

From: Soul Legion <Brodiess@REDACTED.email>
To: Accounts Receivable <accounting+id1W56ZW-PJ5WE@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com>
Subject: Re: [Trustpilot] Re: Re: Update on your request #00713084 [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]
Date: Fri, 12 Dec 2025 07:37:44 +1100



This is who you are willing to break the law for by the way. Someone who says this kind of sick shit.

From: Trustpilot Legal (Accounts Receivable) <accounting@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 December 2025 7:34 AM
To: Soul Legion <Brodiess@REDACTED.email>
Subject: [Trustpilot] Re: Re: Update on your request #00713084 [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]

##- Please type your reply above this line -##

Your request (508859) has been updated. To add additional comments, reply to this email.



Trustpilot Legal

Dec 11, 2025, 21:34 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Soul Legion

Comment Content :

Since you have now said you will “no longer respond to the same request” while still hosting material you have been put on detailed legal notice about, you do not get to simply disengage and pretend the problem is solved. Until you either remove the proven false reviews and confirm that

you are complying with your obligations under Australian law, or provide a substantive legal response that can be tested by a regulator or a court, I will send a brief follow-up roughly every 15 minutes so there is a clear written record that Trustpilot continues to publish this content after notice while refusing to engage.



Soul Legion

Dec 11, 2025, 21:34 GMT+1

Since you have now said you will “no longer respond to the same request” while still hosting material you have been put on detailed legal notice about, you do not get to simply disengage and pretend the problem is solved. Until you either remove the proven false reviews and confirm that you are complying with your obligations under Australian law, or provide a substantive legal response that can be tested by a regulator or a court, I will send a brief follow-up roughly every 15 minutes so there is a clear written record that Trustpilot continues to publish this content after notice while refusing to engage.



Trustpilot Legal

Dec 11, 2025, 21:24 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Accounts Receivable

Comment Content :

To view the status of the ticket or add comments, please visit [Sincerely, Trustpilot Support Team](#)



Soul Legion

Dec 11, 2025, 21:24 GMT+1

Here, I've taken the liberty of enquiring if this is legal by asking eSafetyCommission on twitter.

<https://x.com/LegionKillfeed/status/1999212130340667718>

While I was at it, I asked the Australian Tax Office if you're allowed to lie about your tax status

<https://x.com/LegionKillfeed/status/1999212133331140630>

Criminal behaviour with the tax office, I'm gonna need that legal point of contact in Australia and your real ABN now.



Trustpilot Legal

Dec 11, 2025, 21:05 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Accounts Receivable

Comment Content :

To view the status of the ticket or add comments, please visit [Sincerely, Trustpilot Support Team](#)



Soul Legion

Dec 11, 2025, 21:04 GMT+1

Another thing for you, Nicole and TrustSafety to take into account,

You have just told me you will “no longer respond to the same request” while still hosting content I have put you on detailed legal notice about. Before you shut the door, I want the record to be clear about what has actually been happening across all of these tickets.

1. Pattern of mishandled reviews and silent reversals

Across Legion Killfeed and DayZ Multi Tool you have:

- Allowed coordinated competitor reviews from Havasu / Links / pups (Whitelist.gg) and Anthony Buchanan / OzzieHousos / UntoldTruthy (dayzboosterz.com) to stay live for weeks, only to eventually remove them as defamatory once I pushed hard enough.
- Quietly reinstated or reshuffled reviews after removal, so your “transparency” page never reflects what really happened and hides the fact that you originally accepted obviously fake or coordinated content.
- Failed to show a full picture of my profile by omitting positive reviews that were flagged and then removed, while leaving the negative warzone front and centre.

On top of that, during the July–September 2025 review-bombing you were shown screenshots of a competitor publicly organising fake reviews. You still reinstated several of those reviews more than once before quietly removing them later, with no proper explanation and no correction of your public “trust” metrics.

2. Current reviews: Consumer / Hooded_saw and Kamy

You are now taking the same approach with:

- **Consumer / Hooded_saw** on Legion Killfeed, where your own history UI shows a mess of conflicting investigations (hate/discrimination,

different business, personal information, advertising/promotional content, not genuine experience) and even acknowledges a “technical error”, yet you keep the review up and treat each fresh complaint as if it is the first time you have heard about it.

- **Kamy**, a known competitor tied to the same group you already accepted as defamatory in 2024. Your tools clearly show that both “Not based on a genuine experience” and “Harmful or illegal” have already been run. You still tell me, with a straight face, that it “has not been flagged under NBGE” and I should flag it again from the dashboard.

You cannot have it both ways. If your own interface shows that these workflows have run and that the review has been fully investigated under those reasons, then telling me to start the flagging loop again is not a genuine “process requirement”. It is just a way to buy more time while the attacks stay online.

3. Kyle review and the blank-ticket pattern

The Kyle “This bot was used to wipe my server” review is a perfect example of how you treat this. You left a clearly impossible, provably false “Verified” review online for over a year after notice, locked my ability to flag it, and then:

- Sent a completely blank email under Ticket 39666963 with nothing but your footer.
- Only after I challenged that empty message did you finally issue a “we have taken the review offline” decision and tie it back to the same ticket.

Internally, you move things around and eventually act. Externally, I am told to re-flag, re-appeal and politely wait while the damage continues.

4. Your “guidelines only, not law” position

The most serious part of this is not a single review, it is your stated position on the law.

On 4 December 2025, Gowtham from Trust Support wrote to me (Ticket 00695808) and said, in black and white:

“Trustpilot is not able to make legal determinations regarding defamation, harassment, or unlawful conduct... We cannot remove content based on legal arguments. We can only take action when a review clearly violates our internal guidelines, not based on external legal standards.”

That is not a harmless bit of boilerplate. It is an admission that even when you are put on proper legal notice that material is defamatory and unlawful, you refuse to act **because** the complaint is framed in legal terms rather than as just another tick-box guideline flag.

In New South Wales, once you receive a written complaint that:

- identifies the plaintiff,
- identifies the matter complained of, and
- explains why it is defamatory,

you do not get to shrug and say “we only follow our internal guidelines”. Your digital-intermediary defence depends on taking reasonable steps to prevent access within the statutory period. You have had that level of notice many times over, across multiple reviews and multiple tickets, and chosen instead to hide behind your own processes.

Every time you refuse removal after notice you are not a neutral “host”. You are a primary publisher making a fresh publication with knowledge.

5. Mishandling of harassment and legal escalation

Across roughly 500 emails and tickets you have:

- Ignored or slow-walked legal notices that clearly met your own “complaint” criteria while prioritising narrow content-integrity tickets that let you say “does not breach guidelines”.
- Misrepresented your own Australian registration status until I forced you to acknowledge the obligations attached to trading here.
- Continued to show a “Verified” badge on reviews you knew were not genuine customer transactions, which misleads both Australian consumers and regulators about the reliability of your system.
- Used the fact that I have mentioned being pushed to the point of suicidal thoughts as a PR shield, while still leaving up the content and campaigns that contributed to that state in the first place.

Now Nicole has written that you “will no longer respond to the same request” while those same reviews and transparency distortions remain in place. This is not a good-faith exhaustion of process. It is a refusal to engage with your legal duties.

