

From: Do not reply <donotreply@trustpilot.com>
To: "Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Subject: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]
Date: Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:11 +0000

Hello,

We have investigated the matter based on the flagging reason provided, and we confirm that the review has already been flagged for defamation under ticket no. 01161135. Upon checking, we can see that an appeal has already been submitted in that same ticket. The case is currently under investigation by our Appeals Team, and once the review process is complete, they will respond directly within the appeal ticket.

Please note that our platform does not determine the factual accuracy of disputed claims between parties. In cases involving factual disagreements, we encourage the parties to resolve the matter directly. If you believe the content is unlawful or defamatory, we recommend providing clear supporting documentation or an official legal determination, such as a court order, so that we can take appropriate action in line with our policies.

Kind regards,

Hariharan



See our reviews



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

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

From: Soul Legion [Brodies@REDACTED.email]
Sent: 15/02/2026 13:00
To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com
Subject: Re: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]

To Hariharan and the other criminals running Trustpilot,

Consumer/Hooded_saw has not ever been a customer. They are an unverified "friend" of an elderly subscriber who never opened his own ticket, never paid for anything, never used the service through any channel I can verify, and whose "experience" is limited to harassing me in DMs after the real account holder ignored an open ticket.

You have the full ticket history and DM logs showing that. You have been on notice since it was initially posted, you are stating you will continue publishing material you already know is proven untrue. That is unlawful.

This is an ongoing mess around the "Consumer / Hooded_saw" review, which was heavily edited after disability-based insult, it now says:

"Rude, unwilling to help, If you're hoping for helpful support or basic respect, Legion Killfeed isn't the place to find it..." and then adds a long "P.S." claiming to be a paying customer and accusing me of refusing to help, calling them names, etc.

You know from the material already in your possession that:

- The only paying subscriber in this scenario is a server owner using the Discord account @lihou2451, described by his unverified "friend" as a 70-year-old British combat veteran.

- The only support ticket was opened for that account. That subscriber repeatedly refused to answer basic questions in his own ticket and chose instead to complain in public channels.
- “Hooded_saw” is a self-described admin which means they are not confirmed to have any connection to their “friend”. This Hooded_Saw, who never paid for his own subscription, never opened his own ticket, and never had his access confirmed by the actual subscriber. His only contact with me was through private DMs that breached my support rules.
- Never did he pay for a subscription in his own name.
- Not once did Hooded_Saw enter my support queue as a customer.
- He has no interaction with the service through any verifiable channel.

His “experience” is limited to trying to bypass the support system in DMs, being told to use the ticket like everyone else, and then attacking my business when I enforced that rule. On top of that, the original version of his review included the disability-based insult “Soul needs professional help”.

You cannot honestly describe that as a genuine review from a verifiable customer. It is a hostile narrative from an unverified third party whose goal is to damage my reputation, not resolve any issue.

Running a private DayZ server with an external Discord killfeed bot is not something a random person does by accident.

It requires a minimum technical baseline:

- renting and configuring a Nitrado DayZ server,
- linking it to my bot,
- joining my support Discord,
- authenticating and following written setup instructions,
- and understanding basic interface elements like channel names and clickable links.

It is not credible to suggest that a person can do all of that but somehow cannot click a clearly marked blue ticket link and type a sentence into their own support ticket.

That is why I have repeatedly raised concerns that the older subscriber may not be the one actually controlling these interactions and that his identity is being used as cover by his “admin” friend. When your platform then accepts aggressive reviews from that friend and from a known competitor, it is helping to weaponise a 70-year-old’s account details against me.

Regarding Trustpilot’s continued failure to remove – and prevent the republication of – a defamatory review targeting me and my business on your platform. Despite multiple takedown requests and substantial documentation provided to you over the past 18 months, the same false and malicious review has remained accessible or reappeared on Trustpilot. This letter serves as a final notice under Australian defamation law and your final opportunity to act in good faith before I initiate formal legal proceedings in the Supreme Court of New South Wales.

Trustpilot’s Failure to Remove Defamatory Content

On numerous occasions, I notified Trustpilot of a blatantly defamatory review about me (Anthony Brodie, owner of Legion Killfeed). The content of this review – and others in a targeted “review bombing” – includes egregious lies and extreme accusations clearly intended to destroy my reputation. For example, the reviews leveled false allegations that I am a “scammer” who “takes your money and deletes your server” and even more despicable smears

implying pedophilia and criminal misconduct, none of which have any basis in fact. These statements are unambiguously defamatory, identifying me and my business by name and imputing the most heinous conduct.

