

Re: [6-6692000040714] Your Request to Google

Legion Killfeed <legion.killfeed@gmail.com>

Sat, Jun 20, 2026 at 3:18 PM

To: removals@google.com, googlebusinessprofile-support@google.com

From: Anthony Gordon Brodie ("Soul"), Legion Killfeed (ABN 28 387 377 607)**Date: 21 June 2026****PRELIMINARY STATEMENT AND IDENTITY****This is a formal consolidated escalation and further concerns notice under s 12A, provided for the purposes of s 12B of the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW).**

Google must immediately stop treating my previous and current reports as unrelated, isolated requests. They concern the same sustained campaign, the same false factual accusations, the same affected individual and sole trader business, and Google's continuing reproduction and amplification of that material after repeated, detailed notice.

I am Anthony Gordon Brodie, publicly known as "Soul." I am an Australian resident and the individual sole trader operating Legion Killfeed under ABN 28 387 377 607. I am a natural person, not a corporation, and there is no separate incorporated entity operating Legion Killfeed.

The corporate restrictions in s 9 of the Defamation Act do not convert a sole trader into a corporation. The accusations concerning Legion Killfeed identify me personally and directly harm my personal, professional and commercial reputation. Google's previous demands for corporate directors, issued shares, shareholders and corporate holdings were therefore fundamentally misconceived.

Legion Killfeed is an internationally used paid technical service for DayZ console communities. Its operation depends on customers trusting its server integrations, token handling and administrative access. By continuing to rank and reproduce my business name alongside allegations of file theft, fraud, hacking, malicious code, token abuse, server sabotage and deliberate destruction, Google is attacking the precise technical and commercial trust on which my service depends.

REPEATED FORMAL NOTICE AND LUMEN RECORDS

Google has not received one isolated report. It has received extensive legal notices, evidence submissions, follow-ups and removal requests over more than nine months.

The consolidated concerns-notice thread itself carries these Google references: [5-3327000041185], [7-1475000041317], [9-5176000040649], [7-6851000041029], [1-3859000040385], [2-9213000040525], [1-3859000040385], [4-4314000040578] and [0-9681000041045].

Related records include: [0-4685000039839], [0-7685000040341], [1-6651000040596], [2-7896000040770], [4-6120000040834], [5-8357000041583], [6-6692000040714], [6-7168000040663], [7-4274000039113], [8-0020000041441] and [8-8385000040209].

Google also submitted my formal notices to the Lumen Database on or around 17 September 2025, 24 October 2025, 13 January 2026, 15 February 2026 and 19 April 2026. Those notices identified the URLs, defamatory imputations, Australian legal nexus and resulting commercial and reputational harm.

Google has therefore received documented notice across numerous internal records and at least five externally recorded legal notices. There is no credible basis for claiming that Google lacks sufficient identification, URLs, imputations, jurisdictional information or evidence of harm.

CONTRADICTORY RESPONSES AND CONTINUING PUBLICATION

Google has repeatedly stated that identified material was "not currently displayed" or had "been removed." Those statements are contradicted by dated evidence showing the same allegations remaining visible or subsequently reappearing through ordinary results, snippets, "Discussions and forums," result panels, AI Mode and AI Overviews. The documented contradictions include:

- 18 September 2025: Google stated that six Reddit pages were no longer displayed or had been removed.
- 23 and 30 December 2025: Google refused action concerning substantially the same material without reconciling its previous removal statement.
- January 2026: Google again stated that specified material was not displayed or had been removed, then subsequently refused action concerning the same URLs.
- April and May 2026: Google alternated between being unable to locate the material, stating that it was removed and deciding not to take action.
- 20 May 2026: Google again stated that specified Reddit comments and Facebook material were not displayed or had been removed.

These internally contradictory decisions are relevant to the adequacy and reasonableness of Google's review process, the continuing and cumulative harm, and any later assessment of whether Google's post-notice conduct aggravated that harm. I reserve the right to rely upon the complete decision history in any subsequent proceedings.

Screenshots dated 15 November 2025, 22 December 2025, 14 January 2026, 19 April 2026, 20 April 2026, 30 April 2026, 10 May 2026, 17 June 2026 and 20 June 2026 disprove the suggestion that the problem was resolved.

On 20 June 2026, Google was still prominently displaying the accusation that Legion Killfeed collects and sells users' files. Google was simultaneously displaying Facebook accusations that using Legion Killfeed would reset-loop a server and force players to leave a community. Google's own result panel states that the result "typically appears for searches outside Australia." That confirms both the international distribution and why Australia-only suppression would be inadequate.

Google's Results About You system has also produced demonstrably incorrect classifications, including:

- Treating hostile Facebook material as content I control.
- Claiming that a Reddit result titled "What's Soul's issue?" did not match my identity.

I do not control those hostile pages, groups or posts. "Soul" is my established public identity and the thread expressly concerns Legion Killfeed.

DIRECTLY CONTRADICTORY EVIDENCE IGNORED BY GOOGLE

Google is not neutrally presenting the overall discussion. It is selecting the most damaging accusation as the defining extract while disregarding comments within the same material that directly contradict it.

The supplied Reddit record contains statements that:

- Greedy said the conduct was not committed by Soul.
- PissedOffTexan said it was not Soul.

