
Re: [7-1475000041317] Your Request to Google

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

Tue, Jun 2, 2026 at 1:01 AM

Hello Google Legal / Removals Team,

I am replying to your email dated 20 May 2026 regarding request [7-1475000041317].

You asked me to confirm that I have first attempted to use the relevant site removal procedures for the Facebook/Meta and Reddit URLs.

I have attached a bundled zip of all the files:

 supplying-to-google.zip

That evidence bundle contains records showing that I attempted to use Reddit and Meta/Facebook reporting, support, appeal, legal, moderation, and review pathways before asking Google to remove, deindex, or stop surfacing the material through Google Search and related Google-controlled surfaces.

The attached evidence includes Reddit-specific proof such as:

- 2025-10-01-reddit-emailed-staff.pdf
- 2025-10-04-reddit-dont-email-staff.pdf
- 2026-04-28-reddit-legal-direct.pdf
- 2026-04-28-reddit-is-absolutely-putrid.pdf
- 2026-05-05-reddit-blocked-me.png
- 2026-05-02-reddit-selective-moderation.png
- 2026-05-02-reddit-staff-biased-moderation-busted.png
- 2026-05-02-reddit-abusive-moderation.png
- 2026-02-13-reddit-mod-report.pdf
- 2026-04-22-reddit-moderator-path-report.pdf
- 2025-12-09-reddit-report.pdf
- 2025-12-26-reddit-domain-contact.pdf
- 2025-11-21-0124-soul-legion-re-your-request-sent-to-reddit-support.pdf
- 2025-11-21-1109-soul-legion-re-reddit-support-re-your-request-sent-to-reddit-support-aca-2024-0528878-cyr-0672200.pdf
- 2025-11-21-1143-soul-legion-re-copyright-report-form-1551590946047200.pdf
- 2025-10-01-reddit-official-cease-and-decist.pdf
- 2025-10-01-reddit-official-cease-and-decist-thread.pdf
- 2025-10-02-reddit-official-cease-and-decist-response.pdf
- 2025-10-04-reddit-affirm-legal-rights.pdf
- 2025-10-04-reddit-official-cease-and-decist-response.pdf

The attached evidence also includes Meta/Facebook-specific proof such as:

- 2025-08-05-proof-meta-contacted.pdf
- 2025-08-04-meta-facebook-complaint.pdf
- 2025-08-14-meta-facebook-formal-legal-notice.pdf
- 2025-09-30-facebook-appeal-oversight-board.pdf
- 2025-10-07-facebook-oversights-board.pdf
- 2025-10-07-oversights-board-meta.pdf
- 2025-11-05-meta-facebook-complaint.pdf
- 2025-11-09-meta-cease-and-decist-via-copyright.pdf
- 2025-11-21-1143-soul-legion-re-copyright-report-form-1551590946047200.pdf
- 2025-11-22-meta-facebook-complaint.pdf
- 2025-12-09-meta-report.pdf
- 2025-12-08-0149-facebook-data-subject-rights-for-third-party-information-used-for-ai-at-meta-824259110393656.pdf
- 2025-12-09-0109-facebook-data-subject-rights-for-third-party-information-used-for-ai-at-meta-824259110393656.pdf
- 2025-12-09-0121-anthony-brodie-re-data-subject-rights-for-third-party-information-used-for-ai-at-meta-824259110393656.pdf
- 2025-12-09-0125-anthony-brodie-re-data-subject-rights-for-third-party-information-used-for-ai-at-meta-824259110393656.pdf
- 2025-12-09-0312-anthony-brodie-re-data-subject-rights-for-third-party-information-used-for-ai-at-meta-824259110393656.pdf
- 2026-01-31-support-inbox-meta.pdf
- 2026-01-31-support-inbox-meta-account-two.pdf
- 2026-01-31-support-inbox-meta-account-three.pdf
- 2026-01-31-oversight-board-independent-judgment-adam-cooper-agent-of-joel-walker.pdf
- 2026-01-14-reported-joel-and-santos.png
- 2026-02-15-meta-reports-3-rejected-instantly.png

- 2026-02-15-www.facebook.com_support__item_id=3633657860107395.png
- 2026-02-16-the-post-google-ai-quotes-admin-formal-7-days-notice.png
- 2026-02-16-the-post-google-ai-quotes-admin-message-reply.png

This evidence directly answers Google's request for confirmation that I first attempted the site removal procedures at Facebook/Meta and Reddit.

The relevant URLs Google asked about were:

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/dayzeditors/posts/1385739236246930/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgretagain/posts/1468775737537580/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgretagain/posts/1481591939589293>
- https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue
- https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue/

I have not skipped the original platforms. I have repeatedly used their reporting and escalation systems.

The issue is that those reporting and escalation systems have failed to resolve the harm, while Google continues to make the material discoverable, searchable, previewable, excerptable, rankable, and capable of being surfaced through Google Search or related Google-controlled search surfaces.

Please treat this email and the attached evidence bundle as my confirmation and supporting proof that Reddit and Meta/Facebook were contacted first.

Regards,
Anthony Gordon Brodie
Owner, Legion Killfeed

On Wed, May 20, 2026 at 8:56 PM <removals@google.com> wrote:

Hello,

Thanks for reaching out to us.

Regarding the following URLs:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/711550526936017/posts/1678813530209707/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kjskiyb/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kteombn/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/ktpfv26/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kwcjm4s/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyv8inc/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kywtf93/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyxztrs/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyy8xq7/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/l5a15bj/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/l5xli3/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/lnt64ot/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/lnt7b2s/>

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/nreb800/>

A recent review of the situation showed that the specified web page is not currently displayed in our search results or has been removed. If you are still concerned about this issue, please send us the URL of the page in question, as it appears on the Google search results page.

Follow these steps to find the correct URL:

1. Type your query into the search box on Google.com and click **Google Search**.
2. Right-click the title of the site in question, and click **Copy link address**.
3. Paste the copied URL into your reply to this email.