Despite being put on notice repeatedly, Trustpilot failed to remove this harmful content in a timely manner. In fact, your own fraud detection team initially flagged at least one of these reviews (posted under the alias “Z Doneskies”) as “Not based on a genuine experience” and indicated it “will be taken offline” if the reviewer failed to provide proof within 3 days. Another review (“Robert McDonovan”) was, according to your correspondence, filtered and supposedly “online for 3 working days only”. Yet, in reality these reviews remained visible far longer – and even resurfaced after supposed removal. One of the defamatory reviews was inexplicably re-published months after it had been removed/archived, without any notice to me. I only discovered this republication by chance and was forced to flag the same malign content yet again for removal. This pattern – remove or mask, then quietly reinstate the defamatory material – is unacceptable and evidences a bad-faith moderation practice on Trustpilot’s part. Trustpilot’s handling of my complaints has been nothing short of egregious. I have sent hundreds of notices and follow-ups (by one count, 382 emails between July 2024 and September 2025) to ensure Trustpilot was aware of the defamatory content. These efforts included formal “Report Review” submissions through your platform and direct concerns notices via email (addressed to your legal and content integrity addresses). Rather than prompt and decisive removal, Trustpilot ignored or inadequately responded to these notices. Most disturbingly, Trustpilot repeatedly reinstated reviews that had been removed after complaints. This suggests an intentional decision to re-publish defamatory material after notice, which can only be viewed as bad faith (if not retaliatory) conduct on your part. Each time Trustpilot left the review up or restored it after being alerted, you effectively republished the defamation – compounding the damage to me.

It is clear that Trustpilot’s internal processes have utterly failed in this case. The moderation has been inconsistent and non-compliant: on the one hand flagging the review as fake or harmful, but on the other hand quietly allowing it to remain or return online. Such “review tampering” – removing content under legal pressure only to reinsert it later – has no innocent explanation. It starkly violates any notion of good faith in content moderation and disregards the trust users and businesses place in your platform’s integrity.

Ongoing Bad-Faith Moderation & Harm Caused

Trustpilot’s systematic refusal to permanently remove the defaming review and its active republication of that content have caused me severe and ongoing harm. Your platform’s own records, as well as my detailed evidence log, document the following:

Systematic Ignoring of Notices: Trustpilot received extensive notice of the defamatory content (including the 382 emails mentioned above), yet largely ignored these or provided only perfunctory responses. This demonstrates a willful blindness to known defamation.

Deliberate Republishing of Removed Content: Trustpilot deliberately reinstated content that had been removed for defamation, sometimes immediately after legal complaints. Such actions appear intentional and even “indicative of retaliatory intent”, as if to punish or deter me for pursuing the issue. No legitimate content integrity rationale exists for reinstating a review you know to be false and injurious.

Inconsistent and Contradictory Actions: Your team has provided contradictory messages – for example, acknowledging a review was fake and “taken offline,” yet later claiming the matter “closed” while the same review quietly reappeared. This erratic moderation suggests that

Trustpilot's left hand does not know what the right is doing, or worse, that Trustpilot chose to prioritize the harasser's content over the victim's rights. Either scenario reflects bad faith. Facilitation of a Harassment Campaign: By failing to promptly remove the false reviews (and by resurrecting them after removal), Trustpilot became a central platform amplifying a coordinated harassment campaign against me. Indeed, these defamatory reviews on Trustpilot have been used to legitimize and spread the false allegations onto other platforms (Facebook, Reddit, Discord, etc.), emboldening a mob of harassers. Trustpilot's inaction thus facilitated broader abuse across the internet.

The reputational and financial harm resulting from Trustpilot's conduct is substantial. The false allegations (such as vile insinuations of pedophilia, fraud, and other crimes) have gravely damaged my standing in the community and industry. I have been ostracized and defamed in the eyes of clients and peers. The harassment stemming from these reviews even impacted my mental well-being and sense of personal safety. From a business perspective, the campaign (sustained in part by Trustpilot's platform) led to a collapse of nearly half my subscriber base and over 50% contraction in revenue for Legion Killfeed. In real terms, we lost 81 of 170 servers ($\approx 47.6\%$) and 44 of 129 subscribers (34.1%) from our peak metrics. This dramatic customer exodus and revenue loss directly correlates with the timeline of the defamatory postings and their continued visibility. It is not mere coincidence – the false reviews urged others to “stay away” and even encouraged fraudulent chargebacks, which many users apparently heeded, devastating our growth. The goodwill of my business has been severely eroded by the stain of these defamations.

Furthermore, Trustpilot's compliance failures have aggravated the harm. Under your own Terms and content policies, fake or defamatory reviews should be removed. In this case, you identified the reviews as likely fake and injurious, yet failed to enforce your policies consistently. The protracted presence of the defamatory content (in total, the worst review was visible for weeks across multiple separate periods despite “removals”) has materially increased the damage. Every additional day of publication post-notice is a new harm – and here we are dealing with content that lingered or returned again and again over many months. This lack of effective, final removal and the republication after notice will be viewed by the court as highly aggravating conduct, likely warranting aggravated damages.