- Kamikaze had previously attributed the conduct to "Azzzy."
- Soul was originally described only as a suspect before being directly accused years later.
- Retained files contradict the accusation that I deleted or stole the relevant material.

I retained and supplied files to assist with recovery. That conduct is fundamentally inconsistent with the accusation that I stole, deleted or sold the files.

Google nevertheless continues presenting the accusation that I stole, collected, sold or deleted customer files as the defining extract beside my business name. It cannot rationally assess only the hostile allegation while ignoring directly contradictory statements in the same source.

GOOGLE'S RELIANCE ON S 10D AND DEFTEROS

Google has repeatedly stated:

"In relation to our liability as a search engine, please also see s10D of the Defamation Act 2005 (NSW) and Google LLC v Defteros (2022) 96 ALJR 766." That is not a complete legal analysis and does not answer this complaint.

Section 10D is a conditional exemption. Under s 10D(1), it applies where the provider's role is limited to providing an automated process through which a user generates search results.

Section 10B defines a "search result" as a result limited to identifying a webpage through its title, hyperlink, extract or image. Google must identify which complained-of outputs it says satisfy those statutory conditions.

Google's AI Mode and AI Overviews do substantially more than identify webpages.

They combine allegations from multiple sources, generate new wording, present allegations as factual findings or warnings, compare commercial services and recommend competitors. The AI Overview that published inaccurate pricing, presented a "Reliability Warning" and recommended MDZGA Killfeed is not merely a hyperlink or webpage extract. It is a Google-generated commercial comparison. Google must explain how that output is "limited to identifying a webpage" within s 10B and how Google's role remained limited as required by s 10D(1).

I acknowledge that s 10D(3) provides that the exemption may apply regardless of whether a search engine provider knew or ought reasonably to have known that material was defamatory. I do not contend that notice alone automatically disapples s 10D. The relevant points are that s 10D:

- Does not establish that the accusations are true.
- Does not require Google to continue indexing or reproducing them.
- Does not resolve Google's contradictory removal decisions.
- Does not determine the application of Google's voluntary removal policies.
- Does not automatically apply to every Google-generated AI output.
- Does not determine Google's obligations under other laws or jurisdictions.
- Does not answer the request for voluntary worldwide suppression after extensive proof of falsity and serious harm.

Section 10D(2) also provides that the exemption does not apply to the extent results are promoted or prioritised because of payment or another benefit given by or on behalf of a third party.

Google must confirm whether any payment, advertising consideration, commercial relationship or other third-party benefit affected the prioritisation, presentation or recommendation of MDZGA Killfeed or any other competing service.

This is a request for disclosure and assessment under the actual statutory test. I am not asserting that ordinary SEO activity alone constitutes payment or another benefit under s 10D(2).

DEFTEROS, DUFFY AND GOOGLE-GENERATED CONTENT

Google LLC v Defteros [2022] HCA 27; (2022) 96 ALJR 766 concerned a search result linking to a separate newspaper article. The High Court's official summary records that there was no suggestion the search result itself was defamatory and that the defamatory matter was not reproduced in the search result. The present circumstances are materially different. Google directly reproduces the complained-of accusations through extracts, snippets, panels and discussion modules. Its AI products then synthesise those accusations into new warnings, conclusions and commercial recommendations.

I acknowledge that an extract from a webpage may fall within the statutory definition of a search result in s 10B. The point is that Defteros alone does not determine the application of s 10D to every complained-of surface, particularly Google-generated AI answers that go beyond identifying or extracting from a webpage. In Duffy v Google Inc [2015] SASC 170, affirmed in Google Inc v Duffy [2017] SASFC 130, Google-generated autocomplete suggestions and defamatory text appearing in search-result paragraphs were capable of constituting publication by Google.

I recognise that Duffy predates the present s 10D exemption and does not displace that later statutory provision. It nevertheless demonstrates that text generated and communicated through Google's own search systems cannot automatically be characterised as legally irrelevant merely because it appears within a search product. The application of s 10D to each modern AI output must be assessed against the actual statutory conditions, not assumed merely because Google operates a search engine.

SECTION 31A AND ACCESS-PREVENTION STEPS

Section 31A creates a separate defence for publications involving digital intermediaries. It does not replace s 10D, and failure to establish the s 31A defence does not automatically forfeit a separate s 10D exemption.

However, if Google relies upon s 31A for any complained-of output to which s 10D does not apply, Google bears the burden of proving the requirements of s 31A(1).

My complaints identified:

- My name and public identity.
- The defamatory matter.
- The locations where it could be accessed.
- That I considered the matter defamatory.
- The resulting serious harm.

Those complaints therefore contained the information specified by s 31A(3). Google must explain what reasonable access-prevention steps it took, either before receiving those complaints or within seven days afterward, as required by s 31A(1)(c). Repeated statements that the material had been removed, followed by continued or renewed publication, raise a direct question about whether Google could establish that statutory requirement for any output governed by s 31A.

Section 39A also confirms that an intermediary exemption is not equivalent to a prohibition against access-prevention orders. Where the threshold conditions in s 39A(1) are met, a court may order a non-party digital intermediary to take access-prevention steps even if that intermediary is not or may not be liable for defamation.

