

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
To: "Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JIBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]
Date: Mon, 22 Dec 2025 10:05:47 +0000

Hi,

We have reviewed the reference ticket **00713084** as mentioned and would like to inform you that the review submitted by **Camus** has been filtered following our assessment process. As a result, this review is no longer visible on your business profile.

Please note that we assess reviews strictly on a **case-by-case basis**, in line with our moderation guidelines.

We apologize for the delayed response and appreciate your understanding. If you have any further questions or need additional clarification, please feel free to reach out to us.

Kind regards,

Akhil



See our reviews



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]
Sent: 15/12/2025 22:34
To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JIBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Urgent follow-up: silent removal of competitor review, but "Hooded_saw" still live with flagging disabled (Case #00713084)

Hi Trustpilot,

I need this handled as a process failure and a publication-after-notice issue, not another loop of generic "continue in the ticket" messaging.

1) Email handling: you respond promptly on one thread, but my detailed notices and evidence packs from my regular address (LEGIONKILLFEED@OUTLOOK.COM) are still not receiving substantive replies. Please confirm, in writing, that correspondence from Brodies@REDACTED.email is being received, attached to the same case history, and escalated to an authorised decision-maker (Legal/Compliance), not buried inside routine Content Integrity workflows.

2) Silent removal vs ongoing publication: it appears the competitor review (Kamy) has now been removed silently (no written confirmation, no explanation, no assurance against reinstatement). Yet the review you said would be reviewed/reassessed, "Consumer / Hooded_saw" (Case #00713084), remains live.

3) Flagging/appeal disabled on Hooded_saw: on the Hooded_saw review, my business dashboard shows "Investigation complete ... there is a different issue", but the "Read our decision" button loops into a technical error page, and the flag/appeal/dispute options are not available at all. This means Trustpilot is continuing to publish the review while effectively disabling the platform's own complaint mechanism for it.

What I need now (please answer each point clearly):

- A. Written confirmation of whether emails from Brodies@REDACTED.email are being actioned, and by which team.
- B. Written confirmation that the Kamy review removal is permanent and will not be reinstated.
- C. Immediate takedown of the Hooded_saw review OR, at minimum, temporary removal pending reassessment, plus restoration of normal flag/appeal functionality (and confirmation the technical-error loop is fixed).
- D. Preservation of all versions/edits, internal notes, decision logs, and timestamps for both reviews.

Regards,
Anthony Brodie (Soul Legion)
ABN 28 387 377 607
Preferred contact: Brodies@REDACTED.email


From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Saturday, 13 December 2025 12:56 AM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi,

I hope you're doing well.

We would like to clarify how Trustpilot handles reviews and what options are available to you:

Trustpilot can only take action on reviews based on the specific flagging reasons available in our system.

We're not able to make decisions outside of those processes or skip our standard assessment steps — even when a reviewer is suspected of being a competitor.

If you believe a review is **not based on a genuine experience** or may have been posted by a competitor, please **flag it under the relevant reason**. Once flagged, our Content Integrity Team will review it in accordance with our Guidelines for Reviewers and Businesses.

Please note:

- We **cannot remove or take reviews offline** outside of our established moderation processes.
- A review can only be removed if it **breaches our Guidelines** after a full assessment by our Content Integrity Team.

If you would like to pursue a legal route or have already sent legal correspondence, you can contact our Legal team directly using this form:

https://help.trustpilot.com/s/contact-us/get-in-touch?language=en_US

To move forward as quickly as possible:

1. Flag any reviews you believe are non-genuine or competitor-driven.
2. Include all relevant context and evidence in the flag text field.
3. Contact our Legal team directly if you wish to escalate the matter through legal channels.

If you need help with anything else, feel free to let us know.

Kind regards,

Akhil



See our reviews



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]

Sent: 11/12/2025 16:14

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi Akhil,

It is now after 3:00 am in my time zone. I have spent the last seven hours going back and forth with Trustpilot staff, including you, just to get you to apply basic legal obligations that you cannot realistically dispute once you are on formal notice.

So I will keep this simple.

1. You have now confirmed that the Kyle review has been filtered. That is one step, but it does not resolve the wider problem I have repeatedly put in front of you:
 - you continue to host and process other clearly non genuine, competitor driven reviews, and
 - you continue to treat this as a “guidelines” issue rather than a legal one.
2. Under Australian defamation law, once you are on written notice that identifies me, identifies the reviews and explains why they are defamatory and not based on a genuine experience, every continued publication after that is on you, not me. Every refusal, delay or “we applied our guidelines” response counts as another instance after notice.
3. I have already provided exhaustive detail about Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw, including the competitor links and the history of earlier defamatory reviews you removed in 2024. You do not need one more round of flagging or one more polite ticket to understand that these are not normal customer reviews.

