

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
To: "Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]
Date: Wed, 04 Feb 2026 07:30:50 +0000

Hello,

Thank you for taking the time to share such a detailed explanation with us. We can see that you've put significant effort into outlining your concerns, and we appreciate the context you've provided around the situation.

After reviewing the review in question, we want to clarify one important point, as there seems to be some understandable confusion around the reporting categories.

At this stage, the review has **not yet been formally flagged under defamation**. While we understand that some of the content may also feel abusive or discriminatory, allegations such as false criminal claims or serious misconduct fall specifically under **defamation**, and these need to be reported using the defamation option in order for our Content Integrity team to assess them correctly.

To ensure your concerns are reviewed under the appropriate policy, we kindly ask that you please **flag the review again, selecting "Defamation" as the reason**, and include the relevant context or evidence you've already outlined. Once submitted under the correct category, the review will be assessed specifically against our defamation guidelines.

We understand how frustrating this process can be, especially given the amount of detail you've already shared, and we want to reassure you that flagging it this way is the correct and necessary next step for us to proceed.

If you have any questions while submitting the flag or need further clarification, please don't hesitate to let us know — we're here to help.

Thank you for your cooperation and for your patience.

Warm regards,

Hariharan

See our reviews



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

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

From: Soul Legion [Brodies@REDACTED.email]
Sent: 04/02/2026 07:58
To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com
Subject: Re: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]

Still can't flag it you fucking clown. But look at what you're in for.



Defamation Case Analysis (Legion Killfeed Harassment 2019–2026)
Aggravated Damages Evidence Matrix

False Criminal Allegations & Extreme Smears: Multiple attackers made heinous false accusations against Anthony “Soul” Brodie, such as calling him a **“pedo”** (pedophile), a **“woman basher”** (domestic abuser), and even claiming he **uses hard drugs (meth)**. For example, in October–November 2025, Joel L. Walker publicly posted statements like *“Soul from Legion Killfeed is a pedo”* on social media. Earlier, in mid-2024, competitor Anthony Buchanan, after a disagreement, insulted Brodie as a *“pedo”* and *“drug addict”*. These are among the most serious possible defamatory imputations (alleging vile criminal behavior and moral depravity) and were made with clear malice. Such extreme and baseless smears greatly intensify harm to reputation and emotional well-being, strongly supporting a claim for **aggravated damages**.

Coordinated and Sustained Campaign: The evidence indicates a long-term, **organized campaign** to destroy Brodie’s reputation, rather than isolated outbursts. Over **three years** (2021–2025), a group of rivals and disgruntled individuals repeatedly spread defamatory claims across multiple platforms. They often acted in concert – for instance, on July 28, 2025, a Facebook group thread led by Daniel Santos (using the hashtag **#TeamKami**) rallied others (including a “Danny Hayes”) to **“review bomb”** Legion Killfeed on Trustpilot and heap insults on Brodie. Similarly, on Discord and Reddit, collaborators used fake accounts and shared narratives to amplify the smear. The **persistence and planning** – dozens of defamatory posts, comments, and even fake “reviews” – show a deliberate attempt to maximise damage. The **sheer volume** of incidents (approximately **1,940 pieces of evidence** gathered) and the **duration** (spanning 2019–2026, with intense activity in 2024–25) demonstrate an exceptional level of malice. This sustained onslaught, repeatedly hitting the same false themes, would justify the court in finding the conduct outrageous and **aggravating** in nature.

Doxxing and Threats to Safety: The harassers didn’t stop at online slurs – they **crossed into real-life intimidation**. Notably, on November 23, 2022, one individual (Mason “Links” Stockton) **doxxed** Brodie by publishing a video revealing Brodie’s **home address**. This exposure of private information put Brodie and his family at risk and was clearly intended to terrorize. Earlier, on October 11, 2021, members of a rival Discord (led by Ronald “Jarvis” Lund) directed menacing messages at Brodie, including threats like *“Play games, you get burnt”* and *“We coming for you boy.”* Such **direct threats of harm** and efforts to incite others to locate or target him go far beyond typical defamation – they show a campaign designed to instill fear. This behavior is highly reprehensible. In defamation terms, it **aggravates the injury** by causing additional anxiety and undermining the plaintiff’s sense of safety. Any reasonable assessment of damages would take these threats and doxxing incidents into account to **increase the award**.

Use of Fake Identities and Deceptive Tactics: The attackers frequently employed deceit to further the defamation. For example, Mathew “Kami” Trojanowski (a competitor behind a rival service **DayZ++**) and his associates used **sockpuppet accounts** to infiltrate Brodie’s community. In September 2024, an account known as “pups” (later tied to Mason Stockton) pretended to be a concerned Legion user, asking about “drama,” but was secretly **private-messaging Brodie’s customers** with sales pitches to switch to DayZ++ and spreading the false claim that Brodie was involved in misconduct. This same fake persona probed for personal info (like implying they found Brodie’s address) under the guise of friendly concern – a clear intimidation tactic. Additionally, evidence shows competitors plotting to **fabricate negative reviews**: one instance in November 2022 has Trojanowski openly discussing using automation to spam bad reviews of Legion. These calculated, covert tactics highlight a high degree of premeditation and malice. When defendants go to such lengths – creating false personas,

staging fake “customer” complaints, and lying to third parties – courts treat it as **aggravating conduct**. It proves the defamers weren’t acting in good faith or out of momentary anger; they orchestrated a scheme to defame, warranting a higher damages category.

Repetition Despite Warnings / Refusal to Retract: Another aggravating factor is the **repeat publication** of the defamatory claims even after they were reported or removed. The harassers showed no remorse or caution when confronted – instead, many **doubled down**. For instance, Buchanan’s defamatory Trustpilot review (accusing Brodie of “drama, jealousy, manipulation” and unsafe practices) was removed by Trustpilot in September 2024 for violating content standards – yet he or his allies managed to get the same review **reinstated** briefly (reportedly due to a platform error) and continued posting elsewhere. In late 2025, Joel Walker made a series of posts over consecutive days (Oct–Nov 2025), each piling on new slurs (“*kiddy fiddlers*,” “*Legion’s owner stalks me*,” “*he resets servers to kill communities*” and so on), showing a relentless pattern. These were not offhand remarks; they persisted over time, even as Brodie and others **filed dozens of reports** to Facebook and Discord. The fact that content remained visible for weeks or months (one Walker post stayed up **101 days** despite 40+ user reports) shows the defamers were undeterred by community standards or the victim’s pleas. The **failure of the perpetrators to apologize or cease** – indeed, their escalation – is classic evidence supporting aggravated damages. It underscores their **intent to maximize harm** and the callous disregard for the truth or the victim’s suffering.