Regarding the following URLs hosted on Facebook, Reddit:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/dayzeditors/posts/1385739236246930/>

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1468775737537580/>

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293>

https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue

https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue/

Please confirm that you have first attempted to use the site's removal procedure at <https://www.facebook.com/help/2214522878809427>, <https://support.reddithelp.com/hc/en-us/requests/new>. Removal of this content from Google's search results will not remove it from the web, and will not prevent users from viewing the content via other avenues, such as other search engines, social media, or web pages containing links to the content in question.

With regard to the following URLs:

<https://skynetvslegion.com/>

At this time, Google has decided not to take action.

We understand you are concerned about the content in question, but there is nothing that Google can do to remove content from third-party web pages. Google simply aggregates and organizes information published on the web; we don't control the content found in the pages you've specified.

In relation to our liability as a search engine, please also see s10D of the *Defamation Act 2005* (NSW) and *Google LLC v Deferos* (2022) 96 ALJR 766.

We encourage you to resolve any disputes directly with the owner of the website in question. Please visit <https://support.google.com/websearch/answer/9109> to learn how to contact a site's webmaster and request a change.

If you pursue action against a site that results in the removal of the material, our search results will reflect this change after we next crawl the site. If the webmaster makes these changes and you need us to expedite the removal of the cached copy, please submit your request using our [webpage refresh request tool](#). If you pursue legal action and the content is found to be illegal or ordered to be removed, you can also send us the court order seeking removal.

Regards,

The Google Team

Google LLC

For more information about our content removal process, see g.co/legal.

Fri, May 01, 2026 at 17:48 UTC

Report a legal removal issue

Country of residence

Australia

Full legal name

Anthony Gordon Brodie

Company name

Legion Killfeed

Name of the company or organization whose legal rights you represent

Legion Killfeed

Contact email address

legion.killfeed@gmail.com

Is this complaint about a matter covered by the AU Online Safety Act? If so, please specify the type below: Select one

Other

Allegedly infringing URLs

https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293>
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1468775737537580/>
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/dayzeditors/posts/1385739236246930/>
<https://skynetvslegion.com/>
https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue/

Attach a screenshot of the allegedly infringing material

2026-04-25-mathew-n-joel-defamatory-slander.pdf

Explain in detail why you believe the content on the above URL(s) is unlawful, citing specific provisions of law wherever possible. For requests other than defamation, Google shares the information in this open text field with Lumen for transparency purposes. Do not include any personal data in your explanation. For more information about Lumen, see here.

ITEMISED EXPLANATION OF REPORTED URLS

The affected person is an Australian adult and sole trader. The affected service is personally operated by that sole trader. These URLs should be assessed as a connected pattern of defamation, targeted cyber abuse, competitor-linked harassment, commercial sabotage and search manipulation, not as isolated criticism.

For each URL below, the legal issue is that the material either directly publishes false factual allegations, republishes and amplifies those allegations, encourages harassment, uses competitor-linked attack material to divert users, or forms part of the same coordinated campaign. The affected person's legal identity is provided only in the required claimant/contact fields and is intentionally not repeated here because legal removal requests may be republished by transparency databases.

1. <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Make DayZ Great Again Facebook post states that if users use the affected business, the affected sole trader will "reset loop" their server and "force" their players to leave their community. It further claims the affected sole trader "literally bragged" for months about forcing other communities to die.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It is a serious factual allegation that the affected sole trader deliberately sabotages servers and communities. It tells prospective users that using the affected service creates a risk that their server will be intentionally reset-looped and that their player base will be forced away. That is a direct attack on commercial trust, software safety, customer confidence and personal reputation. It alleges intentional technical sabotage and malicious interference with customer or community assets.

The competitor context is important because the post appears in the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment associated with Joel Lenny Walker and mdzga.com, a competing DayZ-related service environment. The statement is not merely saying "I dislike the service". It tells users that the affected sole trader intentionally destroys communities, which is a grave and commercially damaging allegation.

AUSTRALIA: This gives rise to defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), including serious harm under s 10A, because it identifies the affected person/service and conveys a serious false imputation that the person deliberately sabotages servers and communities. It also raises cyber-abuse issues under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because it is targeted at an Australian adult and is harassing, menacing or offensive in the broader competitor-linked campaign context.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel and commercial disparagement issues because it asserts false facts about intentional sabotage of servers and communities. If made or amplified in a competitor-linked environment, it may also support unfair competition arguments where false statements are used to damage or divert customers.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises issues under the Defamation Act 2013 because the statement is likely to cause serious harm to reputation and serious financial loss by alleging intentional technical sabotage. It may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed as part of a repeated course of conduct.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the statement tends to lower the affected person's reputation, refers to the affected person/service, and is published to others. It may also support injurious falsehood or trade libel arguments if false statements are used to damage the service commercially.2. <https://www.facebook.com/group/s/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1468775737537580/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Make DayZ Great Again Facebook post states: "Anyone pointing the finger at me over calling out pedos is a pedo" and then identifies "Soul from {business name}" as "a pedo". It directly labels the affected sole trader a pedophile.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is one of the most serious defamatory statements in the

reported material. A false accusation of pedophilia is not criticism, banter, opinion, or consumer commentary. It is a serious sexual/criminal allegation against an identifiable Australian adult and sole trader. It is calculated to destroy reputation, invite hatred, cause ostracism, and make customers afraid to deal with the affected person or service. The competitor context is again material. The post appears in the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment associated with Joel Lenny Walker and mdzga.com. In context, this is not a detached personal argument. It is part of a broader pattern where competitor-linked spaces and accounts publish extreme allegations against the affected sole trader and service, causing personal, commercial, safety and mental-health harm.