6. What I am asking, one last time

This email is not a “new ticket”. It is a summary of exactly how your own communications and decisions have brought you to this point. I am asking for three concrete things:

1. Immediate legal compliance

- Permanently remove the Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw reviews from my profiles and bar those accounts and their associated competitor group from reviewing my business in future.
- Correct your transparency and “Verified” labels so they no longer misrepresent which reviews were genuine, which were removed as defamatory, and which positive reviews have been excluded.

2. Proper handling of legal complaints

- Acknowledge that my previous legal notices (including those August 2025 letters and the more recent formal defamation notices) are being treated as legal complaints, not just as another content-integrity queue item.
- Confirm that relevant logs, review histories, internal notes and ticket communications are being preserved for regulators and any court proceedings.

3. Australian point of contact

- Given the gravity of the harassment and your ongoing publication after notice, please confirm the name and contact details of the person or entity that acts as your point of contact in Australia so that I can direct NSW Police and other authorities to the correct representative when I raise this formally. If you have no such contact, say so clearly so I can pass that fact on as well.

If you genuinely believe your handling of these matters is lawful in Australia, then say so clearly and own that position. You already have Gowtham on record saying you “cannot remove content based on legal arguments”. If you want to test that in front of a judge by suing me for calling this behaviour unlawful and criminal, I will welcome that opportunity. It will force all of these emails, tickets, review histories and “technical errors” into the open under oath, which is where they belong.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Owner – Legion Killfeed / DayZ Multi Tool
ABN 28 387 377 607



Trustpilot Legal

Dec 11, 2025, 20:40 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Soul Legion

Comment Content :

Hi Nicole,

You’ve said:

“We consider having answered your questions several times, and in order to avoid repetitive emails, we will no longer respond to the same request, unless you have new information to communicate to us.”

This email is exactly that: **new information**, framed specifically against your own published guideline categories, showing that the “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review violates multiple Trustpilot rules even before we get to defamation and Australian law.

You and your colleagues have repeatedly told me that:

“the review will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation”

and that your focus is on “**authenticity (a genuine experience) and content standards**”, not adjudicating “the underlying truth of a transaction”.

Even on those terms, the Consumer/Hooded_saw review fails your own standards in multiple ways.

1. Not based on a genuine experience (core authenticity breach)

Your own guidelines require that reviews reflect a **genuine experience with the business**.

In this case:

- The Apple relay email/account attached to the review is **not the paying Legion Killfeed subscriber** in my records.
- The *actual* payer is an elderly relative who has never personally interacted with me, my bot, or my support channels and has never confirmed authorising this review.
- The story told in the review (about “my” support, “my” tickets, “my” refusals, etc) does **not match any ticket history or Discord logs** under the actual subscriber’s identity.

That means the author is, at best, a **third-party storyteller** speaking on someone else’s account and, at worst, a proxy being used as part of a pre-existing harassment campaign. In either case, it is **not** a clean, first-hand customer experience and therefore fails your “genuine experience” requirement.

2. Misinformation / impersonation of a customer

In earlier correspondence, your team gave examples of content removable as “Advertising / Promotional / Misinformation / Impersonation”, including:

- reviews that present **false claims as fact**, and
- **impersonation**, where someone represents themselves as a customer when they are not.

The Consumer/Hooded_saw review:

- **Presents the author as the person who paid for and used the service**, when my billing records show otherwise.
- Asserts a detailed support history (“I opened tickets”, “I was refused support”, etc) that does **not exist in my logs** for the actual paying subscriber.
- Leans on the “Verified” and invitation / “reviewer information attached” treatment to imply that this is a valid, transactional customer story when your own internal metadata contradicts itself (invited vs organic; “reviewer information attached” vs subscription logs).

That combination is exactly what your own examples describe: a **misleading, impersonated customer narrative** presented as genuine,

and therefore removable under your misinformation / impersonation standards even before we talk about defamation.

3. Conflicting internal status = clear authenticity red flag

Your systems have already recorded, for this one review:

- Multiple **different investigation reasons and outcomes**, including “not a genuine experience”, “different business”, “personal information”, “advertising/promotional content” and “technical error”.
- At one point it is treated as an **invited review with reviewer information attached**, at another as **Organic**.
- The text has been **substantially rewritten after you were on notice**, shifting from a short insult into a long, detailed narrative about tickets, refusals and alleged mistreatment.

That pattern is not consistent with a normal, honest consumer review. It is consistent with someone **testing the edges of your system**, rewriting their story after each challenge, and your tools struggling to keep a consistent classification.

Under your own guidelines, that should be enough to treat it as **non-credible / non-authentic content** and remove it, rather than dig in and insist it must stay.

4. Conflict of interest / competitor-linked harassment

You have known since 2024 that:

- The authors of the earlier one-star reviews removed as defamatory (Havasu/Links/pups and Anthony Buchanan/OzzieHousos/UntoldTruthy) are **direct competitors** and associates of **Kamy/Kami/Mathew**.
- Those earlier reviews were removed because they were defamatory and part of a wider campaign, not honest consumer feedback.

The Consumer/Hooded_saw review:

- Re-runs the same themes and accusations that appeared in those earlier competitor reviews, just in more “polished” form.
- Sits alongside Kamy’s review as part of the same ongoing pattern of **coordinated attacks** on my business and products.

Your own guidelines speak about **conflict of interest**, misuse of the platform, and organised attacks. Leaving this review up as if it were an isolated customer story is not consistent with that. It is part of a known cluster of competitor-linked, bad-faith reviews that you have already partially recognised and removed.

5. Harmful / illegal content (accusations of unlawful conduct)

Even in its edited form, the Consumer/Hooded_saw narrative:

- Implies that my handling of their subscription/payment and support constitutes **misconduct** or effectively “taking money without providing service”,
- Frames that in a way that suggests **dishonesty or exploitation** rather than a simple disagreement or misunderstanding.

Your own “Harmful or Illegal” guidance includes content that makes **serious allegations of unlawful or fraudulent behaviour** against a business. You cannot simultaneously:

- claim you do not “adjudicate the truth”, **and**
- maintain a category for “misinformation / impersonation / harmful content” that inherently requires you to consider whether an allegation is credible.

Here, you have:

- my subscription and billing records,
- the mismatch between the payer and the reviewing identity,
- and the existing harassment/competitor evidence.

That is more than enough to put this in the “high-risk and likely harmful” bucket under your own standards.

6. Why this *is* “new information” for this thread

Up to now, you and your colleagues have repeatedly framed your refusal to remove the Consumer/Hooded_saw review as:

- a decision on **defamation only**, and
- a refusal to “take sides” on the underlying truth.

This email:

- **Sets out, explicitly and in one place**, how this review breaches your own **authenticity, misinformation/impersonation, conflict-of-interest and harmful-content standards**,
- Consolidates points that have previously been scattered across multiple tickets and months of correspondence.

That is **new information in this ticket**, presented in the exact categories you say you rely on. It is not “the same request” repeated. It is the evidence mapped directly to your own rules.

What I am asking from you now

Given the above, I am asking you to:

1. **Reopen and re-evaluate the Consumer / Hooded_saw review**, not just under “defamation”, but under:
 - Authenticity / genuine experience,

- Misinformation / impersonation,
 - Conflict of interest / competitor involvement, and
 - Harmful / illegal content.
2. **Confirm in writing** whether, in light of this, you still maintain that this review complies with your guidelines in all of those categories.
3. If you choose to keep it online despite the above, do so in the explicit understanding that you are:
- acknowledging the authenticity, misinformation, conflict-of-interest and harmful-content issues raised here,
 - choosing to leave the review in place after detailed notice,
 - and therefore increasing Trustpilot's exposure as a knowing publisher under Australian law.