Impact Magnified by Platform Failures: While the **actions of the platforms** are not the plaintiff’s doing, the context in which this defamation occurred worsened its impact. Attackers took advantage of platform loopholes and slow responses, which effectively **republished and prolonged the harm**. For example, **Trustpilot**, a well-respected review site, became a conduit for defamatory claims: after Brodie warned Trustpilot in advance that rivals were planning a “review bombing” attack, a wave of false one-star reviews ensued (late 2024 and mid-2025). Trustpilot’s content moderation often lagged – some obviously false reviews remained live for **weeks or months**, and in one case a review containing an obscene slur in the username was mistakenly reinstated after removal. Each day a defamatory review stayed up, it lent credibility to the falsehoods and potentially misled more viewers (since users trust such platforms for unbiased information). Similarly, **Facebook** allowed abusive posts to stay accessible long enough to garner attention and be shared. The harm to Brodie’s reputation was **amplified by this extended exposure**. In legal terms, this environment doesn’t excuse the original defamers – rather, it can be argued to **aggravate the damage** because Brodie had to endure a longer and broader dissemination of the lies. It also lays groundwork for potential platform liability (after notification) which adds pressure in a legal claim, but at minimum, it vividly illustrates how egregious and unchecked the campaign became.

Personal and Professional Devastation: The **cumulative toll** on Brodie provides a final category of evidence for aggravated damages. This campaign struck at both his **livelihood** and his **mental health**. Professionally, by late 2022, Brodie was **exhausted and overburdened** – he stepped back from leading his successful DayZ server community (Aggro PVP) after relentless conflicts and stress. The harassment continued into 2023–2025, directly impacting his new business (Legion Killfeed subscriptions) as detailed below in the damages valuation. On a personal level, the constant defamation and harassment (including content suggesting he should kill himself, and attacks implicating his family) caused severe emotional distress. The files reference Brodie even publicly addressing **suicidal ideation incitement** – meaning the

attackers at times used “**kill yourself**”-type abuse or tried to push him towards self-harm. It’s evident that what began as online rivalry escalated into **serious psychological harm**: anxiety for personal safety, anguish over being falsely painted as a predator, and the stress of defending his name non-stop. Courts factor in such **intangible harm**. The presence of **malicious intent** and **evidence of actual emotional trauma** can lead a court to award a very high sum for non-economic loss. In sum, the evidence matrix shows that virtually every **aggravating factor** recognized in defamation law is present here: long-duration malice, repetition, lack of mitigation, use of threats, and real personal fallout. This will strongly support an aggravated damages claim.

Case Strength Analysis (NSW)

Clear Defamatory Imputations: The content in question undoubtedly contains defamatory imputations about the plaintiff, Anthony “Soul” Brodie. The false statements accuse him of heinous crimes and misconduct – *pedophilia, domestic abuse, substance abuse, fraud, sabotage*, and general dishonesty. Under Australian defamation law, statements that *tend to lower a person’s reputation in the eyes of the community* or cause others to shun or avoid them are defamatory. Calling someone a “pedo” (pedophile) is clearly defamatory **per se** – it imputes a serious criminal offence and moral depravity. Similarly, claiming he “resets servers to force communities to die” or “collects and sells user files” are assertions of unethical/fraudulent conduct that would make others mistrust him in his profession. These statements, on their face, are defamatory of Brodie.

Identification and Publication: Brodie is identifiable in all these publications. Many posts explicitly use his online handle and service name “Soul from Legion Killfeed,” and some use his full name. There is no ambiguity that the comments refer to him. The publications were made to **third parties** in abundance – on public social media posts (viewable by many in the gaming community), in Discord servers with numerous members, and on a public review website (Trustpilot) where anyone searching the business could see them. Thus, the element of publication is well satisfied. Given the wide dissemination (Facebook, Discord, Reddit, Trustpilot, etc.), the scope of publication likely reaches hundreds if not thousands of viewers over time. This strengthens the case, as Brodie can demonstrate that the defamatory matter was communicated broadly, exacerbating damage.

Falsity and No Viable Defenses: The plaintiff’s position is that all these imputations are completely false. There is no evidence whatsoever that Brodie engaged in the reprehensible acts alleged. In fact, context suggests the opposite – for instance, far from harming other servers, he was known for helping community members and building a reputable tool. The defendants (the individual harassers) would carry the burden of proof for any truth defense, and it’s exceedingly unlikely they could prove these extreme allegations are true. Likewise, other defenses under the Defamation Act are **unlikely to succeed**:

- **Honest Opinion:** For a defendant to claim the statements were their honest opinion, they would need to frame the remarks as opinion based on proper material, on a matter of public interest. Here, calling someone a pedophile or “kiddy fiddler” is stated as a fact, not as an opinion or a comment on disclosed facts. Moreover, these were made with malice (evidenced by the coordinated attack) which can defeat the honest opinion defense (since it must be genuinely held). The posts lack any factual substratum that could lend itself to an

opinion defense. They appear as pure assertions of fact or simple name-calling – not protected opinion.

- **Qualified Privilege:** There is no obvious privileged occasion for these statements. They were not made in a context like giving a reference, reporting a crime to police, or a parliamentary proceeding. At times the harassers framed their posts as “warnings” to the community about Brodie, but those were unsolicited public posts born out of personal animosity and competitive rivalry, not a duty or interest situation that Australian law would likely recognize as a qualified privilege. Even if a defendant argued a form of common interest privilege (e.g. “we were warning fellow community members”), the **malicious intent** behind the posts would defeat that privilege. The sheer viciousness and dishonesty of the allegations show the predominant motive was to injure Brodie, not to legitimately inform.
- **Triviality:** The defense of triviality (available in NSW for pre-2021 publications, and in some form under the new law as well) holds that if the defendant proves the circumstances of publication were such that the plaintiff was unlikely to sustain any harm, they escape liability. Here, that is inapplicable – **serious harm clearly occurred**. The publications were not confined or minor; they were spread in popular community channels and had tangible impact on Brodie’s reputation and business. No court would deem these accusations “trivial” or unlikely to cause harm, especially given evidence of actual harm (loss of customers, etc.).

In summary, the content checks all boxes for actionable defamation: identifiable plaintiff, defamatory meaning, published to third parties, and no valid defense (assuming Brodie can prove falsity and that the publications weren’t privileged – all indications are he can).

Serious Harm Threshold: Since Brodie will likely be suing over posts made from 2021 onward (after the Defamation Amendment Act 2020, which introduced the “serious harm” requirement in NSW), he must prove that the defamatory publications have caused or are likely to cause **serious harm** to his reputation. The evidence strongly supports this. The **serious harm threshold** is met through both **qualitative and quantitative** factors:

- *Nature of the Allegations:* Accusations of being a pedophile or engaging in gross misconduct are so severe that any reasonable person would think much less of the subject. Such claims inherently carry a high likelihood of serious reputational damage. This is far from a slight or a minor insult; it strikes at the heart of one’s integrity and lawfulness.
- *Extent of Publication:* The campaign ensured these claims reached large segments of the relevant community (DayZ gamers/server owners). The Trustpilot reviews meant that anyone Googling Legion Killfeed or Brodie’s service would encounter alarming allegations. Social media posts were visible for long durations and were interacted with (e.g., commented on, shared by others, and at least seen by members of those groups). This broad dissemination increases the risk and actual occurrence of serious reputational harm.
- *Evidence of Actual Impact:* Importantly, Brodie can show concrete consequences: by late 2025, **paying subscribers left his service**, explicitly or implicitly due to the poisoned reputation (some customers were directly approached with the false claims, others likely saw the negative reviews and posts). Approximately 30% of his customer base was lost in a few months, which is a material business impact. Additionally, community administrators

banned Legion in certain circles (“Any community using Legion is banned from this community – ask me why,” one rival declared), demonstrating that people took the defamatory narrative seriously and acted on it. Brodie’s standing in the community clearly suffered – he went from a respected developer to someone a segment of the community was labeling and avoiding.

