

From: Soul Legion <Brodiess@REDACTED.email>
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: [thread::ST9RXy1ZesSr5EdS6TX4lWA::]
Date: Wed, 10 Dec 2025 02:50:37 +1100

Hi,

Thank you for your email of 10 December 2025 regarding Case **#00725903**, in which you describe yourself as an **Escalation Specialist** and state that:

“the review in question has been removed from the platform... As the review has already been addressed, no further action can be taken regarding this case.”

I need you to actually engage with what is happening, because at the moment your response simply repeats the same pattern of false assurances and non-answers that I have been dealing with since August.

1. Which review are you talking about?

Your email does not identify:

- the reviewer name,
- the URL of the review,
- the review ID, or
- which earlier chain it relates to.

The subject line only contains the thread ID thread::ST9RXy1ZesSr5EdS6TX4lWA:: and Case **#00725903**. It does **not** cross-link to Case **#00713084** or any of the other chains I have open with you.

Before we go any further, I require you to confirm in writing:

1. Exactly **which review** you say has been removed in Case **#00725903** (reviewer name, review URL, review ID and business profile).
2. Which **prior ticket(s)** that review relates to (case numbers and thread IDs).
3. The **date and time** (with time zone) when that review was removed.

Without that, “the review in question has been removed” is meaningless.

2. The “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review is still live and auto-flagged as harmful/illegal

While you are saying reviews are “removed”, at least one of the central reviews in this dispute is still public in its edited form:

- <https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/692b14c5772dcebff6caec38>
- <https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co>

On that URL, your own system now displays a banner that says:

“Trustpilot’s automated software has flagged this review for containing harmful or illegal content.”

Despite that banner:

- The full edited text is still visible to the public.
- It is still labelled as a review of “Legion Killfeed – DayZ Discord Bot”.
- It is still marked as a review by “Consumer”, with “Verified user” and “Unprompted review” tags.
- When I view my profile, I cannot flag it again – the interface only shows “You’ve already flagged this review”.

So at the same time as you are telling me in various cases that reviews have been removed, your platform is:

- actively publishing a review that your **own automated tools** have flagged as potentially harmful or illegal, and
- blocking me from re-flagging it despite new and more serious defamatory content being added via edits.

This is the same review where:

- the only “verification” you have is an Apple relay email 2znkkydr98@privaterelay.appleid.com,
- my Membership Setup records show **no subscriber** and **no pledge** under that email or under the name “hooded_saw”, and
- the Discord ticket logs you already hold show that this person was never the paying customer and was attempting to bypass my support process to threaten me with moving funds to a competitor.

You have had all of that evidence put in front of you repeatedly. Ansa has been told this in detail and has nonetheless continued to send emails claiming that the review has been removed when it patently has not. That pattern is repeated across multiple cases since August.

As Escalation, I need you to address this review and this workflow specifically, not just send another “it’s removed, case closed” template.

3. Systemic problem with edited reviews and flags

Your own history for the “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review shows:

- Multiple investigations for “hate speech or discrimination”, “advertising or promotional content”, “not based on a genuine experience”, “personal information” and “being about a

different business”, all marked “doesn’t breach our guidelines”.

- A “Review versions” box showing that the **original** version was a very short text (“Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs profession help”), while the **current** version is a long narrative with detailed factual allegations that were added later via edits.

The real-world effect of your system is:

1. Once the original, shorter text is “cleared”, your system treats the entire review ID as permanently cleared.
2. The reviewer can then add new and much more serious allegations through edits.
3. Those edits are never re-assessed under your “genuine experience”, “personal information” or “different business” rules.
4. The business is blocked from flagging again because your interface only shows “You’ve already flagged this review”.

You also encourage reviewers to edit and update instead of posting new reviews.

When you combine all of that, you have designed a process where:

- edited reviews **bypass** the very checks you hold out as your “Content Integrity” safeguards;
- you continue to publish the edited material even when your own automated tools call it “harmful or illegal”; and
- the subject of the review is locked out of using your flagging system to respond to the new allegations.

That is not an unfortunate oversight. It is a platform design that is fundamentally incompatible with your obligations under Australian defamation law and Australian Consumer Law, especially now that you have explicit notice that it is working exactly this way in practice.

4. Ansa’s pattern of ignoring my Calderbank offer, ABN issues and prior complaints

I also need you, as Escalation, to understand that this is not an isolated case. It sits on top of a long documented pattern which Ansa and others have repeatedly failed to engage with.