If, after receiving this, you still insist that "we will no longer respond to the same request", then that will simply be added to the record as further proof that Trustpilot is unwilling to apply its own guidelines when doing so would require removing clearly non-authentic, high-risk content.

Furthermore, given the gravity of the harassment and your ongoing willingness to host lies you have been repeatedly put on notice about, please provide the details of your Australian contact person or office (legal entity name, physical address and best contact email). In around three hours, when it is a reasonable time here, I intend to formally refer this matter to NSW Police and request that they investigate – and, if appropriate, arrest your Australian contact in relation to Trustpilot's ongoing criminal conduct in publishing and republishing this material after notice.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Owner – Legion Killfeed / DayZ Multi Tool
ABN 28 387 377 607

To view the status of the ticket or add comments, please visit
<https://service.trustpilotcorp.com/public/tickets/38a6c824b076bb2cea6a4c9a66a312b876d0a1b020193b1c98cc47000f4a4e0b>

Sincerely,
Trustpilot Support Team



Soul Legion

Dec 11, 2025, 20:40 GMT+1

Hi Nicole,

You've said:

"We consider having answered your questions several times, and in order to avoid repetitive emails, we will no longer respond to the same request, unless you have new information to communicate to us."

This email is exactly that: **new information**, framed specifically against your own published guideline categories, showing that the "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review violates multiple Trustpilot rules even before we get to defamation and Australian law.

You and your colleagues have repeatedly told me that:

"the review will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation"

and that your focus is on "**authenticity (a genuine experience) and content standards**", not adjudicating "the underlying truth of a transaction".

Even on those terms, the Consumer/Hooded_saw review fails your own standards in multiple ways.

1. Not based on a genuine experience (core authenticity breach)

Your own guidelines require that reviews reflect a **genuine experience with the business**.

In this case:

- The Apple relay email/account attached to the review is **not the paying Legion Killfeed subscriber** in my records.
- The *actual* payer is an elderly relative who has never personally interacted with me, my bot, or my support channels and has never confirmed authorising this review.
- The story told in the review (about "my" support, "my" tickets, "my" refusals, etc) does **not match any ticket history or Discord logs** under the actual subscriber's identity.

That means the author is, at best, a **third-party storyteller** speaking on someone else's account and, at worst, a proxy being used as part of a pre-existing harassment campaign. In either case, it is **not** a clean, first-hand customer experience and therefore fails your "genuine experience" requirement.

2. Misinformation / impersonation of a customer

In earlier correspondence, your team gave examples of content removable as "Advertising / Promotional / Misinformation / Impersonation", including:

- reviews that present **false claims as fact**, and
- **impersonation**, where someone represents themselves as a customer when they are not.

The Consumer/Hooded_saw review:

- **Presents the author as the person who paid for and used the service**, when my billing records show otherwise.
- Asserts a detailed support history ("I opened tickets", "I was refused support", etc) that does **not exist in my logs** for the actual paying subscriber.
- Leans on the "Verified" and invitation / "reviewer information attached" treatment to imply that this is a valid, transactional customer story when your own internal metadata contradicts itself (invited vs organic; "reviewer information attached" vs subscription logs).

That combination is exactly what your own examples describe: a **misleading, impersonated customer narrative** presented as genuine, and therefore removable under your misinformation / impersonation standards even before we talk about defamation.

3. Conflicting internal status = clear authenticity red flag

Your systems have already recorded, for this one review:

- Multiple **different investigation reasons and outcomes**, including "not a genuine experience", "different business", "personal information", "advertising/promotional content" and "technical error".
- At one point it is treated as an **invited review with reviewer information attached**, at another as **Organic**.
- The text has been **substantially rewritten after you were on notice**, shifting from a short insult into a long, detailed narrative about tickets, refusals and alleged mistreatment.

That pattern is not consistent with a normal, honest consumer review. It is consistent with someone **testing the edges of your system**, rewriting their story after each challenge, and your tools struggling to keep a consistent classification.

Under your own guidelines, that should be enough to treat it as **non-credible / non-authentic content** and remove it, rather than dig in and insist it must stay.

4. Conflict of interest / competitor-linked harassment

You have known since 2024 that:

- The authors of the earlier one-star reviews removed as defamatory (Havasus/Links/pups and Anthony Buchanan/OzzieHousos/UntoldTruthy) are **direct competitors** and associates of **Kamy/Kami/Mathew**.
- Those earlier reviews were removed because they were defamatory and part of a wider campaign, not honest consumer feedback.

The Consumer/Hooded_saw review:

- Re-runs the same themes and accusations that appeared in those earlier competitor reviews, just in more "polished" form.

- Sits alongside Kamy's review as part of the same ongoing pattern of **coordinated attacks** on my business and products.

Your own guidelines speak about **conflict of interest**, misuse of the platform, and organised attacks. Leaving this review up as if it were an isolated customer story is not consistent with that. It is part of a known cluster of competitor-linked, bad-faith reviews that you have already partially recognised and removed.

5. Harmful / illegal content (accusations of unlawful conduct)

Even in its edited form, the Consumer/Hooded_saw narrative:

- Implies that my handling of their subscription/payment and support constitutes **misconduct** or effectively "taking money without providing service",
- Frames that in a way that suggests **dishonesty or exploitation** rather than a simple disagreement or misunderstanding.

Your own "Harmful or Illegal" guidance includes content that makes **serious allegations of unlawful or fraudulent behaviour** against a business. You cannot simultaneously:

- claim you do not "adjudicate the truth", **and**
- maintain a category for "misinformation / impersonation / harmful content" that inherently requires you to consider whether an allegation is credible.

Here, you have:

- my subscription and billing records,
- the mismatch between the payer and the reviewing identity,
- and the existing harassment/competitor evidence.

That is more than enough to put this in the "high-risk and likely harmful" bucket under your own standards.

6. Why this *is* "new information" for this thread

Up to now, you and your colleagues have repeatedly framed your refusal to remove the Consumer/Hooded_saw review as:

- a decision on **defamation only**, and
- a refusal to "take sides" on the underlying truth.

This email:

- **Sets out, explicitly and in one place**, how this review breaches your own **authenticity, misinformation/impersonation, conflict-of-interest and harmful-content standards**,
- Consolidates points that have previously been scattered across multiple tickets and months of correspondence.

That is **new information in this ticket**, presented in the exact categories you say you rely on. It is not “the same request” repeated. It is the evidence mapped directly to your own rules.

What I am asking from you now

Given the above, I am asking you to:

1. **Reopen and re-evaluate the Consumer / Hooded_saw review**, not just under “defamation”, but under:
 - Authenticity / genuine experience,
 - Misinformation / impersonation,
 - Conflict of interest / competitor involvement, and
 - Harmful / illegal content.
2. **Confirm in writing** whether, in light of this, you still maintain that this review complies with your guidelines in all of those categories.
3. If you choose to keep it online despite the above, do so in the explicit understanding that you are:
 - acknowledging the authenticity, misinformation, conflict-of-interest and harmful-content issues raised here,
 - choosing to leave the review in place after detailed notice,
 - and therefore increasing Trustpilot’s exposure as a knowing publisher under Australian law.

