenshots of those logs. None exist, because the event never occurred.

The allegation that “bot code was leaked online and code was found to delete all channels, messages” is also fabricated. No such code has ever existed in this project and nobody has produced any screenshot of it, despite repeated requests.

You have had all of this explained to you in detail, with screenshots, in previous complaints and in the PDFs already provided.

3. Evidence that this was a retaliatory fake review

The Discord material you hold (and which I have sent you multiple times) shows:

- The reviewer, under the name **cactus**, joining the DayZ Multi Tool Discord only to drag in external drama and attack other users, then being told to stop and respect the server rules.
- Subsequent messages from the same person boasting that they have “left my reviews on all your websites”, specifically naming **Trustpilot** and “all the discord bot websites”, after that moderation action.

They admitted the review spree themselves. They were not reporting a genuine experience with the bot. They were retaliating because they did not like being moderated. That is the very definition of a non-genuine review.

Despite that, your case log for this review shows a long list of reinstatements and “does not breach our guidelines” outcomes, and you have now blocked further flagging.

4. Your guidelines do not override Australian law

Your latest boilerplate responses talk only about whether the review breaches **Trustpilot’s guidelines** for:

- harmful or illegal content
- personal information
- advertising or promotional content

That may be convenient internally, but it is legally irrelevant. I am in **New South Wales, Australia**. The standard that matters here is **Australian law**, not whatever an internal policy or an automated tool is willing to let slide.

In particular, you need to consider:

- **Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)** – including the new **section 31A** on digital intermediaries and the traditional **section 32** defence of innocent dissemination. Once you receive a written complaint that clearly identifies the plaintiff, the matter and why it is defamatory, you only keep your digital-intermediary defence if you take “**reasonable access prevention steps**” within 7 days. [NSW Legislation](#)
- If you choose to leave the material up after being given clear, technical proof that it is false and cannot have occurred, you are no longer an innocent conduit. You are a primary publisher with knowledge. Every day you continue to host it and every time you refuse removal after a complaint is treated as a fresh publication.

I have already given you written complaints that:

1. Identify me and my business;
2. Identify the specific review and where it appears;
3. Explain in detail why the matter is defamatory and technically impossible.

That is exactly the type of complaint contemplated by section 31A(3) of the Defamation Act. [NSW Legislation](#)

Once that happens, you **do not** get to hide behind “our guidelines were applied” while doing nothing meaningful to prevent access. The law is not “we ran it past an AI and it said okay”.

5. You have a documented pattern of ignoring notice

There are **494 emails** between me and Trustpilot. Approximately **380** of those were exchanged between **30 July and 1 September 2025**, during the last coordinated review-bombing campaign in which:

- You were shown screenshots of a competitor publicly organising fake reviews on Facebook;
- You repeatedly reinstated obviously non-genuine reviews;
- Only weeks later, and after multiple escalations, you quietly removed a batch of them with no meaningful explanation.

On top of that, I have already raised issues about the way you mis-stated your own **ABN status** in earlier correspondence and then changed your position when I pointed out the relevant Australian requirements, while now refusing to engage on that point at all.

This pattern matters because it shows you are fully aware of Australian legal standards, fully aware of the risk, and choosing to proceed anyway.

6. What I am asking for on this specific review

For the review by **Kyle** (“This bot was used to wipe my server”) I am asking for concrete, specific actions:

1. **Immediate and permanent removal** of the review, with confirmation that it will not be reinstated.

2. Removal of the “**Verified**” badge and an internal review of how that badge was granted in the first place, given that there was no genuine customer transaction.
3. Restoration of my ability to use your complaints mechanism for this and any future reviews, instead of permanently locking the flagging while leaving the review online.
4. Preservation (no deletion or alteration) of:
 - All versions and edits of the review;
 - All documentation or “evidence” provided by the reviewer;
 - All decision logs, timestamps for every publication/removal/reinstatement, and internal notes on this review and on my complaints.
5. Escalation of this matter to a senior human decision-maker or your legal team, not another automated guideline tick-box.

To be completely clear:

- You have had full technical and contextual evidence since **August 2024** that this review is false, impossible and retaliatory;
- You have chosen to continue publishing it, mark it as “Verified”, and block my ability to flag it further;
- Under Australian defamation law, every day you do that after notice increases your exposure, not mine.