BARILARO AND CONTINUING GOOGLE-CONTROLLED PUBLICATION

In *Barilaro v Google LLC* [2022] FCA 650, the Federal Court awarded \$715,000 against Google in relation to defamatory videos published through YouTube. I recognise that Barilaro concerned YouTube publication, not ordinary search indexing, and I do not represent it as a decision about s 10D.

It is nevertheless relevant to the separate issue of continuing Google-controlled publication after notice. The Court considered Google's failure to remove material, persistence in defences later abandoned, failure to apologise and other post-notice conduct when awarding aggravated damages. Google has now received repeated notice of the falsity, contradictions and serious harm in this matter. To the extent Google is found liable for any Google-generated or Google-controlled publication, I reserve the right to rely upon its post-notice conduct as aggravating the harm and supporting aggravated damages where legally available.

SERIOUS HARM AND COMMERCIAL LOSS

The serious harm requirement under s 10A is plainly engaged. The accusations convey that the identifiable individual operating Legion Killfeed commits theft, fraud, hacking, sabotage, malicious interference, token abuse and deliberate destruction of customer systems and files. Because Legion Killfeed is operated by me as an individual sole trader, these allegations directly attack my personal and professional reputation. Google cannot separate the attack on Legion Killfeed from the attack on me by incorrectly treating the business as an unrelated corporation.

The resulting harm includes:

- Loss of prospective customers.
- Customer cancellations and refund requests.
- Customers confronting me with allegations discovered through Google.
- Damage to trust in a service requiring technical integrations and administrative access.
- Diversion of customers towards competing services.
- Continued international exposure through page-one results.
- Google-generated warnings and competitor recommendations.

This damage is cumulative and ongoing. The material has remained prominent for months, has been selected for special result modules and panels, and has been transformed by Google AI into apparent commercial guidance.

WORLDWIDE REMOVAL IS REQUIRED

Australia is the primary legal nexus because I reside and trade in New South Wales and suffer the resulting personal, reputational and commercial harm here. The other countries and legal regimes identified in previous notices were included cumulatively because Google distributes the material internationally and a geographically restricted remedy would not prevent the continuing harm. Legion Killfeed serves customers internationally. The allegations appear through Google country editions outside Australia and reach prospective customers globally. Google's own result panel acknowledges that the result commonly appears outside Australia.

Restricting access only from Australia would leave the commercial and reputational harm substantially intact. That is why my previous notices also identified legal bases in other affected jurisdictions.

REQUIRED ACTION

1. I require Google to: Conduct one consolidated human legal review covering every reference identified above.
2. Stop fragmenting this sustained matter across separate queues and issuing inconsistent decisions without considering the complete notice history.
3. Remove or suppress worldwide the identified Reddit and Facebook URLs from searches for Legion Killfeed, Soul and Anthony Brodie.
4. Remove the defamatory extracts from ordinary snippets, "Discussions and forums," result panels and similar Google surfaces.
5. Confirm that the previously reported Google Business Profile and Maps review remains removed from every Google surface and will not be republished.
6. Remove the accusations, warnings, inaccurate pricing and competitor recommendations from AI Mode, AI Overviews and other generative Google products.
7. Prevent substantially identical accusations from being regenerated from cached, indexed or previously processed copies after removal.
8. Correct the false Results About You findings that I control the hostile Facebook material or that "Soul" and Legion Killfeed do not identify me.
9. Provide a substantive human-reviewed response addressing:
 - How each complained-of AI output satisfies the s 10B definition of a search result.
 - How Google's role in generating each AI output was limited as required by s 10D(1).
 - Whether any payment or third-party benefit within s 10D(2) influenced the competitor recommendation.
 - If Google relies upon s 31A, what reasonable access-prevention steps were taken within the statutory period.
 - Why Google continues selecting accusations contradicted by comments in the same source.
 - Why Google repeatedly stated that material was removed when dated screenshots showed its continued publication.
 - Why previous decisions concerning the same URLs and allegations produced contradictory outcomes.

10. Preserve all records concerning these complaints, including review notes, internal status changes, ranking records, snippet-selection records, AI source-selection records, cached outputs and internal communications. This paragraph is an express preservation notice.

Please acknowledge receipt within 48 hours and provide a substantive human-reviewed decision within seven days. A further template response merely stating that Google is a search engine, or repeating s 10D and Defteros without addressing the distinctions above, will not constitute a substantive response or resolution.

All rights are reserved, including rights concerning defamation, injurious falsehood, misleading or deceptive commercial conduct, regulatory complaints to the eSafety Commissioner and ACCC, access-prevention orders, injunctive relief, aggravated damages where legally available, and recovery of loss caused by continued publication and amplification.

I am not going to continue reporting the content over and over while you treat Reddit and Facebook as a trustworthy source while possessing evidence that contradicts the illegal content they host that you then choose to host alongside my business name. Especially when you are trusting content posted by competitors that was only made to cause business harm. and posted by direct competitors..

Fucking sick of it, stop assisting these criminals attacking my fucking business.