What I want to know, right now, is very direct:

- Are you and your team prepared to start following the applicable law, not just internal Trustpilot guidelines, in relation to the remaining reviews?
- Are you prepared to take Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw offline immediately while your legal team reviews the material you already hold, instead of pushing me back through a broken flagging system again?

- Will you confirm that my legal correspondence has been escalated to your legal department with a clear timetable for a substantive response?

I would like to be able to go to bed or work on my product, instead of spending another night composing repetitive, detailed legal emails to try to stop your platform from publishing material you already know is false and harmful.

Please answer those questions directly. If the answer is “no”, then I will treat that as a conscious decision by Trustpilot to keep republishing defamatory content after notice, and I will proceed accordingly with the eSafety Commissioner, the ACCC and defamation proceedings in New South Wales.

Regards,

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

From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Sent: Friday, 12 December 2025 2:38 AM
To: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hello Akhil,

Your response does not address the actual substance of my complaint or the legal notice already provided to Trustpilot:

- The Kyle review was left online for well over a year after I first gave you detailed technical and legal evidence that it was false, technically impossible and retaliatory.
- You have not addressed the fact that my flagging ability was disabled while the review remained live, which meant your “case by case” process was effectively closed to me.
- You have not addressed the wider pattern of competitor driven reviews (including Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw) that I have documented repeatedly, or the fact that those reviews are still live and still causing harm.

Telling me to “continue the conversation in the provided tickets” simply restates the very problem I am complaining about. You already have multiple tickets, 400+ emails, and a formal cease and desist style legal notice that identifies the reviews, explains why they are defamatory and non genuine, and sets out your obligations under Australian law. What I need now is not another round of boilerplate about “guidelines”, but a clear acknowledgement that:

1. The Kyle review has been removed on a permanent basis, not just quietly filtered, and will not be reinstated.
2. All versions, edits, logs and internal notes relating to that review are being preserved in full.

3. The remaining competitor reviews (including Kamy and Consumer / Hooded_saw) will be dealt with in light of the evidence you already hold, instead of being bounced around the same broken flagging workflows.
4. My legal correspondence submitted via your forms and from my other email address is being handled as a legal matter by the appropriate team, not buried inside ordinary content integrity tickets.

If Trustpilot wants to talk about “respectful communication”, it starts with respecting the fact that I have been providing detailed technical and legal evidence for more than a year, and that it is your systems and internal choices, not a few swear words, that have turned this into a multi year escalation. If you want me to tone down the language you have caused, then show enough respect to actually read and act on what I have already sent, or at the very least stop processing and hosting clearly unlawful content about my business.

Please confirm, in writing, that the points above are being addressed and that my legal notice is now with your legal team for a substantive response.

I guess you missed the earlier emails where they have stated they want me to Ahkill-myself and given the serious nature of this harassment, you'd think you would actually intelligently abide by the law incase I was to hit the point in their harassment where I did decide to Ahkill-myself but instead you double down with your criminal misconduct. Get an intelligent staff member please.

Regards,

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

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 December 2025 2:32 AM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi,

Thank you for your message. We would like to inform you that you can continue the conversation in the provided tickets for any further clarification regarding this matter.

Please note that **we assess reviews on a case-by-case basis**, and after careful evaluation, as mentioned earlier, the review in question has been **filtered** in accordance with our guidelines.

If you have additional questions or information to provide, please continue the discussion within the ticket, and our team will assist you accordingly.

Kind regards,

Akhil



[See our reviews](#)



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]

Sent: 11/12/2025 14:47

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JIBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi Akhil,

Thanks for confirming that the Kyle review has now been filtered and is no longer visible on my business profile.

Your “reminder” about civil and respectful language neatly skips over *why* my tone has escalated: three years of coordinated harassment, multiple defamatory competitor reviews, repeated reinstatements, and hundreds of emails where I’ve had to spell out technical and legal facts your system should have picked up on the first time.

You’re upset about a couple of blunt sentences. I’m upset that your platform has repeatedly hosted and resurrected clearly unlawful content about me and my products, after notice, while telling me to “just reply to the review”.