- *Personal Suffering*: While the legal threshold is about reputational harm, the personal anguish Brodie experienced (stress, safety fears) underscores the severity of the situation and would likely be persuasive in showing that the matter was far from trivial or inconsequential.

Given these points, a court would almost certainly find the serious harm requirement satisfied. In fact, this case exemplifies *serious harm* – it’s prolonged, widely published, and damaging in multiple facets.

Evidence and Proof: One of the strengths of this case is the **meticulous documentation** Brodie has assembled. He reportedly has contemporaneous logs, screenshots, and archives of all the relevant messages, posts, and reviews (nearly two thousand items indexed chronologically). This means the plaintiff can **prove each publication** and exactly what was said, when, and by whom. There is little reliance on memory or hearsay – it’s backed by hard evidence (screenshots of Facebook posts, Discord chat exports, preserved Reddit threads, saved copies of reviews, etc.). This trove of evidence not only makes establishing the defamatory statements straightforward, but it also helps in proving elements like malice (for aggravated damages) by revealing patterns of behavior. It also minimizes the risk of factual disputes about what was said. In defamation litigation, having this kind of evidence is invaluable, especially if some content gets removed later – here it’s already saved.

Identification of Defendants: The case involves multiple potential defendants:

- **Individual wrongdoers:** People like Joel Walker, Mason “Links” Stockton, Mathew “Kamikaze” Trojanowski, Anthony Buchanan, etc., who directly wrote or instigated the defamatory posts. Many of these individuals are identified by real name or long-term alias. Joel Walker, for instance, is a known person (e.g., referenced by name with a character statement letter in evidence). Others like Trojanowski and Stockton are also real persons behind the aliases, known within the community. As such, Brodie can target them in a suit. A challenge sometimes is serving defendants or enforcing judgment if they reside abroad (some might be in the US or elsewhere), but at least within Australia’s jurisdiction, if any attacker is local, that’s straightforward. If some are overseas, an Australian court can still hear the case if the damage occurred in NSW and the publications were accessible here – Australian law has in rem jurisdiction over the publications – but enforcement of a judgment abroad or even just getting the defendant to participate could be an issue. This is something for strategy (perhaps focus on domestic defendants or those with assets or presence in Australia, or proceed knowing some might default).
- **Platforms:** A novel and important aspect is the potential liability of platforms like **Facebook (Meta)** or **Trustpilot**. Traditionally, platforms can be considered “secondary publishers” once they are notified of defamatory content and fail to remove it. The High Court’s decisions (such as in Voller’s case) established that even hosts of comments can be liable as publishers. While that applied to page owners, the principle extends that a platform that

facilitates publication and has the power to remove could be liable if they neglect to act after being put on notice. In this case, **Trustpilot** was explicitly notified multiple times by Brodie that certain reviews were false and harmful; at least one review was removed for defamation and then inexplicably reinstated. After that notice, Trustpilot could be seen as **publishing** the defamatory material (no longer just an innocent disseminator) because they knowingly let it remain. Similarly, if Facebook was sufficiently alerted (via user reports or perhaps a formal notice), and they left up the posts, there's an argument they too became a publisher of the content. Australian law in 2025 continues to evolve on this, but recent reforms (the *Social Media Anti-Trolling legislation*, if enacted, or at least the framework introduced) encourage plaintiffs to go after the original posters but also provide a pathway to hold platforms accountable if the poster can't be identified or if the platform doesn't offer a complaints scheme. Here, since some posters are identifiable, primary suits would be against them; however, including the platform as a defendant (especially **Trustpilot**, which is a company with assets and which demonstrably handled the content) could be a tactic to ensure deeper pockets and added pressure to remove content. The **case strength against platforms** will depend on showing they had knowledge of the defamation and failed to remove it in a reasonable time. The evidence logs of dates of reports and removal (e.g., a Facebook post visible 101 days with 42 reports logged as "visible") help establish that. This can overcome a platform's potential defense of innocent dissemination (which is lost after notice of defamation).

Legal Procedure Posture: Before filing a defamation lawsuit in NSW, a **concerns notice** must be sent to each prospective defendant, giving them an opportunity to make amends (e.g., remove the content, apologize, pay a settlement). It appears Brodie has effectively done similar steps informally – he's repeatedly asked the platforms to remove content and even sent a **legal notice to Trustpilot** in late 2025 demanding removal and foreshadowing legal action (including a compensation demand by a deadline). Those communications would satisfy or at least align with the spirit of a concerns notice. The lack of any adequate response or resolution from the recipients bolsters the case that litigation is needed. Once in court, the plethora of evidence and clear harm should make for a compelling narrative.

Potential Challenges: While the case for defamation is strong on liability, there are practical considerations:

- Some perpetrators may attempt to stay anonymous or be difficult to locate. However, given the information at hand (real names and known aliases), the major figures are known. If needed, the court can be asked to order platforms to divulge identifying info for accounts that remain pseudonymous.
- Enforcement of judgment on foreign individuals might be tricky; the strategy might be to either focus on local defendants or use the judgment to then pursue foreign enforcement (depending on treaties, etc.).
- The volume of incidents presents a tactical choice: rather than suing on every single publication (which is impractical under the rule against proliferating causes of action for each publication), Brodie's lawyers might select the **most egregious instances** to sue on, and use the rest as background evidence of aggravation. NSW law also now requires **serious harm**, but does not allow pleading multiple separate defamatory imputations unless they are distinct; here though many statements convey similar imputations (pedophilia,

unethical practices, etc.). The legal team will likely simplify into a handful of key defamatory imputations across the publications.

- Another consideration: The **uniform defamation law cap on damages** (discussed below) will likely apply unless aggravated damages are found, which they likely will be. This means even though there are many publications, the court might award one lump sum covering all harm. However, if suing different defendants separately (especially if they're not joint actors in law), theoretically separate awards could occur – but more likely the case would be presented as one campaign.