In summary, Trustpilot's bad-faith moderation has directly caused or exacerbated serious harm to my reputation, business, and well-being. I have meticulously documented every instance of this harm, and the record is as unprecedented as it is damning to Trustpilot.

Trustpilot's Liability under Australian Defamation Law

Trustpilot's obligations here are governed by Australian law, as the defamatory publications were accessible in New South Wales and caused harm here. I remind you of the legal framework and your clear liability:

Defamation Elements: The reviews on Trustpilot contained false and defamatory imputations that clearly identify me (by name, business, or context) and were published to third parties. There is no question these elements are met – accusing someone of heinous crimes and dishonesty is defamatory per se. Under Australian common law (and the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)), Trustpilot by hosting and actively disseminating this content to Australian users is considered a primary publisher of the defamation. Your role is not a passive one; you curate and present user reviews on your site, profiting from their visibility.

Publisher Liability After Notice: Once Trustpilot became aware of the defamatory nature of the content (which indisputably occurred long ago through my complaints), you had a legal duty to remove it expeditiously. The High Court's decision in *Fairfax Media Publications Pty Ltd v*

Voller [2021] HCA 27 confirmed that the operator of an online platform is liable as a publisher from the point they have notice of defamatory material. Trustpilot was put on notice repeatedly and emphatically, yet failed to act or even worse, acted in a way that maintained the publication. In line with Voller, Trustpilot became fully liable for each continued publication and each republication of the reviews after notice. As your own correspondence aptly noted, “any response that maintains publication after notice constitutes republication” of the defamatory material. Trustpilot has engaged in exactly that unlawful republication by leaving the review online and reinstating it after removal. In short, any potential “platform immunity” evaporated once you were notified and then chose not to remove the content.

No Safe Harbour or Defence Available: Trustpilot cannot escape liability through any “safe harbour” provisions or defenses under Australian law. The traditional innocent dissemination defence (Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) s 32) is not available here – it is lost once the publisher has actual knowledge of the defamation and the ability to remove it. You had both knowledge and the technical capacity to delete these reviews, yet you did not do so in a timely or final manner. Likewise, the newly enacted digital intermediaries defence (s 32A / 31A NSW, post-2021 amendments), if it applied to review platforms at all, requires effective compliance with a notice-takedown procedure, which Trustpilot manifestly failed to follow. Trustpilot also did not provide a properly functioning complaints system or a timely “reasonable” response as contemplated by law – instead, you ignored notices or inexplicably reinstated content. In sum, no statutory or common law defence shields Trustpilot in this scenario. You are squarely liable as a publisher of the ongoing defamation.

Serious Harm Threshold: The Defamation Act’s “serious harm” threshold (s 10A) is clearly satisfied in this matter. I have detailed evidence of serious financial harm (the loss of clients, subscribers, and revenue mentioned above) and serious personal harm (extreme humiliation, distress, and even health impacts due to the sustained attacks). Under s 10A, a defamatory publication must have caused or be likely to cause serious harm to the plaintiff’s reputation. Here, the harm to my reputation and business has been catastrophic, far exceeding the minimum threshold. In fact, this case is a textbook example of “serious harm” – the false accusations (e.g. branding me a pedophile or fraud) are so heinous and widely propagated that they inherently and demonstrably caused grave damage.

Concerns Notices and Time to Respond: Australian law (Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), Part 3, as amended) requires that a potential defendant be given a Concerns Notice and 28 days to make amends before court proceedings. I have fully complied with this requirement. All communications to Trustpilot to date – including correspondence on 6 August 2025 and thereafter – have constituted formal concerns notices under the Defamation Act. You have been given multiple opportunities and far more than 28 days to remedy this defamation. For example, a detailed concerns notice was served on 6 August 2025, outlining the defamatory material and required actions, yet you did not adequately resolve the issue. Even after that notice period elapsed, I refrained from immediate litigation and instead persisted in trying to resolve this matter cooperatively – only to be met with continued non-compliance. It has now been well over five months since that concerns notice, and the offending review was still being republished as recently as late 2025, demonstrating a blatant disregard for your legal obligations. In short, the statutory pre-litigation requirements have been met and exceeded on my side; Trustpilot has no further grace period to expect.

Given the above, there is overwhelming evidence of Trustpilot’s liability for defamation under NSW law. You were expressly aware of the defamatory content and did not remove it; by contrast, you republished it after notice, which will be viewed as an aggravated instance of

defamation. The courts have little tolerance for publishers who, like Trustpilot here, knowingly permit defamatory material to remain online. Notably, in *Barilaro v Google LLC* [2022] FCA 650, Google was ordered to pay \$715,000 in damages for failing to remove defamatory YouTube videos after notice. Trustpilot's conduct is equally, if not more, culpable – and you should expect similar if not more severe legal and financial consequences.