For the avoidance of doubt:

I am **not** going to “argue with them publicly” in your review section instead of you removing content that you are legally prohibited from publishing once you’re on notice. That is not how defamation law works, and you know it.

The thread I need Ayana on

The Kyle review, the disabled flagging, and the related competitor harassment are already being dealt with (badly) in the **Content Integrity** thread titled:

Decision on the review you’ve flagged – Ticket #28160563 – Ticket #39666963

That is the thread I switched to so I could continue with **Ayana A** without dragging a monster email chain dating back to July 2024 into every export.

In that thread:

- I have already sent a detailed legal complaint about the Kyle review and your handling of it; and
- Most recently, I sent an email to Ayana that begins:

“Hi Ayana,

I switched to this thread as the exports I do on every message have shown the last thread reaching a substantial size with emails dating back to July 2024, so I’ve switched to this one and I hope that doesn’t cause a non-response.”

That message explains:

- exactly what your own interface shows on **Kamy's** review (Harmful or illegal fully exhausted; Not based on a genuine experience already showing *"Reviewer contacted. Thursday, December 11 at 5:24 AM"*), and
- why it is simply false for Content Integrity to tell me that Kamy "has not been flagged under Not Based on a Genuine Experience" and to instruct me to flag it again when your system already shows those workflows as used.

What I am actually asking you to do

So, instead of sending me generic advice about "replying to reviews" and "civil language", I need you to do something useful:

1. **Ensure that Ayana (or whoever is now owning this in Content Integrity) responds directly to my latest email in the "Decision on the review you've flagged – Ticket #28160563 – Ticket #39666963" thread** – the one starting *"Hi Ayana, I switched to this thread..."* – which deals with Kamy, the exhausted NBGE / Harmful-or-illegal flags, and the systemic failures in your process.
2. **Stop fragmenting the matter across random support strands.**
The decision on Kyle, the handling of Kamy, and the related competitor attacks need to live in that Content Integrity / ticket #28160563 / #39666963 chain, alongside the full evidentiary record, not as one-line "filtered" notes in separate queues.

If Trustpilot wants to talk about "respectful communication", it starts by respecting the fact that I have given you detailed technical and legal evidence for well over a year, and that your own systems and staff choices, not a couple of swear words, are what has turned this into a three year escalation. So in future, if you would like me to refrain from language you have caused, start by showing enough respect to actually read my responses, or at the very least respect the law by ceasing to host and process clearly unlawful content about my business. What you are doing is criminal behaviour under Australian law, and if you want to test that by trying to sue me for pointing it out, I will welcome that opportunity.

Regards,

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

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Friday, 12 December 2025 1:24 AM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi,

I hope you are well. We have reviewed the matter and can confirm that the review from **Kyle** has been **filtered** and is **no longer visible** on your business profile.

We kindly remind you to use **civil and respectful language** in all future communication with our team. This ensures we can continue supporting you effectively and efficiently.

If you have any further questions or need additional assistance, please feel free to contact us.

Kind regards,

Akhil



See our reviews



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]

Sent: 11/12/2025 08:58

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

And how fucking dare you ever imply that I should argue with them publicly rather than remove the content you are lawfully forbidden from hosting, you cockhead.

From: Anthony Brodie <Brodies@REDACTED.email>

Sent: Thursday, 11 December 2025 7:56 PM

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

Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

I would like to emphasize, I am coming after you legally, so either remove this bullshit slander or you personally may be liable. Cunt,

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

Sent: Wednesday, 10 December 2025 9:47 PM

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

Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi,

We would like to emphasize why it is important to **reply to reviews**. Responding to reviews allows you to **share your side of the story**, clarify any misunderstandings, and demonstrate your commitment to customer service.

Even if a review is critical, a professional and courteous response can help **build trust with customers**, show transparency, and reflect positively on your business.

Thank you for your attention, and we encourage you to engage with your reviews to maintain a strong and credible online presence.