Overall, **the case's merits are very strong**. The plaintiff can establish all elements of defamation, overcome the new threshold, and negate defenses. The abundant evidence and the egregious nature of the false allegations make it a compelling case for a jury (if it goes to a jury on facts) or for a judge alone. Given NSW's legal landscape, any jury would almost certainly find these publications defamatory and false, leaving only the question of damages to the judge (since in NSW defamation damages are typically assessed by the judge even if a jury decides liability). The prospect of holding at least one corporate defendant (like a platform) liable also increases the likelihood of a meaningful enforcement and recovery. From a **contingency litigation** perspective, this case presents a sympathetic plaintiff (a small business owner and community figure trying to do the right thing) and unsympathetic defendants (internet trolls and competitors engaging in possibly unlawful harassment), as well as the possibility of a high damages award. These factors would encourage a law firm to take it on a no-win-no-fee basis, assuming the jurisdictional and enforcement issues are manageable.

NSW Lawyer Intake Summary

Client: Anthony Gordon Brodie, known online as “**Soul**”, is the creator of *Legion Killfeed*, a popular Discord-based tool for DayZ game server owners. Brodie is a 30-something NSW resident who has been a prominent figure in the DayZ console gaming community, known for providing helpful coding support and running a top-ranked server network (Aggro PVP). He effectively turned his technical skills into a small business with Legion Killfeed, offering server kill-feed services via subscription.

Situation: Brodie has been the target of a prolonged and malicious **defamation and harassment campaign** from late 2019 through early 2026, orchestrated by a group of rivals and disgruntled individuals in the same gaming community. What began as competitive bad-mouthing escalated into a wide-ranging smear campaign spanning multiple online platforms:

- **Discord:** The initial battleground. Competitors in Discord servers started spreading rumors that Brodie was stealing code or sabotaging servers when he left projects. By late 2021, direct threats and harassment appeared in Discord messages (e.g., a rival saying “*We’re coming for you*”).
- **Social Media (Facebook/Reddit):** The campaign spilled into social media posts, especially in 2025. Notably, members of a group aligned with competitor “Kami” (Mathew Trojanowski) coordinated attacks on Facebook, posting that Brodie (Soul) is “*a piece of s****” and, more extremely, a “*pedo*.” A Reddit thread in early 2024 also accused him of unprofessional

behavior, which was amplified by newly made accounts — suspected to be fake profiles controlled by the harassers.

- **Trustpilot and Reviews:** The attackers targeted Legion Killfeed's **Trustpilot page**, especially from late 2024 onward, to damage Brodie's business reputation. False one-star reviews were posted by known rivals posing as dissatisfied customers. Examples include Anthony Buchanan's review (falsely claiming Brodie mishandled data and was driven by jealousy) and Karl "Moley" Messer's review (alleging Brodie took money and provided poor service – a story manufactured out of a failed PayPal payment). These reviews omitted crucial context and were written in bad faith. Brodie engaged with Trustpilot to remove some of them; while a few were removed after being flagged as defamatory, new ones kept appearing, and at least one removed review reappeared due to a Trustpilot error. The result was a **tainted online profile** for his service.
- **Harassment Tactics:** The individuals involved have used a variety of underhanded tactics:
 - **False Identities:** Creating alternate Discord accounts to infiltrate Brodie's support server and gather intel or spread rumors privately. For instance, the "pups" account mentioned above pretended to be a friendly user but was actually operated by a key harasser to covertly message and scare Brodie's clients.
 - **Doxxing:** Publishing personal information. Brodie's home address was exposed publicly by one attacker in a video, and there were insinuations involving his family (the harassers at times mentioned or targeted those close to him, which is extremely distressing to the client).
 - **Threats and Incitement:** Beyond defamation, the tone included threats of physical harm or calls for others to take action against Brodie. He was essentially stalked online: one banned individual created multiple new accounts to continue sending him harassing messages and friend requests (Discord confirmed this and banned the user's IP in Nov 2022). Some posts by the harassers encouraged "*banning*" any community that supports Legion Killfeed, effectively a call to boycott and isolate Brodie's project.
 - **Volume and Persistence:** The harassment did not let up even after platform interventions. It continued across at least **7 years of interactions**, intensifying in the last 2–3 years with the most defamatory content. The client has logged **1940+ evidentiary items** (messages, posts, images, etc.) which show a pattern: whenever one platform or account was shut down, the attackers would resurface through another channel. This created a sense of unescape for the client.

Key Actors (Defamers):

- **Mathew "Kami" Trojanowski:** A former collaborator-turned-competitor. He runs a rival killfeed service (DayZ++). Evidence suggests he has indirectly fueled the campaign – for example, encouraging others (Team "Kami") to post negative content. In late 2022, he was heard discussing generating fake negative reviews. He also at one point financially supported Brodie's server (Aggro PVP) under the guise of help, which gave him insight into Brodie's community. Relationship soured later; he's believed to be a central figure linking several others.

- **Mason Lewis Stockton (aliases “Links”, “Havasu”, “pups”):** A persistent harasser. Originally a community member, he was banned for doxxing. He retaliated by continuously evading bans to harass Brodie. Mason leaked Brodie’s address, repeatedly tried to contact him against his will, and masqueraded as other users to mislead and harm Brodie’s business. Discord’s Trust & Safety team actually disabled a range of accounts linked to Mason’s IP after Brodie’s reports – a notable instance where a platform acted decisively. Mason appears to have been involved in pushing people to the competitor’s service and spreading the worst slurs (he reacted with “” to posts calling Brodie a pedo, etc., encouraging that narrative).
- **Joel L. Walker:** A community member who launched a very extreme defamatory tirade in late 2025 on Facebook. He posted a series of inflammatory statements branding Brodie as a pedophile and more. Joel’s motivations are a bit complex – evidence suggests he had his own reputation issues (there are references to a “Project Jackelope” incident where Joel was criticized, and he may have lashed out at Brodie possibly as scapegoating). Regardless of motive, Joel’s posts are among the most damaging due to their directness and shock value. They remained visible for a long time and continued despite Brodie and others reporting them. Joel Walker’s credibility is undermined by a character statement from a former employer (which the client has obtained) describing Joel’s history of dishonest and aggressive behavior. This will help legally to discredit any of Joel’s possible defenses.
- **Anthony “Tony” Buchanan:** Initially an acquaintance who benefited from Brodie’s help, he later became a competitor (ran a service called DayZBoosterZ). In September 2024, Buchanan sought Brodie’s technical help in a way that could undermine Legion, and when Brodie declined, Buchanan turned hostile. He publically accused Brodie of being a “pedo” and posted a defamatory Trustpilot review under his own name disguised as a customer review. His role demonstrates how business rivalry morphed into personal defamation.
- **Others:** Daniel Santos (organizer of the Facebook “brigading” thread), Danny Hayes (who joined in that thread to announce himself as a competitor and encourage negative reviews), Karl Messer (former user who posted a false story on Trustpilot after a payment mishap, possibly egged on by others), and a few troll accounts on Reddit that appear to actually be the above individuals in disguise. Each played a part in amplifying the false narrative about Brodie.