AUSTRALIA: This gives rise to defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), including serious harm under s 10A, because the material identifies the affected person/service and conveys a serious false criminal/sexual imputation. It also raises adult cyber-abuse issues under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material is targeted at an Australian adult and is menacing, harassing or offensive in context.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation issues because it publishes a factual accusation of serious sexual/criminal misconduct. It may also be relevant to cyberstalking/harassment concerns where the conduct forms part of a course of conduct intended to harass, intimidate or cause substantial emotional distress using online services. If used commercially to divert customers or damage a competing service, it may also support unfair competition or commercial disparagement arguments depending on the forum and facts.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises issues under the Defamation Act 2013 because the statement is likely to cause serious harm to reputation. It may also engage the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed as part of a repeated course of conduct causing alarm or distress, and the Online Safety Act 2023 false/threatening communications framework where false or threatening material is sent or published with intent to cause harm.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the statement tends to lower the affected person's reputation, refers to the affected person, and is published to others. It may also engage Criminal Code provisions concerning defamatory libel, false information conveyed with intent to injure or alarm, criminal harassment, or threatening conduct depending on the full surrounding evidence and intent.³ <https://www.facebook.com/group/s/dayzeditors/posts/1385739236246930/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Facebook URL is included as part of the wider Meta/Facebook pattern. The issue is not merely one support thread. It forms part of the same group environment where competitor promotion, hostile moderation behaviour, refusal to remove abuse, and related attacks against the affected person/service have occurred.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This URL is relevant because it shows the platform/group context in which the abuse, competitor promotion, and refusal to moderate harmful material occurred. It supports the argument that the campaign was not random criticism, but part of a repeated hostile environment involving the affected person's competitors and related communities. Where a thread permits or preserves competitor redirection while refusing to deal with abusive material, it becomes part of the broader commercial and harassment context.

AUSTRALIA: This supports the pattern evidence for defamation and adult cyber abuse under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth). Even if the post itself is less defamatory than the most serious Facebook URLs, it is relevant to malice, context, competitor-linked conduct, platform notice, and repeated harassment.

UNITED STATES: This may support evidence of unfair competition, malicious commercial disparagement, harassment context, and failure of platform reporting pathways. The strongest U.S. legal relevance is contextual: it helps show pattern, motive, bad faith, and competitor-linked amplification.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support a harassment-pattern argument under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 because repeated conduct is assessed cumulatively. It can also support defamation context if the thread contributes to serious harm or competitor-linked publication.

CANADA: This may support a civil defamation and harassment context analysis because Canadian defamation and harassment assessments can consider publication, surrounding context, repetition, and whether conduct forms part of a wider course of targeted abuse.⁴ <https://skynetvslegion.com/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This is a dedicated hostile comparison/attack website targeting the affected service by name. It presents itself as a comparison or information site while functioning as a competitor-linked attack page designed to intercept users searching for the affected service or related services and steer them away.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is legally significant because it is not a casual comment or isolated post. It is a dedicated domain built around the affected service's name and reputation. It appears designed to influence search results, mislead users, damage trust, and divert commercial traffic. If it contains or republishes false claims that the affected service is unsafe, malicious, fraudulent, inferior because of fabricated misconduct, or operated by an untrustworthy person, it creates both defamation and unfair competition issues.

AUSTRALIA: This raises defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) if the site identifies the affected person/service and conveys false defamatory imputations causing serious harm. It also supports misleading or deceptive conduct / unfair commercial context if the site is competitor-linked and presents itself as neutral while steering

users away through false claims.

UNITED STATES: This may raise Lanham Act false advertising / unfair competition issues where a competitor uses false or misleading descriptions of fact in commercial promotion to misrepresent another person's goods, services, or commercial activities. It may also raise defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues under applicable state law.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 issues if the page causes serious harm to reputation or serious financial loss. It may also raise malicious falsehood or passing-off/unfair competition style concerns depending on the wording, commercial presentation, and whether users are misled.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues where the publication identifies the affected person/service and tends to lower reputation. It may also raise injurious falsehood / trade libel concerns if false statements about the service are used to damage commercial interests.⁵ https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue/

WHAT THIS URL IS: This is the main Reddit thread. It targets the affected service and its operator. It frames the operator as abusive, paranoid, unsafe, and a "serious problem" in the relevant community. It warns users not to click links from that person and tells users to remove the service from their servers.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This thread operates as the central search-visible Reddit source for later defamatory comments. It is harmful because Google can surface the whole thread beside searches for the affected service, giving credibility and ranking power to the comments beneath it. The thread is not limited to a personal bad experience; it invites and preserves wider allegations of criminality, hacking, fraud, malicious code, customer sabotage and unsafe business conduct.

AUSTRALIA: The thread gives rise to defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it identifies the affected person/service and carries or republishes serious imputations likely to cause serious harm. It also supports an adult cyber-abuse complaint under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) when assessed with the full thread and related harassment context.

UNITED STATES: This raises defamation issues under applicable state law where false factual claims are made or republished. It may also support harassment/cyberstalking context where the thread forms part of a course of conduct intended to harass or intimidate through online services.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises serious-harm defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2013 if surfaced to UK users or published within UK jurisdiction. The repeated hostile thread context may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the thread identifies the affected person/service, is published to others, and tends to lower reputation. The repeated nature of the thread and comments may also support harassment or false-information concerns if assessed with the wider campaign.⁶ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kwcjm4s/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the affected service exists to collect and sell customer files, that the operator deleted server files, destroyed multiple servers where the operator had FTP access, and is known as a scammer in related communities.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct false factual accusation of theft, data misuse, destruction of customer property, unauthorised access/abuse, and fraud. It does not read as opinion. It presents serious allegations as facts and tells users this is "JUST who" the affected person is. The purpose and effect are to make users afraid to trust the service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it imputes criminal and dishonest conduct and is likely to cause serious harm. It also supports cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) because it is part of repeated targeted abuse against an Australian adult.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues because it asserts false facts about theft, file misuse, destruction, and fraud. Where made by or for a competitor, it may also support unfair competition arguments.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because allegations of theft, fraud, and destruction of customer data are grave factual imputations. It may also form part of harassment if repeated with other posts.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the words would lower reputation, refer to the affected person/service, and are published. It may also raise Criminal Code false-information or defamatory-libel concerns if the sender knew the allegations were false and intended to injure or alarm.⁷ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kywtf93/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims there have been "hundreds of complaints", that the service downloads custom files from customers, that the operator sells them for profit, and that the operator is a known