Please treat this email as part of the same written complaint history for the purposes of the **Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)** and any later proceedings. I will be putting your handling of this review, alongside the Legion Killfeed reviews and your wider pattern of conduct, before:

- The **eSafety Commissioner** – <https://www.esafety.gov.au>
- The **ACCC** – <https://www.accc.gov.au>

and, if necessary, the Supreme Court of New South Wales.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Developer – DayZ Multi Tool / Legion Killfeed
Brodies@REDACTED.email / Brodies@REDACTED.email

Subject: Further complaint – false “Verified” review for DayZ Multi Tool (Kyle) and your legal obligations after notice

Hi Trustpilot,

You have been on notice since at least **25 August 2024** that the “Verified” review titled “*This bot was used to wipe my server*” by **Kyle** is objectively false, technically impossible and malicious.

This email is not “new information”; it is a formal record that you **already know** the facts and are choosing to continue publishing the review.

1. You have locked my ability to flag while leaving the review online

Your own case history for this review shows a long sequence of flags and investigations, including:

- “Not based on a genuine experience”
- “Being about a different business”
- “Advertising or promotional content”
- “Terrorism”
- “Personal information”

Each time you wrote some version of: *“Investigation complete: the review doesn’t breach our guidelines.”*

The latest state is *“Investigation complete – There’s a different issue”* and the interface no longer allows me to flag the review at all, even though the reviewer can still edit it. In other words, my access to your “complaints mechanism” is effectively switched off while you keep the review live.

2. The review describes something that cannot happen with this bot

The review claims that:

“This bot was used to wipe my server and all its channels, messages and roles. The Admin/Owner of this bot used a command to do this.”

That is simply not possible:

- **No destructive commands** – The DayZ Multi Tool bot has never contained any commands to delete channels, messages or roles. The source code has been inspected repeatedly and no such functionality exists.
- **No relevant Discord permissions** – Discord’s public *App Directory* page for this bot clearly shows the bot’s data access: it can see members and roles; it does **not** request “Manage Channels”, “Manage Roles”, “Administrator” or any permission required to delete channels or messages.
- **Audit log proof** – Discord’s audit log records every channel/role deletion with 100% certainty and identifies the actor. The audit logs from the relevant period show only normal moderation actions (kicks/bans and role changes) and **no** mass deletions by the bot. If the alleged wipe had happened, there would be screenshots of those logs. None exist, because the event never occurred.

The allegation that “bot code was leaked online and code was found to delete all channels, messages” is also fabricated. No such code has ever existed in this project and nobody has

produced any screenshot of it, despite repeated requests.

You have had all of this explained to you in detail, with screenshots, in previous complaints and in the PDFs already provided.

3. Evidence that this was a retaliatory fake review

The Discord material you hold (and which I have sent you multiple times) shows:

- The reviewer, under the name **cactus**, joining the DayZ Multi Tool Discord only to drag in external drama and attack other users, then being told to stop and respect the server rules.
- Subsequent messages from the same person boasting that they have “left my reviews on all your websites”, specifically naming **Trustpilot** and “all the discord bot websites”, after that moderation action.

They admitted the review spree themselves. They were not reporting a genuine experience with the bot. They were retaliating because they did not like being moderated. That is the very definition of a non-genuine review.

Despite that, your case log for this review shows a long list of reinstatements and “does not breach our guidelines” outcomes, and you have now blocked further flagging.

4. Your guidelines do not override Australian law

Your latest boilerplate responses talk only about whether the review breaches **Trustpilot’s guidelines** for:

- harmful or illegal content
- personal information
- advertising or promotional content

That may be convenient internally, but it is legally irrelevant. I am in **New South Wales, Australia**. The standard that matters here is **Australian law**, not whatever an internal policy or an automated tool is willing to let slide.

In particular, you need to consider:

- **Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)** – including the new **section 31A** on digital intermediaries and the traditional **section 32** defence of innocent dissemination. Once you receive a written complaint that clearly identifies the plaintiff, the matter and why it is defamatory, you only keep your digital-intermediary defence if you take “**reasonable access prevention steps**” within 7 days. [NSW Legislation](#)
- If you choose to leave the material up after being given clear, technical proof that it is false and cannot have occurred, you are no longer an innocent conduit. You are a primary publisher with knowledge. Every day you continue to host it and every time you refuse removal after a complaint is treated as a fresh publication.

I have already given you written complaints that:

1. Identify me and my business;
2. Identify the specific review and where it appears;
3. Explain in detail why the matter is defamatory and technically impossible.

That is exactly the type of complaint contemplated by section 31A(3) of the Defamation Act.
[NSW Legislation](#)

Once that happens, you **do not** get to hide behind “our guidelines were applied” while doing nothing meaningful to prevent access. The law is not “we ran it past an AI and it said okay”.

5. You have a documented pattern of ignoring notice

There are **494 emails** between me and Trustpilot. Approximately **380** of those were exchanged between **30 July and 1 September 2025**, during the last coordinated review-bombing campaign in which:

- You were shown screenshots of a competitor publicly organising fake reviews on Facebook;
- You repeatedly reinstated obviously non-genuine reviews;
- Only weeks later, and after multiple escalations, you quietly removed a batch of them with no meaningful explanation.