Anthony "Soul" Brodie

Legion Killfeed - Owner

New South Wales, Australia

 2025-09-17-defamation_complaint_to_google_lumen.pdf

 2025-10-24-defamation_complaint_to_google_lumen.pdf

 2025-11-15-post-is-always-page-one.png

 2025-12-22-google-ai-slander.png

 2025-12-22-now-3rd-result-amplifying-harm.png

 2026-01-13-defamation_complaint_to_google_lumen.pdf

 2026-01-14-google-claims-not-found.png

 2026-02-15-defamation_complaint_to_google_lumen.pdf

 2026-02-15-google-ai-again.png

 2026-02-15-google-refusal-1-6651000040596.png

 2026-02-15-google-refusal-1-6651000040596_pt2.png

 2026-02-15-the-post-google-ai-quotes.png

 2026-04-05-mathew-google-review-edit-proof.png

 2026-04-05-mathew-google-review.png

 2026-04-19-google-is-blind.png

 2026-04-19-lumen-joel.pdf

 2026-04-20-google-slander-page-one.png

 2026-04-22-nazi-oversights-board.png

 2026-04-24-google-indexing-defamation-from-competitor.png

 2026-04-24-google-refusal-2-7896000040770.png

 2026-04-24-google-refusal-4-6120000040834.png

 2026-04-24-https-share-google-aimode-62tzoxlugemhhw5un.png

 2026-04-26-google-refusal-6-7168000040663.png

 2026-04-30-google-criminals-act-blind.png

 2026-04-30-google-takedown-again.pdf

 2026-05-05-google-reddit-removal-complaints.pdf

 2026-05-09-google-0-7685000040341.pdf

 2026-05-10-google-indexing-retards.png

 2026-05-10-google-indexing-smooth-brains.png

 2026-06-20-criminals-google-fucks.png

 clear-demand-re_1-3859000040385-youe-request-to-Google.pdf

 Gmail - 5-8357000041583 Your Request to Googl...

 Gmail - [0-4685000039839] Your Request to Goo...

 google-refusal-8385000040209.pdf

 Googles-Fraud-Re_7-1475000041317.pdf

 June - Re_ [6-6692000040714] Your Request to ...

 May Gmail - 8-0020000041441 Your Request to ...

 MayGmail - Re_ [1-3859000040385] Your Reque...

 Re [9-5176000040649] Your Request to Google.pdf

 Re_1-3859000040385-Your-Request-to-Google.pdf

 Re_ [0-7685000040341] Your Request to Google....

 Re_ [1-3859000040385] Your Request to Google....

 Re_ [6-6692000040714] Your Request to Google....

 Re_ [7-4274000039113] Your Request to Google....

 Re_CONCERNS NOTICE [5-3327000041185] - [...]

 September 2025 - Re_ [7-4274000039113] Your ...

On Fri, Jun 5, 2026 at 5:03 AM <removals@google.com> wrote:

Hello,

Thanks for reaching out to us.

Regarding the following URLs:

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>

<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Cg9kGNDKJ/>

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.

In order for us to investigate the matter, we ask that you

1. confirm which country or countries you are requesting removal for, and
2. verify your protectable reputation for each country you list in (1). For example, describe what contacts you or your business have with the country or countries.

In the event we do not receive further information from you as requested above, we will be unable to take any further action on your removal request.

Regards,

The Google Team

For more information about our content removal process, see [g.co/legal](https://www.google.com/legal).

Wed, Jun 03, 2026 at 15:17 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

Cyber-abuse of an Australian adult

Allegedly infringing URLs

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1103015490737168/posts/1440078317030882/>

<https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>
<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>
<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>
https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_puUAXUoYOsiHToxEmMQFnoECDIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
<https://share.google/2G7AjXapqQZ464Mhl>
<https://share.google/JDuWOisSV2bNGkhz0>

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](#).

Google Legal / Search Removals Team,

I am submitting this as a new legal removal request and repeat formal notice concerning Google Search continuing to index, rank, preview, summarise, redirect to and surface defamatory and commercially harmful Facebook material beside searches for an Australian sole trader, the sole trader's service, and related commercial search terms.

The affected person is an Australian adult and sole trader. The affected service is personally operated by that sole trader. This is not a detached corporation with separate brand damage. The same individual personally operates the service, personally provides support, personally receives the abuse, and personally suffers the harm.

The listed URLs are not ordinary criticism or fair consumer opinion. They are part of a repeated Facebook/Meta and Google Search visibility problem involving false allegations about billing, cancellation, payment handling, customer support, service access, refunds, PayPal disputes, deliberate server sabotage, reset-looping communities, forcing players away from communities, and malicious interference with customer servers.

The material falsely alleges or implies that the affected sole trader dishonestly charged a customer, failed to cancel a subscription, charged a customer for a year when the customer had only subscribed the month before, refused paid service, ignored support, denied a customer use of the service, acted scam-like in a PayPal dispute, or deliberately sabotages customer servers and communities by reset-looping servers and forcing players away.

These are serious factual allegations. They are false. They are not protected opinion. They are being used to damage an identifiable Australian adult and sole trader, interfere with that person's business, frighten prospective customers, and divert users searching for the affected service or related DayZ console services.

The affected person has already attempted to use Meta/Facebook's own reporting process. The supplied Meta "Reports about others" screenshot shows repeated reports made through Meta's own app/reporting system across 2025 and 2026, including reports concerning Joel Walker/Joe L Walker posts and comments, harassment, hate speech, nudity, self-injury, regulated products, promoting violence, and related abusive Facebook activity. This evidence is supplied to show that the affected person did not ignore Meta's process. He repeatedly tried Meta's reporting tools, and Meta's process failed to remove or meaningfully stop the abusive material.

