

[9-5176000040649] Your Request to Google

Legion Killfeed <legion.killfeed@gmail.com>
To: removals@google.com

Thu, Apr 30, 2026 at 9:18 AM

Not good enough. This criminal behaviour has been repeatedly reported to your criminal organisation that continues to commit a crime while hiding behind your terms of service that do not override your legal fucking obligations...

If Google refuses to remove or restrict the URLs, I request a written human-reviewed decision that answers the following:

1. Was this request reviewed by a human?
2. What jurisdiction was applied?
3. What legal basis did Google assess?
4. Why does Google consider the listed material lawful to continue surfacing after repeated notice?
5. Why does Google consider false allegations of pedophilia, hacking, fraud, data theft, malicious code and server destruction to be ordinary criticism?
6. Why does Google continue to surface this material when Reddit and Meta reporting pathways have failed?
7. How did Google account for the affected site already disavowing these domains and URLs?
8. What records will Google preserve regarding this request and prior related notices?
9. Has Google been paid by Joel Lenny Walker from Make DayZ Great Again Killfeed - mdzga.com or Mathew Trojanowski from DayZ Skynet - killfeed.com?

This is repeat formal notice. Google has been told the specific URLs, the defamatory imputations, the personal and commercial targeting, the competitor-linked context, the failed platform reporting pathways, the Google disavow action already taken, and the fact that an Australian adult and sole trader is being directly harmed. The affected person's legal identity and contact details are provided only in the required claimant/contact fields of this legal removal request. They are intentionally not repeated in this public-facing explanation because legal removal requests may be republished or indexed by third-party transparency databases.

LEGAL REFERENCES RELIED ON:

AUSTRALIA

- Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), including serious harm under s 10A and digital intermediary/access-prevention issues under s 31A.
- Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), including cyber-abuse material targeted at an Australian adult and removal-notice framework.

UNITED STATES

- State defamation law, generally requiring a false statement of fact, publication to another person, fault, and reputational harm, subject to First Amendment limits.
- 18 U.S.C. § 2261A, cyberstalking/stalking, where online services are used as part of a course of conduct intended to harass, intimidate, or cause substantial emotional distress.
- 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a), Lanham Act false advertising / false or misleading descriptions of fact in commercial advertising or promotion.
- 47 U.S.C. § 230 may affect platform liability for third-party content in the United States, but it does not make the original publisher's statements lawful and does not prevent Google from voluntarily removing or restricting search results under legal/policy processes.

UNITED KINGDOM

- Defamation Act 2013, including s 1 serious harm, s 2 truth, s 3 honest opinion, and s 13 power to order removal/cessation of distribution.
- Protection from Harassment Act 1997, including course-of-conduct harassment and civil/criminal remedies.
- Online Safety Act 2023, including false communications and threatening communications offences.
- Communications Act 2003 s 127 / Malicious Communications Act 1988 remain relevant for some communications depending on timing, jurisdiction, and the specific offence pathway.

CANADA

- Canadian civil defamation law, including the test stated by the Supreme Court of Canada in Grant v Torstar: defamatory meaning, reference to the plaintiff, and publication to at least one person other than the plaintiff.
- Criminal Code s 301, defamatory libel.
- Criminal Code s 264, criminal harassment.
- Criminal Code s 372, false information, indecent communications, and harassing communications.

Google's continued indexing and surfacing of the reported defamatory URLs is legally unreasonable because Google has been placed on notice that the material is false, abusive, competitor-linked, and harmful, yet continues to favour those URLs over credible primary-source evidence already published on the affected site.

The affected site does not merely deny the allegations. It directly points users and search engines to public credibility evidence, including official DayZ developer feedback threads where the affected sole trader reported real technical issues, provided testing data, and received direct developer engagement. The affected site also includes structured data pointing to those official developer-feedback records as evidence of legitimate technical work.

That means Google has access to credible, first-party and primary-source material showing real contribution, testing, and developer engagement, while the reported Reddit/Facebook/hostile-site content consists of unsupported defamatory allegations from anonymous, hostile, or competitor-linked sources with no comparable credibility. The affected site has also disavowed the hostile URLs and domains through Google's disavow process. This means the affected sole trader has expressly rejected those pages as abusive, spam-like, competitor-linked, and harmful search signals. Google has therefore been notified through both legal-removal channels and search-quality/disavow channels that the reported URLs should not be treated as legitimate authority, reputation, relevance, or public-interest signals for the affected site.

By continuing to index, rank, preview, or summarise the disavowed defamatory content over credible evidence published by the affected site and supported by official developer-feedback records, Google is effectively giving search preference to unverified slander over verifiable primary-source material. That is not neutral indexing after notice. It is continued post-notice amplification of defamatory and abusive content despite credible contrary evidence being available and clearly signposted.

Google should de-index or restrict the reported URLs, suppress snippets and AI-generated summaries repeating the allegations, and explain in writing if it refuses to act why it continues to favour disavowed slanderous content over credible evidence directly linked from the affected site.

On Thu, Apr 30, 2026 at 6:33 AM <removals@google.com> wrote:

Hello,

Thanks for reaching out to us.

We have received your request.

We receive many such requests each day; your message is in our queue, and we'll get to it as quickly as our workload permits. Due to the large volume of requests that we receive, we will only be able to provide you with a response if we determine your request may be a valid and actionable legal complaint, and we may respond with questions or requests for clarification. For more information on Google's Terms of Service, please visit <http://www.google.com/accounts/TOS>

Regards,

The Google Team