Unique Severity and Multi-Platform Dimensions of this Case

I also wish to put Trustpilot on notice that this matter is part of a broader, uniquely documented defamation and harassment case that extends beyond just your platform. At least three other online platforms (including Reddit, Facebook, and Discord) have been implicated in the ongoing publication of the same or related defamatory allegations, often in a coordinated manner. The false review on Trustpilot was not an isolated incident; it formed one node in a wider conspiracy to smear my name across the internet. For instance, the exact same false accusations (pedophilia, fraud, sabotage, etc.) have been propagated on Reddit threads, Facebook posts, and Discord chats. In some cases, actors on one platform used content from another to lend credibility to their libel (e.g. Trustpilot reviews were linked in Facebook discussions to “prove” the lies, and vice versa).

This cross-platform defamation campaign is unprecedented in its scope and duration. To illustrate: the Reddit thread alone attacking me remained live for 706 days and climbed into Google's top search results. The Trustpilot reviews likewise spanned many months with your platform's complicity. In total, I am dealing with a defamation scenario involving four major platforms simultaneously (Trustpilot, Reddit, Facebook, Discord), plus even Google's AI summary tool inadvertently amplifying the false content. The severity of the allegations (accusing someone of being a pedophile, among other things) and the extent of publication (multiple outlets over a long period) make this case stand out even compared to the most notorious defamation cases in Australia.

By way of comparison, consider that in *Wagner v Harbour Radio* [2018] QSC 201, a case involving a sustained defamatory campaign via radio and related media, the court awarded a total of \$3.7 million to the plaintiffs. In *Rolph v Smurthwaite* [2023] FCA 1556, involving false pedophilia accusations on the internet, damages of \$400,000 were awarded. The defamation against me is no less severe – indeed, calling someone a pedophile is universally recognized as one of the most gravely defamatory imputations. What makes my case even more extraordinary is the multi-platform, deliberate nature of the publication. In many respects, this situation is worse than *Wagner*: it involves more platforms (multiple websites and social media channels vs. one radio network), a longer timeframe (nearly two years of harm), and more egregious accusations (pedophilia and criminal fraud vs. the political corruption in *Wagner*). The volume and severity of evidence I have compiled is likely to make this case a landmark precedent once it enters the courts.

Trustpilot's role in this cannot be downplayed. Of all the platforms involved, Trustpilot had perhaps the clearest notice and simplest path to mitigation – I flagged the content through your own systems and provided you direct legal notice early on. Trustpilot also had full ability to instantly remove or at least permanently suppress the defamatory reviews. Yet, out of the major platforms, Trustpilot inexplicably stood out by actually republishing content after notice, something even others did not do. (For example, Reddit at least did not bring a deleted post back online; they refused removal but were consistent in their refusal – whereas Trustpilot removed then reinstated, which is worse.) This will be highlighted as evidence of bad faith and willful neglect on Trustpilot's part, contributing to a significant portion of the aggravated damages I will seek. It is telling that even TikTok, a platform not even directly

targeted in my concerns notices, on its own reviewed and took action to curb the spread of this defamation, while Trustpilot obstinately refused to do so. Trustpilot's inaction (and action in restoring the content) effectively gave a green light to the harassers that your site was a safe haven for their smear campaign.

I have been meticulous in documenting every facet of this ordeal. My evidence archive contains 1,953 dated entries (screenshots, emails, logs) that are indexed and cross-referenced to substantiate each allegation I make here. I have preserved proof of what was posted when, how Trustpilot responded (or failed to respond), and the resulting impacts. Multiple concerns notices have been served not just to Trustpilot but also to the other platforms (Meta/Facebook and Reddit), and I have involved regulatory bodies where applicable (such as Australia's eSafety Commissioner and the ACCC for consumer-law aspects). In short, I am fully prepared for litigation: a draft Statement of Claim is ready, and the case against Trustpilot (along with others) is comprehensive and well-supported by evidence. Once this moves to court, Trustpilot's mishandling of this matter will be exposed in open court in all its detail. The outcome is poised to become a cautionary tale for online platforms, given the extreme facts.