On top of that, I have already raised issues about the way you mis-stated your own **ABN status** in earlier correspondence and then changed your position when I pointed out the relevant Australian requirements, while now refusing to engage on that point at all.

This pattern matters because it shows you are fully aware of Australian legal standards, fully aware of the risk, and choosing to proceed anyway.

6. What I am asking for on this specific review

For the review by **Kyle** (“This bot was used to wipe my server”) I am asking for concrete, specific actions:

1. **Immediate and permanent removal** of the review, with confirmation that it will not be reinstated.
2. Removal of the “**Verified**” badge and an internal review of how that badge was granted in the first place, given that there was no genuine customer transaction.
3. Restoration of my ability to use your complaints mechanism for this and any future reviews, instead of permanently locking the flagging while leaving the review online.
4. Preservation (no deletion or alteration) of:
 - All versions and edits of the review;
 - All documentation or “evidence” provided by the reviewer;

- All decision logs, timestamps for every publication/removal/reinstatement, and internal notes on this review and on my complaints.

5. Escalation of this matter to a senior human decision-maker or your legal team, not another automated guideline tick-box.

To be completely clear:

- You have had full technical and contextual evidence since **August 2024** that this review is false, impossible and retaliatory;
- You have chosen to continue publishing it, mark it as “Verified”, and block my ability to flag it further;
- Under Australian defamation law, every day you do that after notice increases your exposure, not mine.

Please treat this email as part of the same written complaint history for the purposes of the **Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)** and any later proceedings. I will be putting your handling of this review, alongside the Legion Killfeed reviews and your wider pattern of conduct, before:

- The **eSafety Commissioner** – <https://www.esafety.gov.au>
- The **ACCC** – <https://www.accc.gov.au>

and, if necessary, the Supreme Court of New South Wales.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Developer – DayZ Multi Tool / Legion Killfeed
Brodies@REDACTED.email / Brodies@REDACTED.email

From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Sent: Saturday, 6 December 2025 7:36 AM
To: TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IdnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]

STILL WAITING FOR A REPLY. IF I DON'T GET ONE, THEN I WILL KILL MYSELF, YES, I WILL DIE.

From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Sent: Friday, 21 November 2025 1:10 PM
To: TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IdnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]

Statement to Trustpilot Regarding the False “Verified” Review

The review displayed under “Kyle – This bot was used to wipe my server” is objectively false, technically impossible, and legally actionable. The fact that

Trustpilot has marked this review as Verified is itself misleading and damaging, because the reviewer has never used my bot, never interacted with my service, and could not possibly have experienced what they claimed.

Here are the core points Trustpilot needs to be confronted with:

1. The review describes an impossible event

The bot they are referring to does not have and has never had:

- **any command capable of deleting channels**
- **any command that can delete messages**
- **any command that can remove roles**
- **any admin-level destructive functionality whatsoever**

Discord permissions make this physically impossible unless:

- 1. An administrator manually gives a bot the “Manage Channels / Manage Roles / Administrator” permissions, and**
- 2. The bot actually includes code that uses those permissions.**

DayZ Multi Tool has none of that capability, and its publicly available source code confirms it. The actions described in the review could not be performed by this bot under any circumstances.

2. Discord retains audit logs for every destructive action

If a bot deletes channels, this appears in the Discord audit log with 100% certainty:

- **The bot’s username would appear as the actor**
- **Each deletion (channel, role, messages) would be individually logged**
- **Every timestamp would be visible**
- **These logs cannot be faked**

The reviewer has never provided a single audit log screenshot, because there are no logs showing my bot doing anything destructive. It did not happen.

3. The reviewer has never used my bot

**The reply attached to the review already states this clearly:
They have never used my bot at all.**

This makes the “Verified” badge factually incorrect and misleading. Trustpilot is presenting the review as tied to a real transaction or legitimate use of the bot,

when no such transaction ever occurred.

That is either:

- **a failure in the verification process, or**
- **a deliberate misuse of the verification system by the reviewer.**

Either outcome makes the “Verified” label false.

4. The claim that “code was leaked online” is fabricated

The reviewer claims that leaked code showed “commands to delete channels and messages”.

This is verifiably untrue:

- **The codebase has never contained such commands**
- **Multiple independent people have inspected the code**
- **No such functionality exists**
- **The claim is invented to create a false impression of danger**

This constitutes defamation, because it asserts criminal or malicious behavior by the bot developer that is entirely fabricated.