The competitor context is material. The Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA Facebook URL is connected to the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com. That post does not merely criticise the affected service. It publishes a serious accusation that the affected sole trader deliberately sabotages communities by reset-looping servers and forcing players to leave. That claim directly attacks personal reputation, business trust, customer safety perception, software safety, and commercial viability.

The other Facebook material falsely turns self-managed subscription conduct, refusal to use the ticket system, proven service use, and a PayPal dispute outcome into public allegations of dishonest service, non-delivery, poor support, or scam-like payment conduct. Google is now on repeated notice that this content is not neutral public discussion. It is defamatory publication, commercial harm, failed Meta moderation, and search amplification targeting a sole trader personally through that person's business identity.

The harm is ongoing because Google is not merely passively linking to material in this context. Google Search ranks it, previews it, excerpts it, redirects to it through Google-controlled URLs, and may summarise it in search features or AI-generated outputs. When Google surfaces this material beside searches for the affected sole trader, the affected service, or related commercial searches, Google gives false and harmful Facebook material reach, visibility and credibility that it would not otherwise have.

Applicable legal issues include:

- Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)

The material identifies the affected sole trader and the affected service. It carries serious defamatory imputations, including dishonest billing, scam-like conduct, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, dishonest payment handling, deliberate server sabotage, reset-looping customer servers, forcing players away from communities, and deliberately destroying communities. These imputations are likely to cause, and have caused, serious harm to the affected person's personal reputation and sole trader business.

- Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth)

The material forms part of targeted cyber abuse against an Australian adult. It is harassing and offensive in context, including repeated Facebook posts, failed Meta reports, competitor-linked pile-ons, public attacks against the affected person's business identity, and repeated attempts to drive distrust, harassment and ostracism against the affected person.

- Google legal removal process

Google's own legal removal process allows removal or restriction where content violates law or rights, including defamation, privacy/personal data, local law, and other legal grounds. This request gives Google the specific URLs, the exact nature of the unlawful content, the applicable legal issues, the identity of the person harmed through the form's claimant/contact fields, and the requested action.

- Failed Meta/Facebook reporting process

The affected person has already used Meta/Facebook's reporting tools. The supplied Meta reports screenshot shows repeated reports through Meta's own app/reporting system. Meta's reporting process has failed. The material remains available, searchable and harmful. Google should not rely on Meta's failure to act as a reason to continue indexing, ranking, previewing, redirecting to or summarising the same material. Ordinary platform reporting paths have already failed. Meta/Facebook's reporting process has failed. The material remains available, searchable, and harmful. Private legal proceedings are not a realistic first-step remedy simply to force Meta or Google to assign a human reviewer. Google is therefore being placed on repeat formal notice through the available legal removal pathway.

I request that Google now:

- remove or de-index the listed URLs from Google Search;
- suppress snippets, previews and cached/derived search text that repeats the defamatory allegations;
- prevent Google AI Mode, AI Overviews, generated summaries, panels or search features from summarising or legitimising the allegations;
- assess the URLs together as a connected Facebook/Meta abuse and defamation issue, not as isolated criticism;
- take into account that Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed;
- take into account the supplied Meta reports screenshot showing repeated reports through Meta's own reporting system;
- preserve this request, prior requests, internal review notes, escalation notes, decision records and any automated or human review outputs;
- provide a human-reviewed written decision if Google refuses removal;
- identify the legal or policy basis relied on if Google continues surfacing the material after notice.

This is repeat notice. Google has been told the specific URLs, the exact allegations, the false and harmful nature of the content, the payment and support context, the PayPal outcome, the competitor-linked context, the failure of Meta reporting pathways, the supplied Meta reports evidence, and the fact that an Australian adult and sole trader is personally harmed by this material.

This request does not seek suppression of genuine criticism. It seeks removal or restriction of defamatory and commercially harmful material falsely accusing an identifiable Australian adult and sole trader of dishonest billing, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, scam-like payment conduct, customer sabotage, deliberate server reset-looping, and deliberate destruction of communities.

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.

REPORTED URLS:

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1103015490737168/posts/1440078317030882/>
- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_peuUAXuOyOsIHToxEmMQFnoECDIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
- <https://share.google/2G7AjXapqQZ464Mhl>
- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_peuUAXuOyOsIHToxEmMQ77oQegQINxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F%23%3A~%3Atext%3DHas%2520anybody%2520ever%2520used%2520legion%2Cremark%2520back%2520on%2520the%2520ticket.&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
- <https://share.google/JDuWOisSV2bNGkhz0>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Cg9kGNDKJ/>

REQUESTED ACTION:

I request that Google remove or de-index the listed URLs from Google Search, and suppress any snippets, previews, summaries, AI Mode results, AI Overviews, panels or generated search outputs that repeat or legitimise the allegations.

I also request that Google take into account that Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed. The affected sole trader has repeatedly attempted to use Meta's own reporting process, and the supplied Meta reports screenshot shows repeated reports made through Meta's app/reporting system.