Summary of Damages and Demands

You should be under no illusion about the magnitude of liability and exposure Trustpilot faces in this matter. The damages arising from your platform's publication of the defamatory material (and the subsequent republication and prolonged availability) are extensive. By failing to act in a timely, good-faith manner, Trustpilot has allowed the harm to compound over a lengthy period. I summarize the key categories of harm and damage below, all of which will be claimed in the event of litigation:

Reputational Harm: The false allegations (e.g. branding me a pedophile, scammer, thief of code, drug addict, etc.) have gravely damaged my personal and professional reputation. I am a software developer and service provider; trust and credibility are paramount. These lies on Trustpilot's public forum have led business partners, customers, and community members to doubt my integrity and even suspect me of heinous crimes, causing irreparable stigma. My name and my product (Legion Killfeed) have been dragged through the mud in search results and public forums. This loss of reputation is incalculable and ongoing – every prospective customer who Googles me or my service finds these defamatory claims, despite their falsity, thus deterring business and destroying goodwill.

Business and Economic Loss: The defamatory review(s) on Trustpilot and their ripple effects have directly caused a significant loss of business. As noted, my subscriber count and active user base plummeted after these allegations circulated. Many existing customers cut ties, and countless potential customers were scared off. I have evidence of specific instances where the Trustpilot reviews were cited by customers as reasons for cancellations or distrust. Additionally, the smear campaign encouraged coordinated harassment such as chargeback fraud (users were urged to file payment disputes en masse), leading to direct financial losses. I have quantified special damages (lost revenue, refunds, time spent on damage control) currently in excess of AUD \$150,000 on these fronts alone. The business disruption is ongoing, as the false stigma still hampers growth even after the content is (temporarily) removed.

Emotional Distress and Personal Suffering: It is important to note the human toll behind these numbers. Being the target of a malicious defamatory campaign – especially one involving accusations as vile as child predation – has caused me immense stress, humiliation, and anguish. I have endured public hatred and ridicule based on pure fabrications. The situation became so dire that it affected my mental health (including episodes of despair and suicidal

ideation, now documented). The harassment facilitated by your platform extended to personal attacks on social media and even doxxing of my home address on affiliated hate sites. The Defamation Act's cap on non-economic damages (currently around \$443,000–\$500,000 for non-economic loss) is intended to cover this kind of severe emotional and reputational harm – and I will be seeking damages at the high end of the cap given the devastating impact on my life.

Aggravated Damages (Bad Faith by Trustpilot): Trustpilot's conduct throughout this matter has been reprehensible and will warrant aggravated damages. Aggravated (exemplary) damages are awarded when a defendant's actions in or after the defamation show egregious wrongdoing or lack of remorse, further hurting the plaintiff. Here, every factor for aggravated damages is present. Trustpilot knowingly persisted in the wrongful conduct (repeatedly publishing content you knew was false). You responded to my legitimate complaints with either indifference or contradictory excuses, and took steps (reinstating content) that appear calculated to frustrate my attempts to protect my rights. This lack of good faith and the prolongation of the harm will significantly increase the damages payable. I note that Trustpilot's post-notice republication of the libel, and even contradicting your own "legal advice" in correspondence, is nearly unheard-of behavior for a platform – it exemplifies the kind of misconduct aggravated damages were designed to punish. I will absolutely be highlighting this for the court.

Non-Compliance and Consumer Law Breaches: (For completeness, I flag that Trustpilot's failure to remove fake reviews also raises issues under Australian Consumer Law – false or misleading representations by allowing defamatory fake reviews to mislead consumers about my service. While defamation is the primary claim, I reserve the right to pursue ACL claims as well, which can carry penalties.) Additionally, Trustpilot's operations in Australia, post the 2022 defamation law reforms, are subject to certain compliance standards for handling complaints. Your "automation-first" moderation and failure to provide reasoned decisions in response to my reports likely breach these standards. These compliance failures reinforce the narrative that Trustpilot cannot be trusted to self-regulate in this matter.

Taking all categories into account, I estimate the total damages in this matter to be at least in the seven figures. In fact, my current **consolidated damages assessment stands at approximately AUD \$1,271,820 (and growing). This figure includes general damages (for reputational harm and distress), aggravated damages (for your bad faith conduct), and special damages (for the specific financial losses). To put it plainly: Trustpilot's liability is already estimated around \$1.3 million – a number that continues to climb as the harm accrues. This exceeds a previous settlement offer I extended to you (which was in the order of \$1.0 million) – an offer you ignored or rejected. That opportunity has now passed, and any resolution will inevitably be more costly given the additional damage since then.

My demands at this stage are straightforward and non-negotiable:

Immediate, Permanent Removal – Trustpilot must permanently remove the defamatory review(s) in question and ensure they are not republished. This includes any form of the same review (or trivial variations of it) that might exist in your system (e.g. in archives, or if the malicious user attempts to edit and repost it). I expect written confirmation that the content has been fully removed and will not be allowed to reappear. No more three-day windows, no more temporary "masking" – permanent deletion is required.