Evidence Base: The client’s evidence is extremely thorough:

- **Chronological Timeline:** Brodie has compiled a detailed timeline of events from 2019 through 2026, with dates, descriptions, and links to evidence. This timeline shows the escalation from minor disputes to full-blown defamation campaign.
- **Screenshots & Files:** There are hundreds of screenshots of Discord chats, Facebook posts, Reddit comments, and review site entries. Each is preserved with timestamps. Many are hosted on a private site (they-wish-i.died.space) and indexed by date. For example, screenshots of the October 2021 Discord threats, the November 2022 doxxing video, the various 2024–25 Trustpilot reviews, and the 2025 Facebook posts by Walker are all saved.
- **Data and Reports:** The client also compiled analytical data, such as the number of reports made to platforms and the platforms’ responses. One JSON report logs each defamatory post, how many times it was reported, how long it stayed up, and whether it was removed.

This demonstrates the persistence of the material and the fact that much remained public even after complaints.

- **Impact Data:** Brodie has records of his service's subscription numbers and revenue over time, which correlate with the timing of the attacks. There is a documented significant drop in subscriber count after the surge of defamatory reviews and posts in mid- to late-2025. This helps draw a causal link between the defamation and tangible harm suffered.
- **Contextual Documents:** Some additional documents provide context on individuals (e.g., the Joel Walker character statement letter from 2021, which is not defamatory content by itself but helps show what kind of person one of the defamers is). Also, communications with Trustpilot and other platforms (emails or support tickets) are available, showing Brodie's efforts to get the content removed and the platforms' often tepid responses.

Harm Suffered by Client:

- **Reputational Harm:** In the niche DayZ console gaming and server-hosting community, Brodie's name went from highly respected to controversial due to these false accusations. He has been **ostracized by some groups**; for example, a competitor's community flat-out banned anyone associated with Legion Killfeed. Potential clients have been scared off – some explicitly mentioned they heard negative things about him. When searching his service online, prospective users find deceptive negative reviews and accusations, planting doubt. This tarnishing of reputation is exactly what defamation law is meant to remedy.
- **Economic/Business Harm:** Legion Killfeed's growth was stunted and even reversed. The client's subscription data shows that after steady growth through early 2025 (peaking around 120 active subscriptions), the numbers declined sharply to about 85 by the end of 2025. This decline coincided with the peak of the smear campaign (particularly the public Facebook and Trustpilot defamation in Q3/Q4 2025). Many cancellations came after targeted solicitations by the harassers or after the appearance of disturbing allegations. This translates to lost income (a roughly \$300 per month revenue drop, and loss of momentum that likely cost future gains). If the reputation damage isn't repaired, it could have a long-term chilling effect on new business.
- **Emotional and Physical Well-Being:** Brodie has endured **significant emotional distress**. The stress from constant attacks and defending himself led to burnout. In October 2022 he quit a major part of his community work (stepping down from running Aggro PVP) largely because he "could not keep grinding" under such hostile conditions. The campaign has at times taken a serious mental toll – the client has indicated feelings of anxiety, humiliation, and powerlessness as false rumors about him proliferate. The doxxing incident raised legitimate fear for his and his family's safety (knowing that someone vindictive had his home address). He has had to be hyper-vigilant online, which is exhausting and detracts from normal life and work. While he hasn't reported physical harm, the psychological impact is evident.
- **Time and Resources Spent:** To combat this harassment, Brodie has invested an enormous amount of personal time. He's effectively had to become an investigator and archivist, tracking everything said about him. He's filed reports to Discord Trust & Safety, to Facebook, to Google (for search result removal), to Trustpilot's content integrity team, and followed up

repeatedly. In mid-2024, seeing no lasting resolution, he started preparing material as if for legal and regulatory action (which is why the evidence is so well catalogued). All this is time he could have spent improving his product or enjoying personal life. Instead, it became a part-time job just to curb the reputational bleeding. This indirect harm (diversion of effort) is not directly compensable as damage in defamation, but it demonstrates how severe the situation became – the client had to go to extraordinary lengths just to protect himself.

Current Status: As of early 2026, the harassment appears to be **ongoing or could resume** at any moment. Some defamatory materials are still accessible:

- At least a few of the false Trustpilot reviews remained visible into late 2025 (and if not removed, would still be up now, unless taken down after the latest communications).
- The Facebook posts by Joel Walker and others were eventually taken down (one was removed after around 3 months), but not before spreading widely; however, those individuals could post again anytime.
- The smear campaigners remain active in the community under various aliases. The risk of continued damage is high unless legal action imposes consequences or injunctions.
- Brodie has exhausted most platform-based remedies. Discord did take strong action in 2022 for a while (banning Mason's accounts), but that didn't stop new players like Joel on Facebook later. Trustpilot's processes ultimately did not prevent multiple defamatory reviews from staying live for long periods. Given this lack of a permanent solution, **Brodie is now seeking a legal injunction and damages** to end the cycle.

Objective for Legal Action: The client's goals in pursuing defamation claims are:

1. **Removal of Defamatory Content:** Obtain court orders (or leverage from a lawsuit) to force platforms to take down all identified defamatory posts and reviews, and to de-index or suppress them in search results. An injunction may also be sought against the individuals to prohibit further defamatory statements.
2. **Restoration of Reputation:** Through a judgment or settlement, achieve some form of vindication – e.g., a public apology or at least the ability to point to a legal finding that the statements were false – which can be communicated to the community and any concerned parties.
3. **Compensation for Damages:** Recover monetary damages for the harm suffered. This serves to compensate his losses (both non-economic and economic) and also holds the wrongdoers accountable in a tangible way. Given the damage done, the client believes substantial damages are warranted.
4. **Deterrence:** By taking this action, discourage the defendants (and others in the community) from continuing or repeating such defamatory conduct. The client wants to set a precedent that such malicious behavior has legal consequences.

Why This Case is Viable (Summary for Intake):

- The **evidence is strong and abundant** – we have everything needed to prove the defamatory publications and their falsity.
- The harm to the client is serious and well documented, satisfying legal requirements and making the case worth the effort.
- Many perpetrators are identifiable and within reach, and a couple of corporate entities could be roped in, potentially ensuring there are sources from which to recover damages or at least enforce removal.
- The narrative of the case is compelling: it involves cyberbullying, false accusations of heinous acts, and a small entrepreneur fighting back – this often resonates with judges/juries.
- The client has shown diligence and good faith (he tried all other avenues first, he even helped these people in the past or gave them chances), whereas the defendants' behavior is egregious. This contrast will play in the client's favor.
- We will need to navigate multiple defendants and potentially multi-jurisdiction issues (if any defendant is overseas), but the core cause of action against each is similar, allowing for an efficient strategy (e.g., one lawsuit naming several key individuals and perhaps a company or two, with the possibility of default judgments against any who don't respond).

This summary should give a prospective NSW defamation lawyer a clear picture of the case's facts, players, and stakes. The next step would be to formalize concerns notices and prepare for filing suit if the demands are not met. Given the timeline, any publications from late 2024 and throughout 2025 are within the usual 1-year limitation (subject to possible extensions for older ones, since the harm was ongoing and some evidence like Trustpilot reinstatement occurred later). The client is ready to move forward, understanding that a coordinated legal approach is likely his best hope to finally end the harassment and repair his reputation.