scammer.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a false factual accusation of customer data theft, commercial misuse of customer files, and fraud. It is not a review of service quality. It tells readers the service steals customer files and sells them, which is a serious allegation of criminal/dishonest conduct and directly damages user trust.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially because it alleges dishonest and potentially criminal business conduct. It also contributes to the targeted adult cyber-abuse pattern under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and commercial disparagement/trade libel issues. If competitor-linked, it may also support Lanham Act false advertising/unfair competition arguments where false claims about another service are used in a commercial context.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 issues because accusations of stealing and selling customer files are likely to cause serious harm and financial loss. It may also support harassment-pattern evidence.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation because it refers to the affected service/operator, is published, and would lower reputation. If knowingly false and intended to injure or alarm, it may also raise Criminal Code false-information concerns.⁸ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kteombn/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment contains personal abuse and claims the operator threatened to remove a customer's service access. It forms part of the overall hostile narrative that the operator mistreats customers and operates abusively.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: Standing alone, this is less serious than the hacking, pedophilia, theft, sabotage or fraud accusations. However, it remains relevant because it contributes to the thread's cumulative defamatory meaning: that the operator is abusive, threatening, unprofessional, and unsafe to deal with. In the wider thread, it supports the pile-on and helps keep the hostile search-visible thread active.

AUSTRALIA: This supports the serious-harm and cyber-abuse context under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), especially when assessed as part of the whole thread and repeated campaign.

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation or false-light style concerns depending on the exact facts and state law, and it is relevant as evidence of online harassment/pile-on conduct.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support harassment-pattern evidence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and may contribute to serious-harm defamation context under the Defamation Act 2013.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation context and repeated-harassment context where it forms part of a larger course of published abuse.⁹ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kjskiyb/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment calls the operator insane, paranoid, abusive, dishonest and commercially incompetent. It also promotes the idea that another service works without problems while the affected service does not.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This comment is legally relevant because it does more than insult. It reinforces a factual narrative that the affected person is mentally unstable, abusive, dishonest, and unfit to run the service. It also steers users toward competitors. In context, it forms part of a commercially damaging and personally targeted campaign.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially where the meaning is that the affected person is mentally unstable, abusive, dishonest and professionally incompetent. It also contributes to the cyber-abuse pattern under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This may be treated partly as opinion if isolated, but in context it supports defamation and commercial disparagement arguments where presented as factual customer misconduct and used with competitor redirection. It may also support harassment context.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may contribute to serious-harm defamation under the Defamation Act 2013 if the context conveys factual assertions, not mere abuse. It also supports harassment-pattern arguments under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation where the words are understood as factual allegations lowering reputation. It also supports repeated harassment context if assessed with the thread as a whole.¹⁰

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/ktpfv26/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed against the archived evidence and the surrounding live thread.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: Even where a comment is deleted or unavailable, it remains relevant if Google indexed, cached, surfaced, previewed, or used it in ranking/snippet/summary systems, or if archived evidence shows it contributed to the defamatory thread. It also supports the pattern of repeated publication and removal/reposting behaviour.

AUSTRALIA: This is relevant to notice, publication history, republication, serious harm, and cyber-abuse pattern under

the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation/harassment evidence where archived copies or Google search records show publication and harm. It may also support notice and platform-failure arguments.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support serious-harm and harassment-pattern evidence where archived publication shows the comment formed part of the course of conduct.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows the comment was published and contributed to the wider campaign.¹¹ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyv8inc/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment accuses the operator of creating fake accounts, being a “hack”, being delusional, needing therapy, and having private complaints against them. It also states the user “found a better bot”, tying the attack to competitor promotion.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not merely rude wording. It reinforces the false narrative that the affected sole trader is dishonest, mentally unstable, unsafe to deal with, and professionally inferior, while redirecting users to competitors. In the context of the broader thread, it supports both personal cyber-abuse and commercial sabotage.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation and serious harm under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), and to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because it is part of repeated targeted harassment.

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation, false-light, harassment, and commercial disparagement arguments depending on applicable state law and context. The competitor comparison element is relevant to unfair competition analysis.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may contribute to Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues and Protection from Harassment Act 1997 course-of-conduct issues.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and harassment context because it is published, targets the affected person/service, and contributes to a repeated hostile narrative.¹² <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyx8xq7/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed with the live thread, archived evidence, and surrounding comments.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: The legal relevance is the same as other deleted/unavailable comments: if the content was published, indexed, archived, surfaced, or used by Google in ranking/snippet/summary systems, it remains relevant to notice, publication history, repetition, and pattern evidence.

AUSTRALIA: Relevant to publication history, serious harm, notice, and cyber-abuse pattern under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: Relevant to defamation/harassment evidence, notice, platform failure, and search amplification if Google indexed or surfaced the content.

UNITED KINGDOM: Relevant to harassment-pattern and serious-harm context if archived evidence shows it contributed to the thread.

CANADA: Relevant to civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows publication to third parties.¹³ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyxztrs/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed with the live thread, archived evidence, and related comments.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: The comment’s deletion or unavailability does not remove its relevance where it was previously published or indexed, or where it contributed to the broader thread that Google continues to surface. It supports the argument that Google must assess the thread as a coordinated pattern, not just individual live comments.

AUSTRALIA: Relevant to publication history, serious harm, notice, and cyber-abuse pattern under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: Relevant to defamation/harassment evidence, notice, platform failure, and search amplification if Google indexed or surfaced the content.

UNITED KINGDOM: Relevant to serious-harm and harassment-pattern context if archived evidence shows publication.