Preventative Measures – Trustpilot must implement measures to prevent republication of the defamatory allegations. This likely means flagging the relevant user accounts and keywords so that any future attempt to post similar libel is automatically blocked. The fact that your system

allowed removed content to resurface indicates a serious flaw that needs addressing. I insist on an assurance of non-repetition, given the history here.

Accountability for Bad Actors – The user accounts involved in this harassment campaign (e.g. the “Z Doneskies”, “Robert McDonovan”, “WARZONE”, “Karl Messer” profiles, among others) should be investigated for violating your terms (e.g. leaving only defamatory reviews) and suspended or banned from your platform. Allowing known abuse-only accounts to persist is unacceptable.

Confirmation of Compliance in Writing – I require a written response from Trustpilot outlining exactly what actions have been taken to meet the above demands, and an official position on this matter. Simply removing the review (after all this time) without comment will not suffice; I need clarity that Trustpilot acknowledges the issue and has taken good-faith steps to resolve it and prevent recurrence.

Damages – Given that this issue has been protracted and the harm done is severe, I am within my rights to seek a monetary remedy from Trustpilot for the damage suffered. While my strong preference was to avoid litigation (and I gave you ample chance to resolve this amicably), your inaction has forced my hand. I note that under Australian law, an “offer to make amends” (which could include compensation) is a step you could have taken at any point after receiving my concerns notices, but you did not. At this late stage, my expectation is that any voluntary resolution from Trustpilot would include a substantial damages payment to compensate for the harm inflicted. If you wish to propose such a resolution, you must do so immediately. Otherwise, this matter will be decided in court, where I will be claiming the full measure of damages (as outlined above, potentially around or above \$1.3M, subject to final calculation).

I have been extraordinarily patient and have given your platform every benefit of the doubt up to now. That patience is exhausted. Your continued failure to act in accordance with the law, and the bad faith pattern of removing and then republishing defamatory content, leaves me no choice but to proceed to formal legal action. I intend to initiate legal proceedings against Trustpilot and the other platforms involved without further notice. Such proceedings will be filed in the Supreme Court of New South Wales (Sydney), and I will be seeking all available remedies: injunctive relief (to permanently bar further publication of the defamation), general damages, aggravated damages, and costs on an indemnity basis. Given the extensive documentation of your conduct, I am confident in the strength of my case. Once in litigation, I will also pursue through discovery any internal records at Trustpilot relevant to the moderation (or lack thereof) of these reviews, which likely will further support my claims of knowing negligence or intent.

Be advised that in any court action, Trustpilot’s mishandling of this situation will become part of the public record. Your emails, actions, and omissions will be scrutinized in open court. The pattern of “masking” reviews after complaints only to reinstate them quietly later, the inconsistency between what you told me and what actually happened, the sheer volume of unanswered complaints – all of this will be laid bare. It will be abundantly clear that Trustpilot has engaged in (or allowed) republication of known defamation, which is likely to draw not only judicial condemnation but also media and industry attention, potentially damaging Trustpilot’s own reputation as a platform. In short, if I am forced to sue, this case will almost certainly become a high-profile precedent in Australian defamation law, highlighting Trustpilot’s failures.

Take this letter as the final concerned notice and warning. I have been more than reasonable and have complied with all legal prerequisites. The matter now clearly meets the threshold for

litigation, and I am prepared to proceed. Remove all of the identified false reviews that still affect my account, like for example, the Havasu review which is the only reference to AI in reviews on my profile and has subsequently caused the false "Artificial Intelligence" tag you display prominently on my profile despite it being "filtered" and most importantly, immediately remove the Consumer/Hooded_Saw lies I have argued with you about for over 60 days, I have included it's last correspondance below. Finally, start discussing settlement offers because there is no way in hell I am simply walking away from the shit your platform has illegally assisted in putting me through. This is the very last opportunity for Trustpilot to resolve the issue privately and to finally demonstrate some good faith after a long saga of bad-faith moderation. Failing that, we will see you in court.

Yours faithfully,

Anthony Brodie

Owner, Legion Killfeed (NSW, Australia)

(Defamed Trustpilot User and Business Owner)

My evidence archive is publicly available at <https://they-wish-i.died.space> and a zip of it is downloadable at <https://they-wish-i.died.space/zip> using the password: Pl4tformK3y

These are the exact images that disprove the false allegations by "Hooded_Saw":

- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-11-29-lihou2451-ticket.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-11-29-lihou2451-public.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-11-29-lihou2451-hooded.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-11-29-lihou2451.pdf>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-05-not-a-customer-hooded-saw-consumer.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-05-hooded-saw-consumer-not-a-customer.png>

Here are links to images that display your fraud in regards to this review:

- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-06-hooded-reinstatements.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-06-hooded-lies.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-06-hooded-invited.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-05-consumer-account-visible-trustpilot.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-06-trustpilot-fraud-hooded-false-hidden-again.png>
- <https://they-wish-i.died.space/harrassment/2025-12-06-hooded-saw-both-reviews.png>

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

Sent: Friday, 13 February 2026 7:53 PM

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 understand that you have already attempted to flag the review and appreciate you bringing this to our attention. We can proceed with flagging the review on your behalf; however, to do so, we kindly request you to provide the following details:

1.The **exact statements within the review** that you believe are problematic or in breach of our guidelines.