If, after receiving this, you still insist that “we will no longer respond to the same request”, then that will simply be added to the record as further proof that Trustpilot is unwilling to apply its own guidelines when doing so would require removing clearly non-authentic, high-risk content.

Furthermore, given the gravity of the harassment and your ongoing willingness to host lies you have been repeatedly put on notice about, please provide the details of your Australian contact person or office (legal entity name, physical address and best contact email). In around three hours, when it is a reasonable time here, I intend to formally refer this matter to NSW Police and request that they investigate – and, if appropriate, arrest your Australian contact in relation to Trustpilot’s ongoing criminal conduct in publishing and republishing this material after notice.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Owner – Legion Killfeed / DayZ Multi Tool
ABN 28 387 377 607

From: TrustSafety (Accounts Receivable)
<accounting@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 6:33 AM
To: Soul Legion <Brodies@REDACTED.email>

Subject: [Trustpilot] Re: Re: Update on your request [#00713084](#) [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]



Trustpilot Legal

Dec 11, 2025, 20:33 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Accounts Receivable

Comment Content :

To view the status of the ticket or add comments, please visit [Sincerely, Trustpilot Support Team](#)

**TrustSafety**

Dec 11, 2025, 20:33 GMT+1

Hello Anthony,

We consider having answered your questions several times, and in order to avoid repetitive emails, we will no longer respond to the same request, unless you have new information to communicate to us.

Thank you for your understanding.

Nicole



See our reviews



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

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

From: Trustpilot Legal [accounting@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com]

Sent: 12/11/2025 2:28 PM

To:

Cc: trust.operations@trustpilot.com; privacy@trustpilot.com; press@trustpilot.com; contentintegrity@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request [#00713084](#) [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]

**Trustpilot Legal**

Dec 11, 2025, 20:28 GMT+1

Hi,

There is a new comment in the ticket submitted by Soul Legion to Trustpilot

Comment added by : Soul Legion

Comment Content :

Hi Nicole,

Thank you for your email.

Let me be absolutely clear at the outset: you have not "solved all open cases in regard to this". You have closed support tickets. That is not the same thing as resolving the underlying legal problem, and it does not reset the notice you have already been given.

I will keep this as structured as I can, because you now seem to be the single point of contact.

1. "Neutral platform" is not a defence after notice

You say Trustpilot is a user generated content platform and that you "maintain a position of neutrality in factual disputes between businesses and reviewers".

Under Australian defamation law, that neutrality only has any relevance before you are on proper written notice. Once you have been given:

- a written complaint that clearly identifies me and my business
- clearly identifies the specific reviews and where they appear
- and explains why those reviews are defamatory and not based on a genuine experience

you are no longer a neutral conduit if you choose to keep publishing them.

You now have multiple emails from me that do exactly that, including:

- the detailed breakdown on the Kyle review
- the detailed breakdowns on the competitor reviews against Legion Killfeed
- the explanation of why the "Consumer / Hooded_saw" narrative does not match my subscription records or your own internal history

From that point on, every decision to leave a review live is a fresh, knowing publication after notice. Saying "we cannot adjudicate the underlying truth of a transaction" might be convenient internally, but it does not change your status in New South Wales if you keep the material online anyway.

You are not a court. You are a publisher making editorial decisions about what you will and will not host after being told in writing that specific content is false and harmful.

2. The "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review

You state that this review "will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation" and that you have "manually assessed the edited content" and decided it does not contravene your guidelines.

The problem is that you are pretending this is just a guidelines question.

You already know that:

- the text has been substantially rewritten after you were put on notice
- your own tools show a long series of different investigations and reinstatements, including a "technical error" reinstatement
- the review has been treated as both "invited with reviewer information attached" and "organic" at different points

- my own subscription and payment records do not match the story being told in the review at all, including who actually pays for the subscription

You may choose to tell yourself that you “cannot definitively determine which party is telling the truth”, but you are sitting on a pile of contradictory internal metadata and external evidence that should at minimum raise a red flag about this being a clean, normal consumer experience. Instead of treating it as part of a wider harassment and competitor campaign, you have decided to keep it online and rely on your own guidelines as a shield.

That is your choice. It is also your liability.

3. The “Verified” explanation

You now say that in this case the “Verified” label relates to the reviewer account, and that it “is not a guarantee of the truth of all factual statements within the review text”.

This does not fix the problem. It creates a new one.

Your own UI and earlier correspondence have:

- presented this review as an invited or attached review at some stages
- presented it as organic at others
- attached “verified” treatments that would lead any ordinary reader to believe the experience itself has been verified, not just that the account has jumped through one of your internal hoops

If your own staff and tools cannot keep a consistent story straight about whether a review is invited, organic, tied to a genuine transaction or just attached to some account verification, then the label is inherently misleading in practice. Telling me, after the fact, that it only means “the account is verified” does not change the impression your badge gives to consumers when it sits next to a long, detailed narrative that you have chosen to keep online.

4. My mental health and your platform’s role

You have taken the time to point out that you have “reviewed all of [my] correspondence” and noticed mentions of self harm, and you have very helpfully provided links to Lifeline and the Suicide Call Back Service.

My mental health did not deteriorate in a vacuum. It has deteriorated in the context of:

- three years of coordinated harassment and false criminal accusations across multiple platforms
- competitors using your site as one of their weapons
- you repeatedly reinstating and hosting reviews that you have been told in writing are false, impossible or non genuine
- and hundreds of emails where I have had to explain basic technical and legal realities to people who fall back on “guidelines” and “neutrality” every time it suits them

If you genuinely care about the impact on my mental health, the single most effective thing you can do is to stop publishing and republishing defamatory and misleading content about me and my products after you have been put on notice.

Telling me to call a helpline while you knowingly keep hosting the content that helped put me in that state is not compassion. It is risk management.

5. What I need from you now

You say you will “address [me] here to avoid miscommunication” and that you have “solved all open cases in regard to this”.

From my side, what needs to be “solved” is very specific:

1. Kyle review

- Confirm that the Kyle review has been permanently removed, not just filtered.
- Confirm that all versions, edits, logs, timestamps and internal notes relating to the Kyle review and the decisions around it are being preserved in full for legal and regulatory purposes.

2. Consumer / Hooded_saw review

- Reconsider your position in light of the fact that this is not a clean, single version review. You have multiple versions, contradictory internal metadata and a payment story that does not match my records.
- If you insist on keeping it published, do so in the explicit knowledge that it will form part of any proceedings and regulatory complaints as an example of publication after notice.

3. Kamy and other competitor linked reviews

- Acknowledge that you have known since at least 2024 that competitors linked to Kamy have used Trustpilot to target my business with defamatory reviews, and that “neutral platform” language does not erase that history.
- Confirm how you intend to handle Kamy’s current review and any future reviews from accounts linked to that same group, given the evidence you already hold.

4. Legal handling

- Confirm that my legal notices and supporting material are being treated as legal matters within Trustpilot, not just as content integrity tickets.
- Provide a timeframe for a substantive written response from your legal team that addresses the defamation and digital intermediary issues directly, rather than only referring back to guidelines.

Until those points are dealt with, closing tickets and calling the cases “solved” simply adds to the record that Trustpilot is not engaging with the substance, only the optics.