CANADA: Relevant to civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows publication and contribution to the wider campaign.¹⁴ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/nreb800/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the operator is a “clown”, unwilling to assist, treats people like garbage, and that lawsuits are “getting the better” of the operator. It then directly recommends a competing service instead.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is relevant because it combines reputational attack with competitor redirection. The comment is not merely saying “I prefer another service”; it frames the affected operator as

abusive, unstable, legally compromised, and not worth users' time or money, then pushes users to a competitor.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially when assessed with the whole thread and serious-harm threshold. It is also relevant to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) as part of the targeted pile-on.

UNITED STATES: This may support commercial disparagement, unfair competition context, and defamation depending on whether the factual claims are false and presented as fact. The direct competitor redirection is legally relevant.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues where the meaning is that the operator is abusive, unstable or commercially unfit. It may also support harassment-pattern context.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and injurious falsehood/trade libel context if false statements are used to damage the service and redirect customers.¹⁵ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/Int64ot/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims information was leaked with a database dump, that the operator uses FTP to destroy servers, wreaks havoc on the community, has SQL injection issues, hijacks user files using tokens, and sells and distributes user files for financial gain.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is one of the clearest unlawful comments. It directly accuses the affected person/service of hacking, data theft, database compromise, server destruction, token abuse, and selling customer files. These are serious criminal/dishonest factual allegations. They are not opinion. They are designed to scare users away from the affected service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges serious criminal, dishonest and malicious conduct and is likely to cause serious harm. It also supports adult cyber-abuse under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) as menacing, harassing and offensive targeted material.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues. If competitor-linked, it may also support Lanham Act false advertising/unfair competition arguments because it misrepresents the nature, characteristics and safety of another service.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises serious-harm defamation under the Defamation Act 2013. It may also fit false-communications concerns under the Online Safety Act 2023 if the sender knew the claims were false and intended psychological or physical harm to a likely audience, and it contributes to harassment context.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potentially Criminal Code false-information/defamatory-libel concerns because it conveys serious false allegations of criminal and dishonest conduct. It may also contribute to criminal harassment context if part of repeated conduct causing fear for safety.¹⁶ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/Int7b2s/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment says users should pay the operator's fee if they want to get hacked and have files stolen, and claims the service is broken and has poor security.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct factual allegation that the affected service hacks paying users and steals files. It also asserts poor security and broken functionality. It is calculated to destroy user trust and prevent customers from using the service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges hacking, theft, poor security, and dishonest conduct likely to cause serious harm. It also contributes to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel/commercial disparagement, and potentially unfair competition issues if competitor-linked or used to divert customers. It falsely represents the service as dangerous and criminal.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because hacking and file theft accusations are grave factual imputations. It may also support false-communications and harassment context when assessed with the whole campaign.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potential false-information/defamatory-libel concerns because it accuses the service of hacking and theft. It may also support harassment context where repeated as part of a campaign.¹⁷ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/Idsxli3/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the operator banned a customer with no refund and scams people for tokens and money.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a false factual accusation of fraud, token misuse, and dishonest business conduct. It directly tells readers the affected operator scams people for money and access tokens. That damages both personal reputation and business trust.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges fraud and dishonest business conduct. It is likely to cause serious harm to a sole trader whose business depends on user trust. It also contributes to the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) cyber-abuse pattern.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and commercial disparagement issues. If made in a competitor-linked thread or used to divert customers, it may support unfair competition analysis.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because allegations of scamming and token misuse are serious factual allegations. It may also support harassment-pattern evidence.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation because it identifies the affected operator/service, is published, and imputes fraud. It may also raise false-information concerns where knowingly false and intended to injure.¹⁸

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/l5a15bj/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the affected service has malicious code, removed and edited files without permission, changed server settings improperly, and that the operator has harmed server owners in the past.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct accusation that the software is malicious and that the operator has a history of harming customers. It is not a vague opinion. It asserts specific technical misconduct and unauthorised file/server interference. It is highly damaging because the affected service depends on users trusting its code, permissions, and integrations.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges malicious software, unauthorised file changes, customer harm, and dishonest technical conduct. It also contributes to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel/commercial disparagement, and potentially unfair competition issues where false technical claims are used to damage or divert customers from a service.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because malicious code and unauthorised file/server interference allegations are serious factual imputations. It may also support false-communications and harassment context where knowingly false and harmful.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potential injurious falsehood/trade libel concerns because it falsely attacks the safety and integrity of the service. If knowingly false and intended to injure, it may also support Criminal Code false-information concerns.

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.

In order to ensure specificity, please quote the exact text from each URL above that you believe infringes on your rights. If the allegedly infringing content is a picture or video, please provide a detailed description of the picture/video in question so that we may locate it on the URL in question.

ITEMISED EXPLANATION OF REPORTED URLS

The affected person is an Australian adult and sole trader. The affected service is personally operated by that sole trader. These URLs should be assessed as a connected pattern of defamation, targeted cyber abuse, competitor-linked harassment, and search manipulation, not as isolated criticism.

For each URL below, the legal issue is that the material either directly publishes false factual allegations, republishes and amplifies those allegations, encourages harassment, uses competitor-linked attack material to divert users, or forms part of the same coordinated campaign. The affected person's legal identity is provided only in the required claimant/contact fields and is intentionally not repeated here because legal removal requests may be republished by transparency databases.¹ <https://www.facebook.com/groups/711550526936017/posts/1678813530209707/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Facebook post targets the affected sole trader and labels that person a "pedo". The preserved edit history shows the accusation was added deliberately after the initial post. The surrounding thread contains violent and abusive comments, including comments referring to pedophiles dying, a woodchipper, knives, and dragging people down a dirt road.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It is a false sexual/criminal allegation against an identifiable adult and sole trader. A false accusation of pedophilia is one of the most serious reputational attacks possible. In context, it is also menacing, harassing and offensive because it appears inside a hostile thread where users respond with violent language. The publication targets both the affected person and the affected service, causing personal, commercial, safety and mental-health harm.