Correct Damages Valuation

In assessing damages for this defamation case, we consider several components: **general damages** for non-economic loss (including any aggravated damages), and **special damages** for quantifiable economic loss. Australian defamation law (NSW) also allows aggravated damages (which enhance general damages) but does not generally permit punitive damages as a separate category. Here is a breakdown of the valuation:

- **General Damages (Non-Economic Loss)**: This compensates for the **hurt, distress, and reputational damage** suffered by Brodie. The defamatory accusations against him are exceptionally grave – being labeled a pedophile, criminal, and fraud can ruin a person's personal and professional life. The law recognizes that such allegations merit high awards. In NSW, there is a statutory cap on general damages (around **A\$500,000** as of 2025 after indexation) for non-economic loss in defamation, *unless* a court finds aggravated circumstances warranting more. Given the evidence of **ongoing humiliation and anguish** (Brodie faced community shaming, fear for safety, and severe emotional turmoil), a court would likely aim toward the **upper end of the range** even without aggravation. We would argue that simply the nature of the allegations and their broad publication justify a figure near the cap to adequately compensate the loss of reputation and dignity. For

instance, cases in Australia involving false accusations of pedophilia have seen very high awards because of the permanent stigma such claims carry.

- **Aggravated Damages:** In this case, aggravated damages are almost certain to apply, which means the cap on general damages can be exceeded. Aggravated damages are not a separate sum but an uplift on general damages due to the defendant's conduct increasing the hurt. Here, the conduct of the defendants was egregious: they acted with **malice**, persisted over a long period, and compounded the harm with threats and insults. They offered no apology or retraction; instead, some mocked Brodie or doubled down when challenged. This has likely **intensified Brodie's suffering** (for example, seeing continuous lies posted about him and being powerless to stop it easily). Courts have often awarded aggravated damages in cases where defendants behaved in a high-handed or abusive manner during or after the defamation; in our case, the entire campaign is high-handed. Consequently, one could expect a significant uplift. It would not be unreasonable to see the general damages (with aggravation) go beyond the cap by perhaps **50% or more**. By way of example, if the notional cap is around \$500k, an aggravated damages award could push the total non-economic damages to, say, **A\$600,000–\$700,000**. Ultimately, it's at the court's discretion, but the goal would be to fully compensate Brodie and acknowledge the flagrancy of the defendants' actions.
- **Special Damages (Economic Loss):** Brodie's tangible financial losses due to the defamation can be claimed as special damages (assuming we can draw a solid causal link). From mid-2025 to the end of 2025, Legion Killfeed's subscriber count dropped from ~122 to ~85, a loss of 37 customers. Each customer subscription was worth roughly **A\$8–\$10 per month**. This equates to about **A\$300 in lost revenue per month**, which over a year is around **A\$3,600**. Additionally, the downward trend and reputational hit likely prevented further growth – absent the defamation, Brodie might have continued to gain subscribers through late 2025 instead of losing them. If we estimate conservatively, he might have grown to 150 subscribers or more; instead he ended at 85. That's 65 potential lost customers beyond the ones who left, representing future income not realized. It's difficult to claim speculative losses, but it demonstrates the opportunity cost. For hard numbers, we will claim the **actual loss of income** from the known cancellations (e.g., those 37 lost subs for whatever period they would have stayed subscribed – for instance, if on average each would have stayed 6 more months, that's $37 * \$9 * 6 \approx \$2,000$). If any specific lost business deals or partnerships can be directly tied to the defamatory campaign, those would be included too (currently, the main quantifiable loss is subscription revenue).

In addition, there were **expenses** incurred that, while not business losses per se, came as a result of the defamation. For example, if Brodie spent money on enhanced security or had to pay for monitoring services, or if he needed therapy or medical help due to stress, those could potentially be claimed as consequential losses (with evidence like receipts or doctor's notes). At this point, however, it seems the losses are mostly in the form of lost income rather than out-of-pocket costs.

- **Total Damages Estimate:** Considering the above, a realistic **total damages** assessment could be in the range of **A\$500,000 to A\$650,000** (combining general and aggravated damages) **plus** whatever special damages are proven (perhaps a few thousand dollars of lost revenue, which is relatively small by comparison). We would likely round up the claim a

bit for negotiation purposes – for example, claim **A\$750,000** total, anticipating that covers extreme reputational harm plus punitive-like effect through aggravated damages, and with the understanding that the court will adjust as it sees fit.

It's worth noting that Australian defamation cases rarely exceed the cap by huge margins unless there are massive economic losses or particularly egregious conduct. Our case has egregious conduct, but the actual economic loss, while real, is not in the hundreds of thousands; it's the non-economic impact that is huge. So expecting a multi-million dollar award would be unreasonable under current law. Instead, we focus on hitting the statutory maximum and just beyond, to properly compensate Brodie. For perspective, if the case were to go to trial and succeed on all fronts, an award might look like: **\$500k general + \$150k aggravated + \$10k special = ~\$660k.**

- **Apology/Retraction Value:** In defamation matters, an apology or retraction doesn't have a direct monetary value but can greatly aid in rehabilitating reputation. Part of "damages valuation" in a practical sense is that Brodie greatly values clearing his name. Therefore, as part of any settlement, we might insist on public apologies or statements of correction from the key individuals and possibly a statement from the platforms acknowledging the content was false and removed. This can be as important as money for the client's peace of mind and future dealings. While not "damages" per se, it's a remedy to pursue alongside damages.
- **Multiple Defendants Consideration:** If multiple people and entities are found liable, the court will apportion or order responsibility appropriately. Typically, defendants who are joint tortfeasors are jointly and severally liable for the whole amount. The practical upshot is that Brodie could recover the full amount from any one of them or portions from each. For example, if Trustpilot and Joel Walker were both found liable for the same defamatory publication, each could be on the hook for the full damages (with contribution between them to be sorted out separately). For settlement talks, we might leverage the presence of a solvent defendant (like a platform) to secure a larger portion of the damages. The valuation remains the same overall, but we have to consider how to actually collect it. Platforms might be more willing to pay a substantial settlement to avoid a judgement and bad press, whereas individual harassers might have limited means – though the individuals could be pressured to agree to smaller amounts plus apologies, etc.

Conclusion on Damages: The harm to the client is profound, and our valuation reflects that reality. The primary driver of the damages figure is the *extreme reputational and emotional harm* (for which we seek an amount near or above the statutory cap), augmented by the *defendants' malicious conduct* (aggravation) and a smaller but concrete *financial loss component*. This case justifies a high-end defamation damages award in NSW, and we will prepare to justify these figures with reference to precedent cases and the evidence of harm. The aim is not only to compensate Mr. Brodie but also to send a message that such coordinated defamation will result in serious financial consequences for those responsible.