On **9 December 2025** I sent a detailed email (quoted in full below for your convenience) responding to yet another “we’re a bit busy” template in Case **#00713084**. That email:

- set out the history of silent removals and republications after “legal closure”;
- explained how your transparency page at <https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co/transparency> misleads consumers by omitting your own errors and late removals;
- documented **494 emails** between me and Trustpilot, including around **380 emails** in the one-month review-bombing period where I lost about half my customers;

- raised your earlier misrepresentation about not having an ABN, followed by a sudden reversal only when I pointed out the Australian requirements;
- reminded you of my **Calderbank-style settlement offer from August**, which you have simply ignored;
- set out my current characterisation of Trustpilot's conduct as that of a criminal enterprise in practical effect;
- described independent damages modelling suggesting a ballpark range of **AUD 800,000–1.5 million** for Trustpilot's share alone, even before we add the contribution of Reddit, Meta and Discord; and
- clearly listed what I expected by way of removal, explanation, transparency corrections and preservation of evidence.

Ansa has never properly engaged with that letter. Instead, she has continued to send short template-style emails asserting that reviews are “removed” or “offline” when they are still live, and offering no explanation of the underlying conduct.

This behaviour – ignoring a Calderbank offer, repeating false assurances about removal, and refusing to correct or even acknowledge the underlying design problems – has been a feature of your handling of my matter since at least August. As Escalation, you now own that history unless you actively correct it.

5. For the record – full text of my 9 December 2025 email

For completeness, and so that there can be no suggestion that Escalation has not seen it, I repeat in full the text of my email of **9 December 2025** (Case #00713084):

Hi Trustpilot,

This automated “we’re a bit busy” follow up for Case #00713084 is identical to what I have already been sent on multiple earlier tickets, including at least the following: Ticket numbers: #37049350, #37940331, #38210515, #00243840, #00211219, #37334669, #36870620, #36822738, #00239391, #37034853, #37617523, #00243681, #36874026.

In several of those matters I never received any proper response at all, and where I did, the decisions were then quietly reversed with silent removals and no explanation. You are already on notice that this pattern is not acceptable. I am not prepared to treat this new template email as a real response.

I have one review left to remove, but removal on its own will not “reset” the harm or your legal exposure. You need to explain your conduct and correct the public record.

1. Silent removals and republications after legal closure

You have repeatedly:

- Stood by clearly defamatory reviews in writing, sometimes after multiple “investigations”.
- Told me matters were “closed” and that your legal department stood by the decision.

- Then silently removed the same reviews days or weeks later, without admitting the mistake or updating your explanation.

- In some cases, you reinstated the reviews again after that, before finally removing them with no reason given.

Every reinstatement after notice is a fresh publication in defamation terms. You had full knowledge of the falsity and of the damage they were causing to my business and my reputation. You do not get to erase that history by silently deleting the review and pretending it never happened.

I expect a clear written explanation for each removal and reinstatement cycle, including who made the decision, when, and on what basis.

2. Misleading “transparency” page and suppression of positive reviews

Your page at:

<https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co/transparency>

frames the situation as if I am the problem – a difficult business that keeps flagging reviews your system thinks are fine.

That is false and misleading because:

- It omits context about the reviews that were clearly defamatory, not based on a genuine experience, or written by direct competitors that you knew about.

- It does not record the multiple times you initially defended those reviews, then silently removed them later after weeks or months of damage.

- It completely ignores the fact that positive or neutral reviews which supported my position have been flagged and removed or suppressed, yet they do not appear on that transparency page at all.

The result is a curated narrative that makes me look like the abuser of your platform, while hiding the fact that your systems and staff repeatedly failed to recognise obvious defamation and brigading, even when given clear proof and context.

If you are going to publish a “transparency” report about my business, it must be accurate and complete, not a PR document that blames the victim.

3. Documented pattern – 494 emails and prior review-bombing

There are 494 emails between me and Trustpilot so far, with roughly 380 of those between 30 July and 1 September alone, during the last organised review bombing where I lost about half my customers.

During that episode:

- You were given direct evidence of public brigading for fake reviews on Facebook and elsewhere.

- You left those reviews up for weeks despite that evidence.

- You then quietly removed them after about a month, again without explaining why your earlier decisions had been wrong.

- At least one review was reinstated two days after your legal department said the matter was closed, before you removed it again with no explanation.

This is not a one off mistake. It is a clear and ongoing pattern of bad faith handling of defamation, amplified by an opaque mix of low quality AI triage and inconsistent human decisions.

4. ABN misrepresentation and Australian regulators

When I asked for your ABN so I could correctly name the Australian entity in legal correspondence, I was initially told you did not have one. Only after I pointed out the relevant Australian requirements did you suddenly produce an ABN.

I have considered reporting that inconsistency to the Australian Taxation Office.

The only reason I have not done so yet is because, unlike the conduct I have experienced from Trustpilot, I am not interested in weaponising regulators in bad faith.

That restraint should not be mistaken for weakness. It is a choice.

5. My Calderbank offer from August and your costs exposure

In August I sent you a Calderbank style offer setting out a detailed, reasonable pathway to resolve the Trustpilot portion of this matter. You did not engage with that offer at all.

To be absolutely clear:

- This email is not a new Calderbank offer.
- I will rely on my August letter when the question of costs is considered.
- Any settlement that might be discussed in future will have to reflect the fact that the harm has continued and amplified since that first offer was ignored.