AUSTRALIA: This gives rise to defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), including serious harm under s 10A, because the material identifies the affected person/service and conveys a serious false criminal/sexual imputation. It also raises cyber-abuse issues under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material is targeted at an Australian adult and is menacing, harassing or offensive in context.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation issues because it publishes a factual accusation of serious sexual/criminal misconduct. It may also be relevant to cyberstalking/harassment concerns where the conduct forms part of a course of conduct intended to harass, intimidate or cause substantial emotional distress using online services. If used commercially to divert customers or damage a competing service, it may also support unfair competition / false commercial disparagement arguments depending on the forum and facts.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises issues under the Defamation Act 2013 because the statement is likely to cause serious harm to reputation. It may also engage the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed as part of a repeated course of conduct causing alarm or distress, and the Online Safety Act 2023 false/threatening communications framework where false or threatening material is sent/published with intent to cause harm.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the statement tends to lower the affected person's reputation, refers to the affected person, and is published to others. It may also engage Criminal Code provisions concerning defamatory libel, false information conveyed with intent to injure or alarm, criminal harassment, or threatening conduct depending on the full surrounding evidence and intent.² <https://www.facebook.com/group/s/dayzeditors/posts/1385739236246930/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Facebook URL is included as part of the wider Meta/Facebook pattern. The issue is not merely one support thread. It forms part of the same group environment where competitor promotion, hostile moderation behaviour, refusal to remove abuse, and related attacks against the affected person/service have occurred.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This URL is relevant because it shows the platform/group context in which the abuse, competitor promotion, and refusal to moderate harmful material occurred. It supports the argument that the campaign was not random criticism, but part of a repeated hostile environment involving the affected person's competitors and related communities. Where a thread permits or preserves competitor redirection while refusing to deal with abusive material, it becomes part of the broader commercial and harassment context.

AUSTRALIA: This supports the pattern evidence for defamation and adult cyber abuse under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth). Even if the post itself is less defamatory than the first Facebook URL, it is relevant to malice, context, competitor-linked conduct, platform notice, and repeated harassment.

UNITED STATES: This may support evidence of unfair competition, malicious commercial disparagement, harassment context, and failure of platform reporting pathways. The strongest U.S. legal relevance is contextual: it helps show pattern, motive, bad faith, and competitor-linked amplification.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support a harassment-pattern argument under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 because repeated conduct is assessed cumulatively. It can also support defamation context if the thread contributes to serious harm or competitor-linked publication.

CANADA: This may support a civil defamation and harassment context analysis because Canadian defamation and harassment assessments can consider publication, surrounding context, repetition, and whether conduct forms part of a wider course of targeted abuse.³ <https://skynetvslegion.com/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This is a dedicated hostile comparison/attack website targeting the affected service by name. It presents itself as a comparison or information site while functioning as a competitor-linked attack page designed to intercept users searching for the affected service or related services and steer them away.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is legally significant because it is not a casual comment or isolated post. It is a dedicated domain built around the affected service's name and reputation. It appears designed to influence search results, mislead users, damage trust, and divert commercial traffic. If it contains or republishes false claims that the affected service is unsafe, malicious, fraudulent, inferior because of fabricated misconduct, or operated by an untrustworthy person, it creates both defamation and unfair competition issues.

AUSTRALIA: This raises defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) if the site identifies the affected person/service and conveys false defamatory imputations causing serious harm. It also supports misleading or deceptive conduct / unfair commercial context if the site is competitor-linked and presents itself as neutral while steering users away through false claims.

UNITED STATES: This may raise Lanham Act false advertising / unfair competition issues where a competitor uses false or misleading descriptions of fact in commercial promotion to misrepresent another person's goods, services, or commercial activities. It may also raise defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues under applicable state law.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 issues if the page causes serious harm to reputation or serious financial loss. It may also raise malicious falsehood or passing-off/unfair competition style concerns depending on the wording, commercial presentation, and whether users are misled.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues where the publication identifies the affected person/service and tends to lower reputation. It may also raise injurious falsehood / trade libel concerns if false statements about the service are used to damage commercial interests.⁴ https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/legion_kill_feed_whats_souls_issue/

WHAT THIS URL IS: This is the main Reddit thread. It targets the affected service and its operator. It frames the operator as abusive, paranoid, unsafe, and a "serious problem" in the relevant community. It warns users not to click links from that person and tells users to remove the service from their servers.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This thread operates as the central search-visible Reddit source for later defamatory comments. It is harmful because Google can surface the whole thread beside searches for the affected service, giving credibility and ranking power to the comments beneath it. The thread is not limited to a personal bad experience; it invites and preserves wider allegations of criminality, hacking, fraud, malicious code, and unsafe business conduct.

AUSTRALIA: The thread gives rise to defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it identifies the affected person/service and carries or republishes serious imputations likely to cause serious harm. It also supports an adult cyber-abuse complaint under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) when assessed with the full thread and related harassment context.

UNITED STATES: This raises defamation issues under applicable state law where false factual claims are made or republished. It may also support harassment/cyberstalking context where the thread forms part of a course of conduct intended to harass or intimidate through online services.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises serious-harm defamation issues under the Defamation Act 2013 if surfaced to UK users or published within UK jurisdiction. The repeated hostile thread context may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the thread identifies the affected person/service, is published to others, and tends to lower reputation. The repeated nature of the thread and comments may also support harassment or false-information concerns if assessed with the wider campaign.⁵ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kwcjm4s/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the affected service exists to collect and sell customer files, that the operator deleted server files, destroyed multiple servers where the operator had FTP access, and is known as a scammer in related communities.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct false factual accusation of theft, data misuse, destruction of customer property, unauthorised access/abuse, and fraud. It does not read as opinion. It presents serious allegations as facts and tells users this is "JUST who" the affected person is. The purpose and effect are to make users afraid to trust the service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it imputes criminal and dishonest conduct and is likely to cause serious harm. It also supports cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) because it is part of repeated targeted abuse against an Australian adult.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues because it asserts