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

- Was this request reviewed by a human?
- What jurisdiction was applied?
- What legal basis did Google assess?
- Why does Google consider the listed Facebook material lawful to continue surfacing after repeated notice?
- Why does Google consider false allegations of dishonest billing, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, scam-like payment conduct, deliberate server sabotage and community destruction to be ordinary criticism?
- Why does Google continue to surface this material when Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed?
- How did Google account for the supplied Meta reports screenshot showing repeated reports through Meta's own reporting system?
- How did Google account for the Ko-fi subscription context, including that the customer did not cancel through the proper self-managed subscription pathway?
- How did Google account for the support-ticket context, including that the customer refused to use the required ticket system?

- How did Google account for service-use logs proving that the customer did receive use?
- How did Google account for PayPal ruling in favour of the affected sole trader?
- How did Google account for the competitor-linked Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA context associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com?
- What records will Google preserve regarding this request and prior related notices?
- Whether any Google Search, Google Ads, Google Business, Google indexing, SEO, promotion, or advertising relationship, payment, campaign, or search product activity connected to Joel Walker, Make DayZ Great Again, mdzga.com, Facebook groups, Meta/Facebook pages, or related competitor-linked domains was considered or excluded when assessing the visibility of these URLs.

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 Meta/Facebook reporting pathway, the supplied Meta reports evidence, the Google-controlled redirect/share URL issue, the payment and support context, the PayPal outcome, 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.

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, failed Meta moderation, 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, uses false customer claims to damage business trust, uses competitor-linked attack material to divert users, or forms part of the same connected 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.

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: These Facebook URLs concern a false billing and cancellation allegation against the affected sole trader and service. The poster never cancelled the subscription through the actual subscription provider. The poster tried to say he had been charged for a year, when he had only subscribed the month before. The poster then left the Discord server and blamed the affected sole trader for not knowing that he wanted the subscription stopped. The subscription was self-managed through <https://ko-fi.com/>, meaning the customer had the ability and responsibility to manage or cancel the subscription through Ko-fi.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It falsely presents a self-managed subscription issue as dishonest billing, improper charging, or scam-like conduct by the affected sole trader. The customer did not cancel through the proper self-managed Ko-fi subscription pathway. The affected sole trader could not fairly be blamed because the customer left Discord and did not cancel through the subscription provider.

The false allegation creates the impression that the affected sole trader knowingly charged the customer incorrectly, charged a longer period than the customer subscribed for, ignored cancellation, or retained payment dishonestly. Those allegations are commercially serious because the affected business depends on customer trust in billing, support, subscription handling and payment fairness.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the customer did not cancel;
- the customer tried to say he had been charged for a year;
- the customer had only subscribed the month before;
- the customer left the Discord server;
- the customer blamed the affected sole trader for not knowing he wanted cancellation;
- the subscription was self-managed through <https://ko-fi.com/>;
- cancellation had to be handled through Ko-fi by the customer.

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 imputation that the affected sole trader improperly charged a customer, mishandled cancellation, or acted dishonestly in relation to subscription payments. It also contributes to an adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material forms part of repeated public attacks against an Australian adult and sole trader.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel and commercial disparagement issues because it asserts or implies false facts about payment handling, subscription conduct and dishonest business practice. If amplified in a competitor-linked or commercially hostile 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 falsely implying dishonest billing or scam-like payment conduct. It may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed as part of a repeated course of conduct targeting the same person and business.

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 about billing and customer payment handling are used to damage the service commercially.

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1103015490737168/posts/1440078317030882/>

- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_puUAXuYOsiHToxEmMQFnoECDIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
- <https://share.google/2G7AjXapqQZ464Mhl>
- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_puUAXuYOsiHToxEmMQ77oQegQINxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F%23%3A~%3Atext%3DHas%2520anybody%2520ever%2520used%2520legion%2Cremark%2520back%2520on%2520the%2520ticket.&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: These Facebook and Google-controlled redirect/search/share URLs concern a false support, service access and payment-dispute allegation against the affected sole trader and service. The poster is completely telling lies. The poster repeatedly refused to use the proper ticket system, threw a tantrum, then claimed he did not get use of the service. The logs prove that he did get use of the service. PayPal reviewed the dispute and ruled in favour of the affected sole trader.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It falsely presents a customer's refusal to use the required support process as a failure by the affected sole trader to provide service. It also falsely implies non-delivery, scam conduct, dishonest payment retention, or refusal to provide paid service even though the service-use logs contradict that claim and PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader.

The ticket system is material. The affected service uses a ticket process so support issues can be tracked, answered, logged and handled properly. A customer who refuses to use the support pathway cannot fairly turn around and publicly claim that support was not provided, especially where logs show actual service use.

The PayPal outcome is also material. The customer raised the payment dispute through PayPal, and PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader. That directly supports the position that the customer's public Facebook allegation is not a reliable statement of fact and should not be treated by Google as a reliable consumer warning.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the customer repeatedly refused to use the ticket system;
- the customer escalated publicly instead of using the required support pathway;
- the customer falsely claimed he did not get use of the service;
- service logs prove the customer did get use of the service;
- PayPal reviewed the dispute;
- PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader;
- the Facebook post and Google redirect/share URLs continue to surface the false allegation despite those facts.