To be absolutely clear about why this is not just a “guidelines” disagreement but a legal one:

In your own words, you have told me that:

“the review will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation.”

and that:

“Our role is not to adjudicate the underlying truth of a transaction. The core of our review guidelines centers on authenticity (a genuine experience) and content standards...”

In other words, you are expressly saying that Trustpilot:

- will not remove a review *even when defamation is the reason raised*, and
- will not engage with whether the factual allegations in a detailed narrative are true or false, even after you are put on written notice that they are wrong and not based on a genuine experience.

That may be consistent with your internal guidelines. It is not consistent with your obligations as a publisher under Australian defamation law once you are on notice.

My position is simple:

- You now have written complaints that identify me, identify the reviews, and explain why they are defamatory and non genuine.
- From that point on, you are no longer a neutral conduit. You are a primary publisher making an active choice to continue or stop publication.
- Every time you say “we will not remove this based on defamation” and keep it online, that is another fresh publication after notice.

You are, on record, choosing to prioritise your internal “we don’t adjudicate truth and we don’t remove for defamation” stance over the legal requirement to take reasonable steps to prevent access to material once you know it is alleged to be defamatory and you have enough information to understand why.

Because you maintain that position, then Trustpilot – not just the individual reviewers – are now being treated as a knowing publisher in complaints to the eSafety Commissioner and ACCC, and for the upcoming defamation proceedings in New South Wales. Your email stating that the review “will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation” will be included verbatim as part of that record.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Owner – Legion Killfeed / DayZ Multi Tool
ABN 28 387 377 607



Soul Legion

Dec 11, 2025, 20:27 GMT+1

Hi Nicole,

Thank you for your email.

Let me be absolutely clear at the outset: you have not “solved all open cases in regard to this”. You have closed support tickets. That is not the same thing as resolving the underlying legal problem, and it does not reset the notice you have already been given.

I will keep this as structured as I can, because you now seem to be the single point of contact.

1. “Neutral platform” is not a defence after notice

You say Trustpilot is a user generated content platform and that you “maintain a position of neutrality in factual disputes between businesses and reviewers”.

Under Australian defamation law, that neutrality only has any relevance before you are on proper written notice. Once you have been given:

- a written complaint that clearly identifies me and my business
- clearly identifies the specific reviews and where they appear
- and explains why those reviews are defamatory and not based on a genuine experience

you are no longer a neutral conduit if you choose to keep publishing them.

You now have multiple emails from me that do exactly that, including:

- the detailed breakdown on the Kyle review
- the detailed breakdowns on the competitor reviews against Legion Killfeed
- the explanation of why the “Consumer / Hooded_saw” narrative does not match my subscription records or your own internal history

From that point on, every decision to leave a review live is a fresh, knowing publication after notice. Saying “we cannot adjudicate the underlying truth of a transaction” might be convenient internally, but it does not change your status in New South Wales if you keep the material online anyway.

You are not a court. You are a publisher making editorial decisions about what you will and will not host after being told in writing that specific content is false and harmful.

2. The “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review

You state that this review “will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation” and that you have “manually assessed the edited content” and decided it does not contravene your guidelines.

The problem is that you are pretending this is just a guidelines question.

You already know that:

- the text has been substantially rewritten after you were put on notice
- your own tools show a long series of different investigations and reinstatements, including a “technical error” reinstatement
- the review has been treated as both “invited with reviewer information attached” and “organic” at different points
- my own subscription and payment records do not match the story being told in the review at all, including who actually pays for the subscription

You may choose to tell yourself that you “cannot definitively determine which party is telling the truth”, but you are sitting on a pile of contradictory internal metadata and external evidence that should at minimum raise a red flag about this being a clean, normal consumer experience. Instead of treating it as part of a wider harassment and competitor campaign, you have decided to keep it online and rely on your own guidelines as a shield.

That is your choice. It is also your liability.

3. The “Verified” explanation

You now say that in this case the “Verified” label relates to the reviewer account, and that it “is not a guarantee of the truth of all factual statements within the review text”.

This does not fix the problem. It creates a new one.

Your own UI and earlier correspondence have:

- presented this review as an invited or attached review at some stages
- presented it as organic at others
- attached “verified” treatments that would lead any ordinary reader to believe the experience itself has been verified, not just that the account has jumped through one of your internal hoops

If your own staff and tools cannot keep a consistent story straight about whether a review is invited, organic, tied to a genuine transaction or just attached to some account verification, then the label is inherently misleading in practice. Telling me, after the fact, that it only means “the account is verified” does not change the impression your badge gives to consumers when it sits next to a long, detailed narrative that you have chosen to keep online.

4. My mental health and your platform’s role

You have taken the time to point out that you have “reviewed all of [my] correspondence” and noticed mentions of self harm, and you have very helpfully provided links to Lifeline and the Suicide Call Back Service.

My mental health did not deteriorate in a vacuum. It has deteriorated in the context of:

- three years of coordinated harassment and false criminal accusations across multiple platforms
- competitors using your site as one of their weapons
- you repeatedly reinstating and hosting reviews that you have been told in writing are false, impossible or non genuine
- and hundreds of emails where I have had to explain basic technical and legal realities to people who fall back on “guidelines” and “neutrality” every time it suits them

If you genuinely care about the impact on my mental health, the single most effective thing you can do is to stop publishing and republishing defamatory and misleading content about me and my products after you have been put on notice.

Telling me to call a helpline while you knowingly keep hosting the content that helped put me in that state is not compassion. It is risk management.

5. What I need from you now

You say you will “address [me] here to avoid miscommunication” and that you have “solved all open cases in regard to this”.

From my side, what needs to be “solved” is very specific:

1. Kyle review

- Confirm that the Kyle review has been permanently removed, not just filtered.
- Confirm that all versions, edits, logs, timestamps and internal notes relating to the Kyle review and the decisions around it are being preserved in full for legal and regulatory purposes.

2. Consumer / Hooded_saw review

- Reconsider your position in light of the fact that this is not a clean, single version review. You have multiple versions, contradictory internal metadata and a payment story that does not match my records.
- If you insist on keeping it published, do so in the explicit knowledge that it will form part of any proceedings and regulatory complaints as an example of publication after notice.

3. Kamy and other competitor linked reviews

- Acknowledge that you have known since at least 2024 that competitors linked to Kamy have used Trustpilot to target my business with defamatory reviews, and that “neutral platform” language does not erase that history.
- Confirm how you intend to handle Kamy’s current review and any future reviews from accounts linked to that same group, given the evidence you already hold.

4. Legal handling

- Confirm that my legal notices and supporting material are being treated as legal matters within Trustpilot, not just as content integrity tickets.
- Provide a timeframe for a substantive written response from your legal team that addresses the defamation and digital intermediary issues directly, rather than only referring back to guidelines.

Until those points are dealt with, closing tickets and calling the cases “solved” simply adds to the record that Trustpilot is not engaging with the substance, only the optics.

To be absolutely clear about why this is not just a “guidelines” disagreement but a legal one:

In your own words, you have told me that:

“the review will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation.”

and that:

“Our role is not to adjudicate the underlying truth of a transaction. The core of our review guidelines centers on authenticity (a genuine experience) and content standards...”