false facts about theft, file misuse, destruction, and fraud. Where made by or for a competitor, it may also support unfair competition arguments.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because allegations of theft, fraud, and destruction of customer data are grave factual imputations. It may also form part of harassment if repeated with other posts.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation issues because the words would lower reputation, refer to the affected person/service, and are published. It may also raise Criminal Code false-information or defamatory-libel concerns if the sender knew the allegations were false and intended to injure or alarm.⁶ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kywtf93/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims there have been “hundreds of complaints”, that the service downloads custom files from customers, that the operator sells them for profit, and that the operator is a known scammer.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a false factual accusation of customer data theft, commercial misuse of customer files, and fraud. It is not a review of service quality. It tells readers the service steals customer files and sells them, which is a serious allegation of criminal/dishonest conduct and directly damages user trust.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially because it alleges dishonest and potentially criminal business conduct. It also contributes to the targeted adult cyber-abuse pattern under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and commercial disparagement/trade libel issues. If competitor-linked, it may also support Lanham Act false advertising/unfair competition arguments where false claims about another service are used in a commercial context.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 issues because accusations of stealing and selling customer files are likely to cause serious harm and financial loss. It may also support harassment-pattern evidence.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation because it refers to the affected service/operator, is published, and would lower reputation. If knowingly false and intended to injure or alarm, it may also raise Criminal Code false-information concerns.⁷ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kteombn/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment contains personal abuse and claims the operator threatened to remove a customer’s service access. It forms part of the overall hostile narrative that the operator mistreats customers and operates abusively.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: Standing alone, this is less serious than the hacking, pedophilia, theft, or fraud accusations. However, it remains relevant because it contributes to the thread’s cumulative defamatory meaning: that the operator is abusive, threatening, unprofessional, and unsafe to deal with. In the wider thread, it supports the pile-on and helps keep the hostile search-visible thread active.

AUSTRALIA: This supports the serious-harm and cyber-abuse context under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), especially when assessed as part of the whole thread and repeated campaign.

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation or false-light style concerns depending on the exact facts and state law, and it is relevant as evidence of online harassment/pile-on conduct.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support harassment-pattern evidence under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 and may contribute to serious-harm defamation context under the Defamation Act 2013.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation context and repeated-harassment context where it forms part of a larger course of published abuse.⁸ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kjskiyb/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment calls the operator insane, paranoid, abusive, dishonest and commercially incompetent. It also promotes the idea that another service works without problems while the affected service does not.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This comment is legally relevant because it does more than insult. It reinforces a factual narrative that the affected person is mentally unstable, abusive, dishonest, and unfit to run the service. It also steers users toward competitors. In context, it forms part of a commercially damaging and personally targeted campaign.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially where the meaning is that the affected person is mentally unstable, abusive, dishonest and professionally incompetent. It also contributes to the cyber-abuse pattern under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This may be treated partly as opinion if isolated, but in context it supports defamation and commercial disparagement arguments where presented as factual customer misconduct and used with competitor redirection. It may also support harassment context.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may contribute to serious-harm defamation under the Defamation Act 2013 if the context conveys factual assertions, not mere abuse. It also supports harassment-pattern arguments under the Protection from

Harassment Act 1997.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation where the words are understood as factual allegations lowering reputation. It also supports repeated harassment context if assessed with the thread as a whole.⁹ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/ktpfv26/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed against the archived evidence and the surrounding live thread.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: Even where a comment is deleted or unavailable, it remains relevant if Google indexed, cached, surfaced, previewed, or used it in ranking/snippet/summary systems, or if archived evidence shows it contributed to the defamatory thread. It also supports the pattern of repeated publication and removal/reposting behaviour.

AUSTRALIA: This is relevant to notice, publication history, republication, serious harm, and cyber-abuse pattern under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation/harassment evidence where archived copies or Google search records show publication and harm. It may also support notice and platform-failure arguments.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support serious-harm and harassment-pattern evidence where archived publication shows the comment formed part of the course of conduct.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows the comment was published and contributed to the wider campaign.¹⁰ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyv8inc/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment accuses the operator of creating fake accounts, being a “hack”, being delusional, needing therapy, and having private complaints against them. It also states the user “found a better bot”, tying the attack to competitor promotion.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not merely rude wording. It reinforces the false narrative that the affected sole trader is dishonest, mentally unstable, unsafe to deal with, and professionally inferior, while redirecting users to competitors. In the context of the broader thread, it supports both personal cyber-abuse and commercial sabotage.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation and serious harm under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), and to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because it is part of repeated targeted harassment.

UNITED STATES: This may support defamation, false-light, harassment, and commercial disparagement arguments depending on applicable state law and context. The competitor comparison element is relevant to unfair competition analysis.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may contribute to Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues and Protection from Harassment Act 1997 course-of-conduct issues.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and harassment context because it is published, targets the affected person/service, and contributes to a repeated hostile narrative.¹¹ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyy8xq7/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed with the live thread, archived evidence, and surrounding comments.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: The legal relevance is the same as other deleted/unavailable comments: if the content was published, indexed, archived, surfaced, or used by Google in ranking/snippet/summary systems, it remains relevant to notice, publication history, repetition, and pattern evidence.

AUSTRALIA: Relevant to publication history, serious harm, notice, and cyber-abuse pattern under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: Relevant to defamation/harassment evidence, notice, platform failure, and search amplification if Google indexed or surfaced the content.

UNITED KINGDOM: Relevant to harassment-pattern and serious-harm context if archived evidence shows it contributed to the thread.

CANADA: Relevant to civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows publication to third parties.¹² <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/kyxztrs/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This deleted or unavailable Reddit comment is included because it forms part of the same Reddit thread and abuse pattern. It should be assessed with the live thread, archived evidence, and related comments.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: The comment’s deletion or unavailability does not remove its relevance where it was previously published or indexed, or where it contributed to the broader thread that Google continues to surface. It supports the argument that Google must assess the thread as a coordinated pattern, not just individual live comments.