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 serious false imputations that the affected sole trader failed to provide paid service, acted dishonestly, ignored support, or scammed a customer. It also contributes to targeted adult cyber-abuse under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material is part of repeated public attacks against an Australian adult and sole trader.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel and commercial disparagement issues because it asserts or implies false facts about non-delivery, payment handling and dishonest business conduct. Where a false customer story is used to deter users from subscribing or to redirect them away from the affected service, it may also support unfair competition arguments depending on the surrounding facts.

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 falsely implying scam-like conduct, non-delivery of paid service, or dishonest handling of a dispute. It may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed with the broader repeated public campaign.

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 where false claims about paid service and support are used to damage the service commercially.

- <https://share.google/JDuWOisSV2bNGkhz0>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Cg9kGNDKJ/>

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: 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. The Google share URL and Facebook share URL continue to surface or route users to the same defamatory Facebook material.

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 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.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the Google share URL surfaces or routes users to the defamatory Facebook material;
- the Facebook group post is in the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment;

- the Facebook share URL surfaces or routes users to the same defamatory material;
- the post claims users of the affected service risk having their server “reset looped”;
- the post claims the affected sole trader will “force” players to leave their community;
- the post claims the affected sole trader “literally bragged” about forcing communities to die;
- the post is connected to a competitor-linked environment associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com;
- the allegations attack the safety and trustworthiness of the affected service’s technical access and tools.

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.

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 Facebook URLs is legally unreasonable because Google has been placed on notice that the material is false, abusive, commercially harmful, competitor-linked in part, and directly damaging to an Australian sole trader.

The affected sole trader does not merely deny the allegations. The affected sole trader has payment-platform outcomes, support-system records, service-use logs, Meta report evidence and platform context showing that the Facebook allegations are false or materially misleading. That means Google has access to credible first-party and platform-context evidence showing the Facebook material is unreliable, while the reported Facebook/Google URL content consists of unsupported defamatory allegations from hostile or competitor-linked sources with no comparable credibility.

By continuing to index, rank, preview, redirect to, or summarise the defamatory Facebook content after notice, Google is effectively giving search preference to unverified Facebook allegations over verifiable payment, support, service-use and Meta-report evidence. 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 supplied.

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 defamatory Facebook material over credible evidence supplied by the affected sole trader.

I am submitting this as a new legal removal request and repeat formal notice concerning Google Search continuing to index, rank, preview, summarise, redirect to and surface defamatory and commercially harmful Facebook material beside searches for an Australian sole trader, the sole trader's service, and related commercial search terms.

The affected person is an Australian adult and sole trader. The affected service is personally operated by that sole trader. This is not a detached corporation with separate brand damage. The same individual personally operates the service, personally provides support, personally receives the abuse, and personally suffers the harm.

The listed URLs are not ordinary criticism or fair consumer opinion. They are part of a repeated Facebook/Meta and Google Search visibility problem involving false allegations about billing, cancellation, payment handling, customer support, service access, refunds, PayPal disputes, deliberate server sabotage, reset-looping communities, forcing players away from communities, and malicious interference with customer servers.

The material falsely alleges or implies that the affected sole trader dishonestly charged a customer, failed to cancel a subscription, charged a customer for a year when the customer had only subscribed the month before, refused paid service, ignored support, denied a customer use of the service, acted scam-like in a PayPal dispute, or deliberately sabotages customer servers and communities by reset-looping servers and forcing players away.

These are serious factual allegations. They are false. They are not protected opinion. They are being used to damage an identifiable Australian adult and sole trader, interfere with that person's business, frighten prospective customers, and divert users searching for the affected service or related DayZ console services.

The affected person has already attempted to use Meta/Facebook's own reporting process. The supplied Meta "Reports about others" screenshot shows repeated reports made through Meta's own app/reporting system across 2025 and 2026, including reports concerning Joel Walker/Joe L Walker posts and comments, harassment, hate speech, nudity, self-injury, regulated products, promoting violence, and related abusive Facebook activity. This evidence is supplied to show that the affected person did not ignore Meta's process. He repeatedly tried Meta's reporting tools, and Meta's process failed to remove or meaningfully stop the abusive material.

The competitor context is material. The Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA Facebook URL is connected to the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com. That post does not merely criticise the affected service. It publishes a serious accusation that the affected sole trader deliberately sabotages communities by reset-looping servers and forcing players to leave. That claim directly attacks personal reputation, business trust, customer safety perception, software safety, and commercial viability.

The other Facebook material falsely turns self-managed subscription conduct, refusal to use the ticket system, proven service use, and a PayPal dispute outcome into public allegations of dishonest service, non-delivery, poor support, or scam-like payment conduct. Google is now on repeated notice that this content is not neutral public discussion. It is defamatory publication, commercial harm, failed Meta moderation, and search amplification targeting a sole trader personally through that person's business identity.

The harm is ongoing because Google is not merely passively linking to material in this context. Google Search ranks it, previews it, excerpts it, redirects to it through Google-controlled URLs, and may summarise it in search features or AI-generated outputs. When Google surfaces this material beside searches for the affected sole trader, the affected service, or related commercial searches, Google gives false and harmful Facebook material reach, visibility and credibility that it would not otherwise have.