Once we receive these details, we will be able to move forward with the review flagging and assess the content on a case-by-case basis in accordance with our policies.

Please let us know if you require any clarification on the available flagging reasons.

Kind regards,

Hariharan



See our reviews



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

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

From: Trustpilot Legal [legal@trustpilot.com]

Sent: 09/02/2026 08:59

To: trust.operations@trustpilot.com

Subject: New comment - [#INC-174706] Re: Update on your request #01086918 [thread::csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]

Hi,

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

Comment added by : TrustSafety

Comment Content :

Hello,

Thank you for getting back to us.

We understand that you have already attempted to flag the review and appreciate you bringing this to our attention. We can proceed with flagging the review on your behalf; however, to do so, we kindly request you to provide the following details:

1.The **exact statements within the review** that you believe are problematic or in breach of our guidelines.

Once we receive these details, we will be able to move forward with the review flagging and assess the content on a case-by-case basis in accordance with our policies.

Please let us know if you require any clarification on the available flagging reasons.

Kind regards,

Hariharan



See our reviews



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

To view the status of the ticket or add comments, please visit

<https://service.trustpilotcorp.com/public/tickets/752f7c427660f3796fb42f7560d1e399187e2bc317f590b5871141aa93ea9a8>

Sincerely,
Trustpilot Support Team

Email Headers (Raw)

Received	from SE2P216MB3236.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:101:2fa::23) by PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM with HTTPS; Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:15 +0000
Received	from PH8PR20CA0012.namprd20.prod.outlook.com (2603:10b6:510:23c::10) by SE2P216MB3236.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM (2603:1096:101:2fa::23) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_2, cipher=TLS_ECDHE_RSA_WITH_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9632.15; Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:13 +0000
Received	from SN1PEPF000252A2.namprd05.prod.outlook.com (2603:10b6:510:23c:cafe::92) by PH8PR20CA0012.outlook.office365.com (2603:10b6:510:23c::10) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9632.14 via Frontend Transport; Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:13 +0000
Authentication-Results	spf=pass (sender IP is 16.170.38.184) smtp.mailfrom=91r9akkwxlchg1.2-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 91r9akkwxlchg1.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com designates 16.170.38.184 as permitted sender) receiver=protection.outlook.com; client-ip=16.170.38.184; helo=smtp-03a62344408d461e8.core1.sfdc-cehfh.s.mta.salesforce.com; pr=E
Received	from smtp-03a62344408d461e8.core1.sfdc-cehfh.s.mta.salesforce.com (16.170.38.184) by SN1PEPF000252A2.mail.protection.outlook.com (10.167.242.9) with Microsoft SMTP Server (version=TLS1_3, cipher=TLS_AES_256_GCM_SHA384) id 15.20.9632.12 via Frontend Transport; Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:12 +0000
X-IncomingTopHeaderMarker	OriginalChecksum:AE9A14DA091B8E38EF9739D60EC539FA8C981A2EF74712971207EF8CD063112C;UpperCasedChecksum:F0B6C5E8B6D4F796F44B8B3F2A062EACAB17A6050419546CEFE0C65B9A4CC060;SizeAsReceived:2439;Count:24
Return-Path	donotreply=trustpilot.com__0-7vsrlfzma33lv@91r9akkwxlchg1.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com
DKIM-Signature	v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/simple; d=trustpilot.com; s=salesforce2; t=1771490531; bh=K eTrhHbDPn+4oy+0fil/hy2RqGfW6MBRjOPpGXWw0LA=; h=Date:From:To:Subject:MIME-Version:Content-Type; b=L7KE+F+fd1Ug7jgbvPf71LRw7osavnWEEQWrtoNy+MkPVT7HCwxQ/NmHlkNzfGRE ACsfQEYIDpTk fSwQJbHmMhRS5ux8R/fE3WNnpXjVs2Whcddt4sl2W1EE9UC81qBFHV +9lGtUuqJqFgEGYL7uyU9mx4vtZbGhPLzVnhb+Y8=
Received	from [127.0.0.1] ([127.0.0.1:46124] helo=eaas-29.eaas.emailinfra.svc.cluster.local) by mx1.core1.sfdc-cehfh.s.mta.salesforce.com (envelope-from <donotreply=trustpilot.com__0-7vsrlfzma33lv@91r9akkwxlchg1.2-bu0peaw.swe54.bnc.salesforce.com>) (ecelerity 4.7.0.20111 r(msys-ecelerity:tags/4.7.0-ga^0)) with ESMTP id 2A/6E-00678-3ECC6996; Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:11 +0000
Received	from 127.0.0.1 (localhost. [127.0.0.1]) by eaas-29 (EaaS) id <1I12400000000000000000000000000000TAP6UA00VNALpD0ISb-6apBa4A6EWA@sfdc.net> for <"Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>> Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:11 GMT (GMT)
Date	Thu, 19 Feb 2026 08:42:11 +0000
From	Do not reply <donotreply@trustpilot.com>
To	"Brodies@REDACTED.email" <Brodies@REDACTED.email>
Message-ID	<1I124000TAP6UA00VNALpD0ISb-6apBa4A6EWA@sfdc.net>
In-Reply-To	<PU4P216MB1568A1F675EEBFC872AEF177DA6FA@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
References	<PU4P216MB156892946D2E78418604C455DA98A@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM> & t:698993f626cf_5c27048842a1@email-sidekiq-euc-bg-blue-778c56d99-pkp4x.mail> <J_1Mp00TAE3CN00CBBjiBZBREmOC2tbpzBNkg@sfdc.net> <PU4P216MB1568A1F675EEBFC872AEF177DA6FA@PU4P216MB1568.KORP216.PROD.OUTLOOK.COM>
Subject	Update on your request #01086918 [thread:csySteCXfB2JxnGiR-0Ej2A::]
Content-Type	multipart/alternative; boundary="-----_Part_680_1235329655.1771490531480"
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	0002ujnssp4yrurd
X-SFDC-Binding	1WrlRBV94myi25uB
X-SFDC-App	coreapp
X-SFDC-EmailCategory	quickActionEmail
X-SFDC-EntityId	500Sh00000boOq1
X-SFDC-Interface	internal
X-IncomingHeaderCount	24
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-ExpirationStartTime	19 Feb 2026 08:42:13.1395 (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	ef43c545-b2c0-41ff-6b8e-08de6f92c737
X-EOPAttributedMessage	0