In other words, you are expressly saying that Trustpilot:

- will not remove a review *even when defamation is the reason raised*, and
- will not engage with whether the factual allegations in a detailed narrative are true or false, even after you are put on written notice that they are wrong and not based on a genuine experience.

That may be consistent with your internal guidelines. It is not consistent with your obligations as a publisher under Australian defamation law once you are on notice.

My position is simple:

- You now have written complaints that identify me, identify the reviews, and explain why they are defamatory and non genuine.
- From that point on, you are no longer a neutral conduit. You are a primary publisher making an active choice to continue or stop publication.
- Every time you say “we will not remove this based on defamation” and keep it online, that is another fresh publication after notice.

You are, on record, choosing to prioritise your internal “we don’t adjudicate truth and we don’t remove for defamation” stance over the legal requirement to take reasonable steps to prevent access to material once you know it is alleged to be defamatory and you have enough information to understand why.

Because you maintain that position, then Trustpilot – not just the individual reviewers – are now being treated as a knowing publisher in complaints to the eSafety Commissioner and ACCC, and for the upcoming defamation

proceedings in New South Wales. Your email stating that the review "will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation" will be included verbatim as part of that record.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Owner – Legion Killfeed / DayZ Multi Tool
ABN 28 387 377 607



TrustSafety

Dec 11, 2025, 20:21 GMT+1

Dear Anthony,

Thank you for your email. I have solved all open cases in regard to this and will address you here to avoid miscommunication and ensure your concerns are addressed.

I understand your situation and we're here to assist you.

However, it's important to keep the conversation professional. We do not accept any threatening or abusive messages and will not continue to communicate if it persists.

Trustpilot is a user-generated content platform, we maintain a position of neutrality in factual disputes between businesses and reviewers unless the content is confirmed to breach our guidelines, which is our specific area of focus. I have already discussed our stance within ticket 00697534 regarding the review by

"Consumer" and the review will not be removed based on the flagging reason, defamation. This review has been edited by the reviewer, but as mentioned, I have manually assessed the edited content and it does not contravene our guidelines for defamation.

We understand your assertion that the detailed content of the edited review is factually inconsistent with your internal records (e.g., non-verified payment, refusal of support). Our role is not to adjudicate the underlying truth of a transaction. The core of our review guidelines centers on authenticity (a genuine experience) and content standards (e.g., no hate speech, illegal material). We cannot definitively determine which party is telling the truth regarding the nature of the business relationship.

The "Verified" label on a review indicates that the review was submitted in response to a verified invitation or that we have requested and received documentation from the reviewer to substantiate a genuine experience.

It is not a guarantee of the truth of all factual statements within the review text.
In regard to

your concerns, I see that the "Verified" label in this case is that the reviewer account is verified. Having a verified account does not mean that the reviews written will always be labeled as "verified", and they can still be removed if they are in violation.

I would also like to take the opportunity to share that
after reviewing all of your correspondence, I see that you have mentioned thoughts of self harm. Your mental health is absolutely vital. It's important to talk with people who can help, so I'd encourage you to reach out to a friend, family member, or mental health professional.

Please find information below of some helpful services
who you could talk to right away:

- <https://www.suicidecallbackservice.org.au/phone-and-online-counselling/>
- <https://www.lifeline.org.au/>

Kind regards,

Nicole



See our reviews



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

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

From: Soul Legion [accounting@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com]

Sent: 12/9/2025 6:55 PM

To:

Cc: trust.operations@trustpilot.com; online@esafety.gov.au; privacy@trustpilot.com; legal@trustpilot.com; press@trustpilot.com; contentintegrity@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request [#00713084](#) [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]



Soul Legion

Dec 10, 2025, 00:55 GMT+1

Subject: Ticket [#508859](#) – Request for escalation to Legal/Compliance re ongoing defamation and competitor abuse
Hi Trustpilot Accounting team,

Thank you for acknowledging ticket [#508859](#). I understand this queue is primarily for billing, but I am using it because the normal Support and Content Integrity channels have failed and I need this matter in front of a human with authority in Legal / Compliance / Risk.

Below is a clear, start to finish breakdown so you can see why this is not a routine "bad review" complaint, but an ongoing situation that exposes Trustpilot to liability under Australian defamation law and your own competitor rules.

1. Who I am

My name is Anthony Brodie (Soul Legion). I run Legion Killfeed, a small subscription business based in New South Wales, Australia, providing a specialist Discord bot and tools for DayZ game servers.

Customers pay recurring monthly subscriptions.

The market is niche and reputation driven. A handful of one star reviews on Trustpilot translates directly into lost subscribers.

2. Long running history with Trustpilot

Over several years I have:

Exchanged hundreds of emails with Trustpilot about obviously false, abusive and coordinated reviews, many tied to direct competitors.

Watched you initially defend reviews as "within guidelines", then quietly remove them weeks or months later without explanation.

Seen your "transparency" page for my business frame me as a serial flagger while omitting the fact that a number of negative reviews were later removed or shown to be from competitors.

In August 2025 I sent a detailed Calderbank style settlement offer regarding Trustpilot's contribution to the damage done to my business. That offer has never been properly engaged with.

3. Current focus – the auto flagged "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review

Case [#00713084](#) concerns a one star review on my profile under the name "Consumer", reference "Hooded_saw", currently reading:

"Rude, unwilling to help... I was a paying customer that you refused to help because apparently I wasn't worth your time... I did make a ticket but got no response... you made a separate channel calling me names such as moron, imbecile and idiot... you were sharing cutoff screenshots to your general to showoff to your party what kind of man you really are."

Key facts:

The email behind the review is 2znkkydr98@privaterelay.appleid.com, an Apple relay address.

My subscription and membership records show no paying customer and no pledge under that address or under the name "Hooded_saw".

The actual paying subscriber for the server in question is a different person: Discord user "lihou2451". That subscriber:

Opened a support ticket.

Received multiple responses from me asking for details.

Chose not to answer the questions and instead relied on "Hooded_saw" to complain and threaten to move funds.

"Hooded_saw" is therefore a non customer third party who tried to bypass my support process for someone else's server.

Your own internal history for this review shows a series of "Investigation complete – no breach" entries. Those investigations relate to the original short version of the review that said little more than "Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs professional help".

After those investigations, the reviewer used your edit function to expand it into the long, detailed narrative above. That new text was never re assessed on its merits.

Despite that, the live page now displays:

A banner at the top saying "Trustpilot's automated software has flagged this review for containing harmful or illegal content".

The full edited text still visible to the public.

A notice to me that I have "already flagged this review", preventing any new flag about the edited content.

So in practical terms:

Your systems have detected risk.

The version now online has never had a proper human defamation / genuineness check.

The business targeted is locked out of your advertised flagging tools.

Yet Content Integrity has informed me that the review "does not contravene" your policies and that it is "improbable" that such content would cause serious harm.

4. Competitor review "Kamy" posted again

Alongside "Hooded_saw" there is a one star review from "Kamy", stating in substance:

"My experience with Legion Killfeed was honestly really bad. The bot owner was extremely difficult to deal with... If you're looking for a bot with decent support I'd recommend looking elsewhere."

"Kamy" is Kamikaze / Mathew Trojanowski, a direct commercial competitor who runs a rival killfeed service and is one of the core organisers of the broader harassment campaign against me.

Important points:

Trustpilot has already removed a previous review from Kamy in the past for being from a competitor. I have the prior correspondence confirming that.