I invite you to actually read that earlier letter. If you wish to engage with it now, you are free to propose terms, but the starting point is no longer what it was in August.

6. Characterisation of Trustpilot and welcome to test that in court

Based on the documented behaviour set out above, and the broader pattern across my tickets, I consider Trustpilot's operations in relation to my business to be those of a criminal enterprise in practical effect, regardless of how you choose to describe yourselves in marketing material.

That is not empty rhetoric. It is a conclusion drawn from:

- Your willingness to keep publishing and republishing defamatory content after clear notice.
- The way you selectively present information on transparency pages in a way that misleads consumers.
- The refusal to correct obvious errors until long after the damage is done, and then only silently.
- Your ongoing use of my data despite explicit objections and withdrawal of consent.

If you believe that description is defamatory, I actively encourage you to sue me over it in an Australian court. Discovery and cross examination will be very educational for everyone involved.

7. Independent damages modelling and multi platform liability

When this dispute was still mostly about Trustpilot alone, an independent AI model trained on Australian law was given full access to my evidence set and asked to estimate likely damages. Even on that narrower scope it produced ballpark figures between approximately AUD 800,000 and AUD 1.5 million for Trustpilot's share alone.

I understand that such a model is not a binding assessment, but it does underline the scale of the harm that a neutral system, working from the evidence, sees as

plausible.

The situation is now worse. The harassment and defamation campaign spans Trustpilot, Reddit, Meta (Facebook) and Discord. If litigation proceeds, my current intention is to pursue a combined platform liability case naming all of those entities as defendants, alongside the individuals involved.

Your handling of my reviews – and in particular your decisions to:

- Ignore or trivialise clear evidence.
- Leave defamatory reviews up for extended periods after notice.
- Re publish them after “legal closure”.
- Block or limit my ability to flag while reviewers can still edit.

will be central to that case.

8. What I expect in response to Case #00713084

For this case and the remaining review, I expect:

- Immediate and permanent removal of the remaining defamatory review.
- A detailed explanation of:
 - Each prior removal and reinstatement.
 - Why those decisions were reversed.
 - What you did to ensure it will not happen again.
- A correction to <https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co/transparency> that:
 - Accurately records your errors and late removals.
 - Acknowledges that positive reviews were wrongly flagged or suppressed.
 - Stops framing my attempts to protect my reputation as the problem.
- A clear statement from a senior legal or compliance person, not a junior support agent or AI template, addressing:
 - Your recognition of your obligations under Australian defamation law and Australian Consumer Law.
 - What you will be preserving by way of logs, tickets, and internal communications for the purposes of potential legal proceedings.

If you cannot or will not do this, then please treat this email as part of the record that will be placed before the court and relevant regulators, including:

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

I look forward to a substantive response that actually engages with the evidence and the law, rather than yet another automated delay message.

Anthony Brodie

Legion Killfeed

Nothing in this present email narrows or replaces the above. Instead, it adds Case #00725903 and the auto-flagged “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review to the list of examples that will be going before the court and regulators.

6. What I require from you as Escalation Specialist

To move this forward, I now require the following from you (not another template):

1. Identification of the specific review covered by **Case #00725903** (reviewer name, URL, review ID and related case numbers).

2. Immediate and permanent removal of the “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review at:

- <https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/692b14c5772dcebff6caec38>
- <https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co>
together with written confirmation.

3. A clear explanation of your handling of edited reviews and flags, including why I am blocked from re-flagging content that has been materially changed and is now auto-flagged by your own software as harmful or illegal.

4. Confirmation that all logs, audit trails and internal communications for Cases #00713084, #00725903 and all related tickets (including removal/reinstatement events, classification decisions and edits) will be preserved for litigation.

5. Escalation of this matter to a senior legal or compliance officer, with a substantive response addressing my August Calderbank offer, the ABN issue, the transparency page and the systemic problems set out above.

Please treat this email as part of the formal record for all related cases. If you are not the right person to answer these points, then as Escalation Specialist your role is to put it in front of someone who is – not to close the file with “no further action can be taken”.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Legion Killfeed

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

Sent: Wednesday, 10 December 2025 1:58 AM

To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>

Subject: Trustpilot engaging in criminal conduct right now falsely stated a review was removed [thread::ST9RXy1ZesSr5EdS6TX4IWA::]

Case number: 00725903

Hi Anthony,

Thanks for getting in touch.

As an Escalation Specialist in Trustpilot's Content Integrity Team, I've now concluded the assessment of your appeal that you raised on **2025-12-08** for **Defamation**.

Outcome of the appeal

We would like to inform you that, upon checking, the review in question has been removed from the platform.

As the review has already been addressed, no further action can be taken regarding this case. This completes the investigation of your case.

Best regards,



Email Headers (Raw)

[illegible]