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

Sent: Monday, 2 February 2026 12:28 AM

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

Subject: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]

Hello,

Thank you for getting back to us.

We have reviewed the content of the review in question and note that it has not yet been flagged for defamation. As you have a claimed business profile, we kindly request that you report the review for defamation directly from your account. Once flagged, the review will undergo a more detailed defamation-based assessment in line with our guidelines.

Thank you for your patience and cooperation.

Warm regards,

Hariharan

See our reviews



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

Email Headers (Raw)

Received	from PUUP216MB3173.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:301:16c::8) by PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM with HTTPS; Wed, 4 Feb 2026 07:30:55 +0000
Received	from DUZPR01CA0024.eurprd01.prod.exchangelabs.com (2603:10a6:10:46b::11) by PUUP216MB3173.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:301:16c::8) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9587.12; Wed, 4 Feb 2026 07:30:53 +0000
Received	from DU2PEPF00028D12.eurprd03.prod.outlook.com (2603:10a6:10:46b:cafe::d6) by DUZPR01CA0024.outlook.office365.com (2603:10a6:10:46b::11) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9587.13 via Frontend Transport; Wed, 4 Feb 2026 07:30:50 +0000
Authentication-Results	spf=pass (sender IP is 16.170.121.195) smtp.mailfrom=q1sagv7vsvey.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com; dkim=pass (signature was verified) header.d=trustpilot.com; dmarc=pass action=none header.from=trustpilot.com; compauth=pass reason=100
Received-SPF	Pass (protection.outlook.com: domain of q1sagv7vsvey.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com designates 16.170.121.195 as permitted sender) receiver=protection.outlook.com; client-ip=16.170.121.195; helo=smtp-06061611da7621d0c.core1.sfdc-cehfhs.mta.salesforce.com; pr=E
Received	from smtp-06061611da7621d0c.core1.sfdc-cehfhs.mta.salesforce.com (16.170.121.195) by DU2PEPF00028D12.mail.protection.outlook.com (10.167.242.26) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9587.10 via Frontend Transport; Wed, 4 Feb 2026 07:30:51 +0000
X-IncomingTopHeaderMarker	OriginalChecksum:47E28815D83163E700DC65C060C9385DC984A15D8A42AEC2A210803E35AB8AC1;UpperCasedChecksum:A0876FFC297EBB7EA6E842F1F2B36D3CD993EFBA27E2BDE5631BE81D8980E358;SizeAsReceived:2312;Count:24
Return-Path	trust.operations=trustpilot.com__5vwizmp9gb9bri2c@q1sagv7vsvey.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com
DKIM-Signature	v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/simple; d=trustpilot.com; s=Gr19sMEPUzYv6P5osCCVzI911JaYnlkBjlt; t=1770190250; bh=v2lqE8Y+epV9iwbxybOBs9UNC5dS942sAg9kiLBPNp4=; h=Date:From:To:Subject:MIME-Version:Content-Type; b=KZcODJaxVcmCiD1BGEww5mVjc1u+PYSi7m9ApwVg78wudFs13oxnFBfiWutSaLioj m3NBBO6tjaW5xFBp+5bXlgZ6crFtelg4qYMN7drROErKDaarWy3X4geFI9jVBNyLbc 8y12UF3W5pxHeHgZOs1FIUUqQk6ZuPFP2k3gjGFs=
Received	from [127.0.0.1] ([127.0.0.1:39206] helo=eaas-15.eaas.emailinfra.svc.cluster.local) by mx1.core1.sfdc-cehfhs.mta.salesforce.com (envelope-from <trust.operations=trustpilot.com__5vwizmp9gb9bri2c@q1sagv7vsvey.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com>) (ecelerity 4.7.0.20111r(msys-ecelerity:tags/4.7.0-ga*0)) with ESMTP id 1F/27-00683-AA5F2896; Wed, 04 Feb 2026 07:30:50 +0000
Received	from 127.0.0.1 (localhost. [127.0.0.1]) by eaas-15 (EaaS) id <oHPRY0000000000000000000000000000T9XBJD00bxCloDXPSwKyijMphg4NCQ@sfdc.net> for <"Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>> Wed, 4 Feb 2026 07:30:50 GMT (GMT)
Date	Wed, 04 Feb 2026 07:30:50 +0000
From	Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
To	"Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Message-ID	<oHPRY00T9XBJD00bxCloDXPSwKyijMphg4NCQ@sfdc.net>
In-Reply-To	<PU4P216MB1568C7C1C65397741CED63E7DA9AA@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
References	<tV11v00T9S83V00WLPfWoBwS2m4nuybpfeqhA@sfdc.net> <PU4P216MB1568C7C1C65397741CED63E7DA9AA@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
Subject	Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]
Content-Type	multipart/mixed; boundary="-----_Part_491_696267473.1770190250708"
X-SFDC-LK	00D20000000BU0P
X-SFDC-User	005Sh000004g6ol
X-Sender	postmaster@salesforce.com
X-mail_abuse_inquiries	http://www.salesforce.com/company/abuse.jsp
X-SFDC-TLS-NoRelay	1
X-SFDC-CORRELATION-ID	0000ip29dssvpqty
X-SFDC-Binding	1WriRBV94myi25uB
X-SFDC-App	coreapp
X-SFDC-EmailCategory	quickActionEmail
X-SFDC-EntityId	500Sh00000boOq1
X-SFDC-Interface	internal
X-IncomingHeaderCount	24
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTime	04 Feb 2026 07:30:51.2148 (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	51435eea-c67f-438a-4fb9-08de63bf52cb
X-EOPAttributedMessage	0
X-EOPTenantAttributedMessage	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa:0