On 30 November 2025, Kamy posted a new review that is near identical in wording to his earlier competitor review. This is not a reinstatement by Trustpilot of an old record, it is the same competitor coming back and posting again.

On the public page it appears as normal "Source: Organic" content, with no warning to readers that:

this author is a competing business; or

Trustpilot has already accepted in an earlier ticket that his reviews breach your own competitor rules.

So a competitor you have previously recognised as ineligible to review my service has been allowed to publish essentially the same "experience" again as if the earlier decision never happened.

5. Coordinated 30 November cluster and subscriber drop off

These reviews do not exist in isolation. On 30 November 2025 you received, in very close succession:

The expanded "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review.

Kamy's new competitor review.

A third one star review from "Unholy", an associate of the same group.

All three repeat the same manufactured story that I am rude, unwilling to help, and mistreat customers. All come immediately after I refused to allow a non customer to control another subscriber's server and called out that behaviour.

Looking only at paid subscribers (unique paying accounts, ignoring other revenue streams):

From early 2024 to August 2025 my subscriber numbers grow steadily into the high double digits, just under 120 active subscribers.

From August to November 2025, after further waves of hostile reviews and harassment, there is no month in which the trend stabilises. Each billing cycle has fewer active subscribers than the one before.

By the end of November about one quarter of my paying subscribers have disappeared compared to August, with no natural recovery.

For a small subscription business this is serious damage, not a theoretical worry, and the timing lines up with the latest surge of hostile Trustpilot content, including the new Kamy and "Hooded_saw" reviews.

I am not providing raw ledgers to Accounting, but this is exactly the kind of data that will be put in front of a court and regulators if needed.

6. Legal framework – Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)

Because I and many affected readers are in New South Wales, the relevant law is the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), including:

The new section 31A dealing with digital intermediaries.

The established section 32 defence of innocent dissemination.

In plain terms:

Once a digital intermediary receives a written complaint that: the intermediary only has the digital intermediary defence if it takes reasonable steps to prevent access within the required period (7 days in the model wording).

identifies the complainant;

identifies the specific content and where it appears; and

explains why it is defamatory and inaccurate,

If the intermediary chooses to keep the material online after such notice, particularly when it also has its own technical warnings and a record that one of the authors is a competitor, it moves from the role of innocent conduit into that of primary publisher with knowledge.

I have repeatedly provided complaints that satisfy section 31A:

They clearly identify me and my business.

They clearly identify the "Consumer / Hooded_saw" and "Kamy" reviews and where they appear.

They explain, in technical detail, why the events described cannot have occurred as written.

Trustpilot can no longer claim it is simply hosting user generated content it knows nothing about.

7. Personal impact and ignored suicide ideation

I have explicitly told Trustpilot that this sustained campaign – much of it amplified and preserved by your refusal to remove obviously abusive and false content – has pushed me to the point of suicidal ideation.

I do not say that lightly. It reflects years of reputational and financial damage, combined with being painted publicly as abusive to customers when the reviews you host are in large part from competitors and non customers.

Despite this, no one at Trustpilot has:

acknowledged that statement;

expressed concern; or

indicated that it affects how my case is handled.

Instead, a "Senior Escalation Specialist" told me that content of this sort is unlikely to cause serious harm and therefore does not meet your internal threshold.

From a risk perspective, ignoring explicit statements of suicidal distress while continuing to publish disputed, auto flagged and competitor content is extremely troubling.

8. Why this is in the Accounting queue and what I am asking you to do

I am writing via Accounting because:

Support and Content Integrity have given me template driven answers that ignore both the factual record and the legal framework.

Accounting is one of the few routes where messages are more likely to be read by a human and, if necessary, passed up the chain.

I am not raising a billing discrepancy here, although continued use of my business data in this way may have contractual consequences. I am asking

you, as an internal stakeholder, to ensure that this situation is properly escalated.

Specifically, I ask that you:

Forward this email and the underlying tickets (including [#508859](#), [#00713084](#) and the related competitor review complaints) to:

Trustpilot's in house Legal team;

the relevant Compliance / Risk officers; and

any senior decision maker overseeing Content Integrity policy.

Request from them, in writing:

Confirmation that they are aware of the auto flagged "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review and the limitations on my ability to re flag it.

Confirmation that they are aware Kamy, a known competitor whose earlier review was removed, has now posted a new near identical review.

An explanation of what they consider to be "reasonable access prevention steps" under section 31A in light of my complaints.

Assurance that all logs, edit histories, internal notes, and decision records relating to these reviews and to my account are being preserved intact for potential litigation and for any regulator who asks.

Confirm back to me that this escalation has occurred and that my correspondence is not simply being bounced back into the same automated queue that has failed to address the issues so far.

I apologise that this lands with your team rather than Legal first, but at this stage I am using any route that will get this in front of a person who understands both numbers and risk. This is no longer about a single unhappy reviewer. It is about ongoing defamation, competitor abuse, and Trustpilot's response after explicit legal notice.

Thank you for your time and for making sure this reaches the right people.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie

Soul Legion

Developer of Legion Killfeed

From: Accounts Receivable <accounting@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com>

Sent: Wednesday, 10 December 2025 2:31 AM

To: Soul Legion <Brodies@REDACTED.email>

Subject: Your request is now received - Ticket [#508859](#)



Soul Legion

Dec 9, 2025, 16:31 GMT+1

Subject: Re: Case [#00713084](#) – edited "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review, auto-flagged as harmful/illegal yet still public

Hi Ansa,

I am following up again on Case [#00713084](#) regarding the "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review.

You previously told me that this review had been taken offline. In fact it is still live in its edited form at:

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

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

On the direct review URL above your own system now displays a banner that reads:

"Trustpilot's automated software has flagged this review for containing harmful or illegal content. Read more."

Despite that banner, the full edited text is still published to the public, and I am still blocked from flagging it again.

I will be embedding the relevant screenshots under this email, including the view of that URL with your "harmful or illegal content" banner at the top.

1. You are publishing a review your own software has flagged as "harmful or illegal"

Your platform cannot have it both ways.

On the one hand, the banner on <https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/692b14c5772dcebff6caec38> is an admission that your automated systems have detected content that may be harmful or illegal. On the other hand, you are:

- Leaving the review online in full.
- Marking it as a verified review of my business.
- Preventing me from filing any further flag against it.

That is not a neutral mistake. At that point you have actual notice from your own tools that there is a problem, you have repeated notice from me that the content is false and defamatory, and you are still choosing to continue publication.

2. The version your team "investigated" is not the version you are now publishing

Your own case history shows that the investigations you rely on relate to an earlier, much shorter version of this review.

- The original text was basically "Rude, unwilling to help, Soul needs profession help."
- After that, the reviewer edited it into the long story currently visible on the page, adding specific factual claims such as:
 - "I was a paying customer that you refused to help because apparently I wasn't worth your time."
 - "I did make a ticket but got no response."
 - "You made a separate channel calling me names such as moron, imbecile and idiot."
 - "You were sharing cutoff screenshots to your general to showoff to your party what kind of man you really are."

Those detailed allegations did not exist in the original text. They were added later via your edit function. Yet your internal timeline shows you repeatedly recording:

- "Investigation complete: The review doesn't breach our guidelines for: not based on a genuine experience."
- "Investigation complete: The review doesn't breach our guidelines for: personal information."
- "Investigation complete: The review doesn't breach our guidelines for: being about a different business."