X-EOPTenantAttributedMessage	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa:0
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-MessageDirectionality	Incoming
X-MS-PublicTrafficType	Email
X-MS-TrafficTypeDiagnostic	SN1PEPF000252A2:EE_]SE2P216MB3236:EE_]PU4P216MB1568:EE_
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthSource	SN1PEPF000252A2.namprd05.prod.outlook.com
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-AuthAs	Anonymous
X-MS-UserLastLogonTime	2/19/2026 8:08:24 AM
X-MS-Office365-Filtering-Correlation-Id	ef43c545-b2c0-41ff-6b8e-08de6f92c737
X-MS-Exchange-EOPDirect	true
X-Sender-IP	16.170.38.184
X-SID-PRA	DONOTREPLY@TRUSTPILOT.COM
X-SID-Result	PASS
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL	1
X-Microsoft-Antispam	BCL:0;ARA:1444111002 9800799015 35120799006 36140799009 9000799056 9400799043 32080799006 10300799038 58200799021 47200799024 1680799066 461199028 28070799003 4302099013 3412199025 440099028 1122599022 30041999003 26104999006 22062799003 1380799030 1370799030 1360799030 56899033 1602099012;
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-OriginalArrivalTime	19 Feb 2026 08:42:12.5862 (UTC)
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Network-Message-Id	ef43c545-b2c0-41ff-6b8e-08de6f92c737
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-Id	84df9e7f-e9f6-40af-b435-aaaaaaaaaaaa
X-MS-Exchange-CrossTenant-AuthSource	SN1PEPF000252A2.namprd05.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	SE2P216MB3236
X-MS-Exchange-Transport-EndToEndLatency	00:00:02.4842442
X-MS-Exchange-Processed-By-BccFoldering	15.20.9632.007
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Mailbox-Delivery	wl:1;pcwl:1;ucf:1;jmr:0;ex:0;auth:1;dest:C;OFR:CustomRules;ENG:(5062000311)(920221119095)(90000117)(920221120095)(90011020)(91015020)(91040095)(90500020)(9060121)(9081003)(9100341)(1010050)(944500132)(4810010)(4910033)(9920006)(9510006)(10105021)(9439006)(9310011)(9220031)(120001);
X-Message-Delivery	Vj0xLjE7dXM9MDtsPTA7YT0wOQ09MTtHRD0xO1NDTD0tMQ==
X-Microsoft-Antispam-Message-Info	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

MIME-Version	1.0
--------------	-----