5. The review asserts professional misconduct and intentional sabotage

The review explicitly states:

“The Admin/Owner of this bot used a command to wipe my server.”

This is not an opinion. This is a factual allegation of intentional damage and abuse of administrator power.

Because this never happened, it is:

- **a false statement of fact**
 - **reputationally damaging**
 - **legally actionable in defamation law**
 - **re-publication after notice if Trustpilot continues hosting it**
-

6. Trustpilot is responsible for re-publishing after notice

You have been notified with:

- **proof the event is impossible**

- **proof the reviewer never used the bot**
- **evidence showing the review is fabricated**
- **evidence the underlying actions cannot physically occur**

Continuing to display the review — especially with a Verified tag — is a fresh publication after notice, which significantly increases Trustpilot’s liability under defamation law.

Concise conclusion to send Trustpilot

Here is the direct message version you can send:

This review is factually impossible, technically impossible, and legally defamatory. The reviewer has never used my bot, their claims cannot occur on Discord, and Discord’s own audit logs prove no such event happened. Marking this review as “Verified” is misleading because no transaction ever occurred. The allegation that my bot wiped a server is fabricated and unsupported by any audit logs or evidence, and the claim about “leaked code” is entirely false.

Now that Trustpilot has been notified, continuing to display this review — especially with a verified badge — constitutes fresh publication after notice. You are knowingly hosting demonstrably false allegations of criminal-level misconduct. The review must be removed immediately.



From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Sent: Saturday, 9 August 2025 5:05 PM
To: TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IdnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]

You mean the way they refuse to despite legal violations in the ticket for #36629468 ?

Do your fucking job because I AM suing.

From: noreply@salesforce.com <noreply@salesforce.com> on behalf of TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Friday, 8 August 2025 11:29 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IdnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]

Hi,
Thank you for getting in touch.
We’ve reviewed the review you mentioned and can confirm that it has already been flagged. Our Content Integrity team has investigated the matter and contacted you with the outcome.
To avoid any miscommunication and to ensure you receive the best possible assistance, please reply directly within that ticket.
Best regards,
Airne

See our reviews



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

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

From: Trust Support [trust.operations@trustpilot.com]

Sent: 08/08/2025 03:47

To: Brodies@REDACTED.email

Subject: Follow-up to your recent inquiry - Ticket #00238048

Hi ,

We're just following up on your recent inquiry entitled 'Inbound enquiry - Fake reviews'.

Things are a little busier than usual right now, which has caused a slight delay in our response. We sincerely appreciate your patience as we work to get back to you as soon as possible.

In the meantime, you can check our [Help Center](#), which may already have the answers you're looking for.

Thanks again for your understanding.

Best,
Trustpilot

Email Headers (Raw)

X-Mozilla-Status	0001
X-Mozilla-Status2	00000000
From	Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
To	TrustSafety <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>, "legal@trustpilot.com" <legal@trustpilot.com>
Subject	RE: Further complaint – false “Verified” review for DayZ Multi Tool (Kyle) and your legal obligations after notice #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IJnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]
Thread-Topic	Further complaint – false “Verified” review for DayZ Multi Tool (Kyle) and your legal obligations after notice #00238048 [thread::D8JatV_IJnWWZh_2xTPUg2A::]
Thread-Index	AQHcaGHP73ig1nMw+U+vOO/54EG7SQ==
X-MS-Exchange-MessageSentRepresentingType	1
Date	Tue, 09 Dec 2025 03:43:42 +1100
Message-ID	<SYBPR01MB533812177EFAAD6D93E8E064A0A2A@SYBPR01MB5338.ausprd01.prod.outlook.com>
References	<wTYiA00T0NMEL00WM63x08kSN2d9EUGqYyxOQ@sfdc.net> <mSLac00T0OG5H00miVPklxuSRGwVkwgvjonQw@sfdc.net> <MEYP282MB3301F25123A34D2FC9EA877DA02EA@MEYP282MB3301.AUSP282.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <SYBPR01MB53385A0062473A47FC1A83ACA0D5A@SYBPR01MB5338.ausprd01.prod.outlook.com> <SYBPR01MB5338236D52911526A647E20FA0A7A@SYBPR01MB5338.ausprd01.prod.outlook.com>
In-Reply-To	<SYBPR01MB5338236D52911526A647E20FA0A7A@SYBPR01MB5338.ausprd01.prod.outlook.com>
Content-Language	en-AU
X-MS-Has-Attach	yes
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL	-1
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator	
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-RecordReviewCfmType	0
msip_labels	
Content-Type	multipart/related; boundary="_002_SYBPR01MB533812177EFAAD6D93E8E064A0A2ASYBPR01MB5338ausp_"; type="text/html"
MIME-Version	1.0