Kind regards,

Akhil



See our reviews



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]

Sent: 08/12/2025 18:30

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: Re: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

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

Hi Trustpilot,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The review claims that:

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

That is simply not possible:

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

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

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

3. Evidence that this was a retaliatory fake review

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

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

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

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

4. Your guidelines do not override Australian law

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

- harmful or illegal content

- personal information
- advertising or promotional content

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

In particular, you need to consider:

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

I have already given you written complaints that:

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

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

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

5. You have a documented pattern of ignoring notice

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

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

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

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

6. What I am asking for on this specific review

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

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

To be completely clear:

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

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

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

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

Regards,

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

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Monday, 8 December 2025 10:17 PM
To: Brodies@REDACTED.email <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #00713224 [thread::3T967JlBezSf3zjUM6TLpmA::]

Hi,

I hope you're doing well. We have reviewed the feedback submitted by **Kyle** and found that the review **does not violate Trustpilot's guidelines**. Therefore, no further action will be taken regarding this matter.

We would also like to share some tips on how to approach critical reviews:

- **Reply to critical reviews** to demonstrate your commitment to customer service, show that you care, and build credibility.
- **Use feedback positively**—negative reviews are not a reason to panic. They provide valuable insights to learn, improve, and strengthen your business.
- **Engage with reviewers professionally** to build trust, address concerns, and potentially win more customers.

For more detailed guidance, please visit this article:

https://help.trustpilot.com/s/article/What-do-I-do-if-I-get-a-negative-review?language=en_US

Thank you for your attention, and feel free to reach out if you have any further questions.

Best regards,

Akhil



See our reviews



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

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

From: Anthony Brodie [Brodies@REDACTED.email]
Sent: 05/12/2025 20:37
To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com; Brodies@REDACTED.email
Subject:

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

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

Statement to Trustpilot Regarding the False “Verified” Review

The review displayed under “Kyle – This bot was used to wipe my server” is objectively false, technically impossible, and legally actionable. The fact that Trustpilot has marked this review as Verified is itself misleading and damaging, because the reviewer has never used my bot, never interacted with my service, and could not possibly have experienced what they claimed.

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

1. The review describes an impossible event

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

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

Discord permissions make this physically impossible unless:

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

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

2. Discord retains audit logs for every destructive action

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

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

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

3. The reviewer has never used my bot

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

This makes the “Verified” badge factually incorrect and misleading. Trustpilot is presenting the review as tied to a real transaction or legitimate use of the bot, when no such transaction ever occurred.

That is either:

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

Either outcome makes the “Verified” label false.

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

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

This is verifiably untrue:

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

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

5. The review asserts professional misconduct and intentional sabotage

The review explicitly states:

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

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

Because this never happened, it is:

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

6. Trustpilot is responsible for re-publishing after notice

You have been notified with:

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

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

Concise conclusion to send Trustpilot

Here is the direct message version you can send:

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

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



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

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

Do your fucking job because I AM suing.

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

Hi,

Thank you for getting in touch.

We've reviewed the review you mentioned and can confirm that it has already been flagged. Our Content Integrity team has investigated the matter and contacted you with the outcome.

To avoid any miscommunication and to ensure you receive the best possible assistance, please reply directly within that ticket.

Best regards,

Airne



See our reviews



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

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

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

Sent: 08/08/2025 03:47

To: Brodies@REDACTED.email

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

Hi ,

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

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

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

Thanks again for your understanding.

Best,
Trustpilot

Email Headers (Raw)

[illegible]