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-MessageDirectionality	Incoming
X-MS-PublicTrafficType	Email
X-MS-TrafficTypeDiagnostic	DU2PEPF00028D12:EE_ PUUP216MB3173:EE_ PU4P216MB1568:EE_
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthSource	DU2PEPF00028D12.eurprd03.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-UserLastLogonTime	2/4/2026 6:57:43 AM
X-MS-Office365-Filtering-Correlation-Id	51435eea-c67f-438a-4fb9-08de63bf52cb
X-MS-Exchange-EOPDirect	true
X-Sender-IP	16.170.121.195
X-SID-PRA	TRUST.OPERATIONS@TRUSTPILOT.COM
X-SID-Result	PASS
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL	1
X-Microsoft-Antispam	BCL:4;ARA:1444111002 168079906 9000799056 461199028 28070799003 9400799043 10300799038 58200799021 47200799024 35120799006 36140799009 9800799015 6092099016 56899033 1370799030 1360799030 1380799030 1602099012 440099028 4302099013 3412199025 1122599022 26104999006 22062799003 30041999003;
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-OriginalArrivalTime	04 Feb 2026 07:30:51.0539 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Network-Message-Id	51435eea-c67f-438a-4fb9-08de63bf52cb
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Id	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthSource	DU2PEPF00028D12.eurprd03.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	PUUP216MB3173
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-EndToEndLatency	00:00:04.2086689
X-MS-Exchange-Processed-By-BccFoldering	15.20.9564.000
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Mailbox-Delivery	ucf:1;jmr:0;ex:0;auth:1;dest:C;OFR:CustomRules;ENG:(5062000311)(9202211109095)(90000117)(920221120095)(90011020)(91015020)(91040095)(9050020)(9060121)(9081003)(9100341)(1010050)(944500132)(4810010)(4910033)(9920006)(9510006)(10105021)(9320005)(9230038)(120001);
X-Message-Delivery	Vj0xLjE7dXM9MDtsPTA7YT0wO0Q9MTiHRD0xO1NDTD0tMQ==
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Message-Info	8+hbbkOIZ1r219mEUR75gJZ9abKkzS0DAPgwezMV29/a7fiNTItJ9jFw1oCPUrPljJBwKGCaYv73BD0Hbom4Rr+xjaZQqjX2iWYLAHIG76Bz9xVjLucTJnxyOgKav2IiilTfuuAkHtEvdPLIK4thFFYzx7PqxZCyyckIZVTi/DcmLBp hBmtaxdODkWmY4eQLXpuEZSQmXh73bSZ/om6sCP1B9+T/4EQN8scp89imlv8QnJ47MWEKaPo418gfO1oC4CwW/p8 yVf58h3TiIPdSSgCN5+5gfpnseWZPrPGczVpytlGod5jXBSagySwLpbZpBw8z/Z8Q6QbboJtOzIPZY4UPbFewwxu ETa1SFJ8vnfRcs3wYAxVDaoMh0zq67/JmHlW85anl05LdHn4RA+dIzp8MpgGswQUUTCkh3tEkpDCeY8Y8KE5/Sga fl0QxmzkDeOY4zfQIY3j5EI6dKH+5AL3oyG0CadnY7ka4gttyv4KsdBNKd1WKaVRTpd5smwtOlXuA2FKJ2TIRiI1 oBc/WMW5JCOI2dxPvtyJPWhP6vkAopgZt/oSXwCOiJCKSAghziRkKwCnCiFiuRdwetWIDXh2hOQwgp7PAQmNWWAxW MSytczY9UGPDBmyMT4NUxqOckWYCGZ8551mDNsLL2t8uQ6ww681lQmbOA2n1y6OXzAb6r6nrPcRN1EGcbsUrwKFc 0VlihP/qGgeoNx4+flEz+aF4WeYEp97malBq8lAn/iav4JhjxyLDvvO+sune6/0Cd/9sVH55rGw+rqgRdHHjOE7y EZPyJtnkvDmwNOnRLmBxphbAh8VwtRJSPxSmDv7kfhit7RL8F4EdnJ01jO7tnc7kHEbV4mb8WKSf6f0y+JLHWqlx 2LlkwfwKBogYjytYTKFRXhAgeAcR0k2dhhdWstGF8qsY8dm8nASqNtmjmhhGxX3eH/zGrGzR1Ar+0VDb9A2rdkjOG D3QSVwBPnqlBHA8Y1e5dOgZhx3QuPNnx880w4WJm+OA+4JugsI/hjRN5ojQPXX6ZJWZ4EPOXDG+wbkF/0hU9kZAr cmA3SQILoQyXhXnLN0zZl+VgZmtDI9OI9hAwZn4N56Zu/7knujixHJjGpDn6lWY0jFR5BXy2MQsLO9odwKCD2Wb y2g5KysKiwYkm1BhbrxL+xub3YDqcBkqK3/m0rFdRwqpQjeQv2Qv0MklVIHRn4ajDSePbO6iM+3Zpz5Rnf3zl5cD msOI1Evo+/ta79l3cAbtV27gA9LBAX8qsur236SXfofUbqL4NEj4aA3b5fdQpr8ZX0TyyXqwmCKfKy/ikz1htzdG TyQFoRPyDy5GpPLyJpKlgt2NTyeS/MULLsUGgUMfPesZCmtdz4UKsLPQy+caPq6z3MvTzxKVFm/7Q8BSIRl8+ki rdaocDnfTGzm6UOOLD2So0hZ44gruW2tZcmI/Eiyor+rmGZzp1qQdrlR54uBBslZUGlgoX0WFFqkq/fyPTPD5h+RW ltm2Pxx487j3tVMpd1czyYeuZloowFajUOi7i6PHfhkTl9nwqWh5UiTWuXxb12nC+7cRYntqQdjFh9hVtws/nVnR 2ZLUk2l6j0DqjViNawqZjyYJxJoi6v6NfNftUqqPUp7L+XQvYiz+9P2OGeQiwCd8dJsrAYrmbmPjmI2fY+2NCy6 z5xjBVgvLUUSsUCpVCNgn3W2bWUAoEfqsQ6kemM8CL5+Uzz6fGVTCdsDau57AKpg9lWgey1/3ez62Ubc/3oar80V 89i/HcvBIM07Gzc266v1YvNlfd3aNrOIU7H88O4gMJt1NMvtMbqh92ntVN35lspzuhb4JpmjKiFVsdXprEiCIQCG IiKc2PYyZuXSgMmHzDJ3E3dSoOk5fgSVg2C3i+Tn+QVTb0P7721aNj2fYq8gQGmATkbenPkpBW4l8M0etJn5CJ7K nUS4KMA9bPWeYkNwVSG3CaKOtOKRkbYyZzGJlv2WPbsvGHbfpkAykoO1FPGcreaoSAv+MJJUWtuVnA8arXbK0oVcj nr5P7V23mMrWnHasjLBr8S3sLsPk1JKbQRbRdlPXR7z1slpMTIhJeobYb64vCsXo8TTS-CsGLzwZUQUJWBW0etAC zWfQhbolwuFIPA5fvZ2q0l3F3uqrw61g52mBUX/TgrcNell6BiaUlfWv+Lfr3jzyVnAvL2LWbmY4ZrY198zipO MGS76egaf81iEbxyxm94jn17BgnooODIOH0Afa8ayr5m4KkpfQ+N0rTApqFMmk9XFua8VetPzux0Yy34iwmzzrgnh LF+qRMDKa8p95tZ/URmS6C4mXPHKUR8jmHrH0jpy9N4vxV6pOb4UYpczHR9qCDVPP9NWB1c4M/OuugF7dGpu7WZ m3N4fmPsX0lzGEAF0mk36ghR8LrykebaA4bYlt/oaNbb2CVZBHd5RAaLaid6DRA5y/iGaj5+c2h7b37VjAxvX4Py nry2dTAbMakmM2za6CaFc1P1VKy2xl0Yvq4+3GGo3OvdiGBocEXP3pap35KZ1uuEEaNCks+dxpGmCilsHtR37ot bq2atq/obeQLqMv7K/5SgngHkH6rhJfQfVBDNRNWXKRgc8bpOmPtcZL9PL6fo2bM1S/7qX87YhGgfNKK70mg93ZGbc/fQ==
MIME-Version	1.0