AUSTRALIA: Relevant to publication history, serious harm, notice, and cyber-abuse pattern under the Defamation Act

2005 (NSW) and Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: Relevant to defamation/harassment evidence, notice, platform failure, and search amplification if Google indexed or surfaced the content.

UNITED KINGDOM: Relevant to serious-harm and harassment-pattern context if archived evidence shows publication.

CANADA: Relevant to civil defamation and harassment context if evidence shows publication and contribution to the wider campaign.¹³ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/nreb800/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the operator is a “clown”, unwilling to assist, treats people like garbage, and that lawsuits are “getting the better” of the operator. It then directly recommends a competing service instead.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is relevant because it combines reputational attack with competitor redirection. The comment is not merely saying “I prefer another service”; it frames the affected operator as abusive, unstable, legally compromised, and not worth users’ time or money, then pushes users to a competitor.

AUSTRALIA: This contributes to defamation under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW), especially when assessed with the whole thread and serious-harm threshold. It is also relevant to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) as part of the targeted pile-on.

UNITED STATES: This may support commercial disparagement, unfair competition context, and defamation depending on whether the factual claims are false and presented as fact. The direct competitor redirection is legally relevant.

UNITED KINGDOM: This may support Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues where the meaning is that the operator is abusive, unstable or commercially unfit. It may also support harassment-pattern context.

CANADA: This may support civil defamation and injurious falsehood/trade libel context if false statements are used to damage the service and redirect customers.¹⁴ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/Int64ot/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims information was leaked with a database dump, that the operator uses FTP to destroy servers, wreaks havoc on the community, has SQL injection issues, hijacks user files using tokens, and sells and distributes user files for financial gain.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is one of the clearest unlawful comments. It directly accuses the affected person/service of hacking, data theft, database compromise, server destruction, token abuse, and selling customer files. These are serious criminal/dishonest factual allegations. They are not opinion. They are designed to scare users away from the affected service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges serious criminal, dishonest and malicious conduct and is likely to cause serious harm. It also supports adult cyber-abuse under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) as menacing, harassing and offensive targeted material.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and trade libel/commercial disparagement issues. If competitor-linked, it may also support Lanham Act false advertising/unfair competition arguments because it misrepresents the nature, characteristics and safety of another service.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises serious-harm defamation under the Defamation Act 2013. It may also fit false-communications concerns under the Online Safety Act 2023 if the sender knew the claims were false and intended psychological or physical harm to a likely audience, and it contributes to harassment context.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potentially Criminal Code false-information/defamatory-libel concerns because it conveys serious false allegations of criminal and dishonest conduct. It may also contribute to criminal harassment context if part of repeated conduct causing fear for safety.¹⁵ <https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/Int7b2s/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment says users should pay the operator’s fee if they want to get hacked and have files stolen, and claims the service is broken and has poor security.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct factual allegation that the affected service hacks paying users and steals files. It also asserts poor security and broken functionality. It is calculated to destroy user trust and prevent customers from using the service.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges hacking, theft, poor security, and dishonest conduct likely to cause serious harm. It also contributes to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel/commercial disparagement, and potentially unfair competition issues if competitor-linked or used to divert customers. It falsely represents the service as dangerous and criminal.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because hacking and file theft accusations are grave factual imputations. It may also support false-communications and harassment context when assessed with the whole campaign.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potential false-information/defamatory-libel concerns because it accuses the service of hacking and theft. It may also support harassment context where repeated as part of a campaign.¹⁶

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/ldsqli3/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the operator banned a customer with no refund and scams people for tokens and money.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a false factual accusation of fraud, token misuse, and dishonest business conduct. It directly tells readers the affected operator scams people for money and access tokens. That damages both personal reputation and business trust.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges fraud and dishonest business conduct. It is likely to cause serious harm to a sole trader whose business depends on user trust. It also contributes to the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth) cyber-abuse pattern.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation and commercial disparagement issues. If made in a competitor-linked thread or used to divert customers, it may support unfair competition analysis. UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because allegations of scamming and token misuse are serious factual allegations. It may also support harassment-pattern evidence.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation because it identifies the affected operator/service, is published, and imputes fraud. It may also raise false-information concerns where knowingly false and intended to injure.¹⁷

<https://www.reddit.com/r/DayZDiscussions/comments/19e9o29/comment/l5a15bj/>

WHAT THIS URL IS: This Reddit comment claims the affected service has malicious code, removed and edited files without permission, changed server settings improperly, and that the operator has harmed server owners in the past.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is a direct accusation that the software is malicious and that the operator has a history of harming customers. It is not a vague opinion. It asserts specific technical misconduct and unauthorised file/server interference. It is highly damaging because the affected service depends on users trusting its code, permissions, and integrations.

AUSTRALIA: This is defamatory under the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) because it alleges malicious software, unauthorised file changes, customer harm, and dishonest technical conduct. It also contributes to adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth).

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel/commercial disparagement, and potentially unfair competition issues where false technical claims are used to damage or divert customers from a service.

UNITED KINGDOM: This raises Defamation Act 2013 serious-harm issues because malicious code and unauthorised file/server interference allegations are serious factual imputations. It may also support false-communications and harassment context where knowingly false and harmful.

CANADA: This raises civil defamation and potential injurious falsehood/trade libel concerns because it falsely attacks the safety and integrity of the service. If knowingly false and intended to injure, it may also support Criminal Code false-information concerns.

I have good faith belief that the reported content is unlawful for the reasons stated above. I confirm that the information I have provided is accurate to the best of my knowledge.

Please note we may suspend the processing of notifications of allegedly illegal content submitted by individuals or entities that frequently submit manifestly unfounded notifications. Find more information about our misuse policy [here](#).

Please check to confirm

Signature

Anthony Gordon Brodie