All of those decisions map to the pre-edit version. None of them addresses the later, more defamatory version that is currently live and auto-flagged by your own software as potentially harmful or illegal.

At the same time, the public page now shows only "You have already flagged this review," so I am prevented from re-flagging it in light of the new content.

So the workflow in practice is:

1. A short version is flagged and "cleared".
2. The reviewer edits it and adds far more serious factual allegations.
3. Edits never receive the same human checks as a new review.
4. The business cannot flag again because the system treats the review ID as already dealt with.

Your edit system is therefore a mechanism for bypassing your own integrity checks.

3. This is not just one review – it is a platform design problem

Trustpilot actively encourages reviewers to update and edit their reviews instead of posting new ones. That is central to your product design. Under your current workflow:

- Edits inherit the "all clear" from earlier investigations.
- The edited text is treated as if it had already passed all checks, even if it is completely different.
- The business cannot flag the edited version in the same way they could flag a new review.

That means every time a review is materially edited, you are publishing a fresh version of the content that has never been properly assessed for "genuine experience", "personal information" or "different business". When the edits are defamatory or otherwise unlawful, and you have locked the target of the review out of the flagging process, you are not just a passive host – you are knowingly facilitating ongoing publication.

The fact that your own automated software has now labelled this edited review as containing "harmful or illegal content" confirms that this is not

hypothetical risk. Your system has literally put a warning label on it while still serving it to the public.

4. You also know the factual story in this edited version is false

On top of the structural problem, in this particular case you have been given clear proof that the core claims in the edited version are false:

- The “verified” email you are using is an Apple relay address: 2znkkydr98@privaterelay.appleid.com.
- My membership and billing records show no subscriber and no pledge under that email or under the name “hooded_saw”. They are not and have never been a paying customer.
- The Discord ticket logs show that:
 - The actual subscriber “lihou2451” opened a ticket.
 - I responded multiple times and asked for the information needed to assist.
 - They refused to use the ticket properly and instead relied on “Hooded” to complain and threaten to move funds to a competitor.

Despite all that, you continue to publish the edited story as if it were a genuine invited and verified customer experience.

5. What I now require

For this case and specifically for the edited “Consumer / Hooded_saw” review at <https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/692b14c5772dcebff6caec38>, I require:

1. **Immediate and permanent removal** of the review in all its versions from public view. It is not acceptable to leave a review online that your own system marks as potentially harmful or illegal.
2. A detailed written explanation of:
 - How edits are handled by your integrity systems.
 - Why flags and investigations carried out on the original short text have been treated as covering the later, edited version.
 - Why I am prevented from flagging the edited version even though it contains new factual allegations.
3. Confirmation that all logs, flags, classification decisions, edit histories, and internal communications relating to this review and this case will be preserved for litigation.
4. Corrections to the transparency page at:
 - <https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co/transparency> so that it accurately records that this review was:
 - Edited to add new allegations after initial investigations.

- Auto-flagged by your own software as containing harmful or illegal content.
 - Kept online while my ability to re-flag it was disabled.
5. Restoration of my ability to flag reviews again whenever the content is materially changed, rather than treating a past investigation of a different version as a permanent clearance.

This email is in addition to my earlier detailed letter of 9 December 2025 and my Calderbank offer from August, which I will rely on for damages and costs. It simply records what your own page and your own warning banner now show – that Trustpilot is knowingly publishing an edited review your automated systems have already identified as potentially harmful or illegal, while blocking me from using the tools you advertise as my remedy.

If you cannot provide the explanations and commitments above, this needs to be escalated immediately to your legal or compliance team. I will be forwarding this exchange and the accompanying screenshots to the eSafety Commissioner and the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission as further evidence of systemic failures in how Trustpilot handles edited reviews, flags and known harmful content.

Regards,

Anthony Brodie
Legion Killfeed

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 December 2025 8:18 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request [#00713084](#) [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]

Hi,
Thank you for your patience while we reviewed the case.
We've now completed our assessment and have taken the review offline.

We appreciate your cooperation throughout the process.
If you have any further concerns or need additional assistance, please feel free to reach out.
Kind regards,

Ansa



See our reviews



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

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

From: Soul Legion [Brodies@REDACTED.email]

Sent: 09/12/2025 03:42

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Subject: Re: Follow-up to your recent inquiry – 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:

1. Immediate and permanent removal of the remaining defamatory review.
2. A detailed explanation of:
 - Each prior removal and reinstatement.
 - Why those decisions were reversed.
 - What you did to ensure it will not happen again.
3. 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.
4. 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

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Tuesday, 9 December 2025 6:48 AM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Follow-up to your recent inquiry - Case [#00713084](#)

Hi Anthony,

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

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

Attachment(s)

[2025-12-05_not-a-customer-cunt.png](#)

[2025-11-29-lihou2451-TICKET.png](#)

[2025-12-05_not-a-customer-cunts.png](#)

[2025-11-29-lihou2451-hooded.png](#)

[2025-11-29-lihou2451-PUBLIC.png](#)

Email Headers (Raw)

X-Mozilla-Status	0001
X-Mozilla-Status2	00000000
From	Soul Legion <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
To	Accounts Receivable <accounting+id1W56ZW-PJ5WE@trustpilotaccounting.zendesk.com>
Subject	Re: [Trustpilot] Re: Re: Update on your request #00713084 [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]
Thread-Topic	[Trustpilot] Re: Re: Update on your request #00713084 [thread::QrtFkOFTeV-G1-y_nXb0u2A::]
Thread-Index	AQHcatNWzkOzkfegH0SDCb0hA7vblrUc0TQugAADPaiAAAAQJ4AAAFBVgAACeQ2AAARjIIAABGIDgAABD3GAAAF1clAAAS8XgAAANIY=
X-MS-Exchange-MessageSentRepresentingType	1
Date	Fri, 12 Dec 2025 07:37:44 +1100
Message-ID	<PU4P216MB1568F935927E13F0E061D303DAA1A@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
References	<1W56ZWPJ5WE@zendesk.com> <693b1c939ac0e_cf1999104171722@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-green-55797456bf-fkmr2.mail> <SE2P216MB1555674A3993492DA7084B1FDAA1A@SE2P216MB1555.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <693b1e3310d80_951ec70841902de@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-green-55797456bf-fkmr2.mail> <SE2P216MB1555C05FD8B7DF3221D92677DAA1A@SE2P216MB1555.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <693b23f4253e5_a726f88158676@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-green-55797456bf-xpkcx.mail> <PU4P216MB15686E35FF54D6A77D678783DAA1A@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <693b288c909a1_a726d302373e6@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-green-55797456bf-xpkcx.mail> <PU4P216MB1568D6B25CCDBB6A2AC6C20ADAA1A@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> <693b2ac3dd1d4_23260c023512a@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-green-55797456bf-xpkcx.mail> <1W56ZWPJ5WE_693b2ac9eeab3_8cfce3cf21ae18_sprut@zendesk.com>
In-Reply-To	<1W56ZWPJ5WE_693b2ac9eeab3_8cfce3cf21ae18_sprut@zendesk.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_PU4P216MB1568F935927E13F0E061D303DAA1APU4P216MB1568KORP_"; type="text/html"
MIME-Version	1.0