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTime	22 Dec 2025 10:05:47.6687 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTimeReason	OriginalSubmit
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationInterval	1:00:00:00.0000000
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationIntervalReason	OriginalSubmit
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-Network-Message-Id	76c4fc99-e0d1-442a-9a88-08de4141adbcb
X-EOPAttributedMessage	0
X-EOPTenantAttributedMessage	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa:0
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-MessageDirectionality	Incoming
X-MS-PublicTrafficType	Email
X-MS-TrafficTypeDiagnostic	AMS0EPF000001B7:EE_IME3PR01MB5800:EE_1SYBPR01MB5338:EE_
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthSource	AMS0EPF000001B7.eurprd05.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-UserLastLogonTime	12/22/2025 6:45:26 AM
X-MS-Office365-Filtering-Correlation-Id	76c4fc99-e0d1-442a-9a88-08de4141adbcb
X-MS-Exchange-EOPDirect	true
X-Sender-IP	16.16.35.165
X-SID-PRA	TRUST.OPERATIONS@TRUSTPILOT.COM
X-SID-Result	PASS
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL	1
X-Microsoft-Antispam	BCL:4;ARA:1444111002 9000799056 28070799003 1680799066 47200799024 10300799038 9400799043 58200799021 461199028 23070799003 6092099016 9800799015 1370799030 1360799030 1380799030 56899033 440099028 3412199025 26104999006 22062799003 30041999003 1122599022;
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-OriginalArrivalTime	22 Dec 2025 10:05:47.5633 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Network-Message-Id	76c4fc99-e0d1-442a-9a88-08de4141adbcb
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Id	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthSource	AMS0EPF000001B7.eurprd05.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-FromEntityHeader	Internet
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-RMS-PersistedConsumerOrg	00000000-0000-0000-0000-000000000000
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-CrossTenantHeadersStamped	ME3PR01MB5800
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-EndToEndLatency	00:00:08.6334431
X-MS-Exchange-Processed-By-BccFoldering	15.20.9434.000
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Mailbox-Delivery	dwl:1;ucf:0;jmr:0;ex:0;auth:1;dest:1;OFR:TrustedDomainList;ENG:(5062000311)(920221119095)(90000117)(920221120095)(90011020)(91015020)(91040095)(90500020)(9060121)(9081003)(9100341)(944500132)(4810010)(4910033)(9930004)(9545005)(10172021)(9449006)(9310011)(9220031)(120001);
X-Message-Delivery	Vj0xLJE7dXM9MDtsPTA7YT0wO0Q9MTiHRD0xO1NDTD0tMQ==
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Message-Info	YiryZCqrEqISLAICBiuCSgQk4+EMbc5Z6EOhcZasozFKw1JrKZ4jf9Nch3hejcOTsYyj4fV4dc58+DuogM6Tt8kN XFDI7MfCyPj4eGHxSEPFiLmCJx5m0r7MKFLrPFpwCDsCS3EFXkAUToTjedjKBJ8vxxK3coWXZ4L8/0vxxm7IV952at 10QeeWqx+he/o6UNWV1crlooG7I/S0ThS/1z+BQAuIARlIheh9mCod3+13HmoarJm3jebtuTgWIXRxZO6gWi6VhW b6bTUwL3BbkAJfalziKao05aa4p21sFNiH7Bns2kNoIAJAIrX7vVPrwZDz72pTYiQxsRJkV/LVWn0ENXFBQV/jkd Y+SjtS1GO0x3eVBv6iX+cxIOfUfomwgrU13Edl4QhOLhwXwN9gfs7kh7Tl6u6/SExb7r+207+Zms9HeTkGk+k7Pn EE5LbmVZ/jQmfgwn6v/awjNSwEgK6nVFqX3etRODHWPLof/4Kh0E8qRIMOXsZ5MVoN+4nzEwKCh02/UnQ7CPuWBS 8cFhBSQbS0NBCLJc5g32w4dNFklu2+ZXqWyUalvMkL/Bp9yK1wzX/ObCE5Sj9HILUgvePeTYSpyXmirQHBFBP7 NefGUjAToPrEINu8g/jz798cn514NMbXBLFEHmTH8XaBtS1upmgmyHV7I8B++P+fCKRbB7ZEKJUeF2hrPS0kfh5 aCRJX2lxt7knvoPQR6SElpbkm3r0DqbhV3bfXG/B4JN7isSuxgCgfszoRDCqut2yjR0sQBenYHdSOVxb65hrAxi H/n10VY/qMc8izgdSwnKP2IXnaZNZSSSGRGJIdE85Spb7CZIDtXJZfg6T0H+ZKzyc8eo8kdhpNkpehWo3GB+upsKE Xt95+9eBkAJT6uRH+PKHWH4wfiHxYAf0Xg5L6/UPgQ2J54WJj0R4q3T9xhSBa0Z9hn1519zsyTNTBdhayrcy9SrO VxbVltCgZ0UQTnFn9YtxCRjzPQPtycN5dAzjwpFAccLzQf+zU0RVqsOvsrkiQDwC1BcTcZX7p/O9RMnl8GxQ2Fs NTiOijtyOlmyaz1pXlgi6+6y1gNZFtE15SgtlpjYg23FBnoAyEH3qMGJ56Y/AZMUBCj5i7kQL4z+wsjECOVsRQT9 /6fGixOes2HwvSP5078xwFbioFLtsPhYwvazr4D/SoyZL/RnZU4q9sZdxU0eR4Lyl9q6U8VmnFo5Sgutg0hgqE5j zvEAvFpFnesy3TjmhDotKsb979E8Y71xlTY+ZrdYcWYsEh3sfw+Xv467z4DT2wFircUmrRYQ10ckFU1rExR6/fH

	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
MIME-Version	1.0