Applicable legal issues include:

- Defamation Act 2005 (NSW)

The material identifies the affected sole trader and the affected service. It carries serious defamatory imputations, including dishonest billing, scam-like conduct, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, dishonest payment handling, deliberate server sabotage, reset-looping customer servers, forcing players away from communities, and deliberately destroying communities. These imputations are likely to cause, and have caused, serious harm to the affected person's personal reputation and sole trader business.

- Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth)

The material forms part of targeted cyber abuse against an Australian adult. It is harassing and offensive in context, including repeated Facebook posts, failed Meta reports, competitor-linked pile-ons, public attacks against the affected person's business identity, and repeated attempts to drive distrust, harassment and ostracism against the affected person.

- Google legal removal process

Google's own legal removal process allows removal or restriction where content violates law or rights, including defamation, privacy/personal data, local law, and other legal grounds. This request gives Google the specific URLs, the exact nature of the unlawful content, the applicable legal issues, the identity of the person harmed through the form's claimant/contact fields, and the requested action.

- Failed Meta/Facebook reporting process

The affected person has already used Meta/Facebook's reporting tools. The supplied Meta reports screenshot shows repeated reports through Meta's own app/reporting system. Meta's reporting process has failed. The material remains available, searchable and harmful. Google should not rely on Meta's failure to act as a reason to continue indexing, ranking, previewing, redirecting to or summarising the same material.

Ordinary platform reporting paths have already failed. Meta/Facebook's reporting process has failed. The material remains available, searchable, and harmful. Private legal proceedings are not a realistic first-step remedy simply to force Meta or Google to assign a human reviewer. Google is therefore being placed on repeat formal notice through the available legal removal pathway.

I request that Google now:

- remove or de-index the listed URLs from Google Search;
- suppress snippets, previews and cached/derived search text that repeats the defamatory allegations;
- prevent Google AI Mode, AI Overviews, generated summaries, panels or search features from summarising or legitimising the allegations;

- assess the URLs together as a connected Facebook/Meta abuse and defamation issue, not as isolated criticism;
- take into account that Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed;
- take into account the supplied Meta reports screenshot showing repeated reports through Meta's own reporting system;
- preserve this request, prior requests, internal review notes, escalation notes, decision records and any automated or human review outputs;
- provide a human-reviewed written decision if Google refuses removal;
- identify the legal or policy basis relied on if Google continues surfacing the material after notice.

This is repeat notice. Google has been told the specific URLs, the exact allegations, the false and harmful nature of the content, the payment and support context, the PayPal outcome, the competitor-linked context, the failure of Meta reporting pathways, the supplied Meta reports evidence, and the fact that an Australian adult and sole trader is personally harmed by this material.

This request does not seek suppression of genuine criticism. It seeks removal or restriction of defamatory and commercially harmful material falsely accusing an identifiable Australian adult and sole trader of dishonest billing, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, scam-like payment conduct, customer sabotage, deliberate server reset-looping, and deliberate destruction of communities.

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.

REPORTED URLS:

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1103015490737168/posts/1440078317030882/>
- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_peuUAXuYoYOsIHToxEmMQFnoECDIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
- <https://share.google/2G7AjXapqQZ464Mhl>
- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_peuUAXuYoYOsIHToxEmMQ77oQegQINxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F%23%3A~%3Atext%3DHas%2520anybody%2520ever%2520used%2520legion%2Cremark%2520back%2520on%2520the%2520ticket.&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449
- <https://share.google/JDuWOisSV2bNGkhz0>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Cg9kGNDKJ/>

REQUESTED ACTION:

I request that Google remove or de-index the listed URLs from Google Search, and suppress any snippets, previews, summaries, AI Mode results, AI Overviews, panels or generated search outputs that repeat or legitimise the allegations.

I also request that Google take into account that Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed. The affected sole trader has repeatedly attempted to use Meta's own reporting process, and the supplied Meta reports screenshot shows repeated reports made through Meta's app/reporting system.

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

- Was this request reviewed by a human?
- What jurisdiction was applied?
- What legal basis did Google assess?
- Why does Google consider the listed Facebook material lawful to continue surfacing after repeated notice?
- Why does Google consider false allegations of dishonest billing, non-delivery of paid service, refusal to provide support, scam-like payment conduct, deliberate server sabotage and community destruction to be ordinary criticism?
- Why does Google continue to surface this material when Meta/Facebook reporting pathways have failed?
- How did Google account for the supplied Meta reports screenshot showing repeated reports through Meta's own reporting system?
- How did Google account for the Ko-fi subscription context, including that the customer did not cancel through the proper self-managed subscription pathway?
- How did Google account for the support-ticket context, including that the customer refused to use the required ticket system?
- How did Google account for service-use logs proving that the customer did receive use?
- How did Google account for PayPal ruling in favour of the affected sole trader?
- How did Google account for the competitor-linked Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA context associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com?
- What records will Google preserve regarding this request and prior related notices?
- Whether any Google Search, Google Ads, Google Business, Google indexing, SEO, promotion, or advertising relationship, payment, campaign, or search product activity connected to Joel Walker, Make DayZ Great Again, mdzga.com, Facebook groups, Meta/Facebook pages, or related competitor-linked domains was considered or excluded when assessing the visibility of these URLs.

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 Meta/Facebook reporting pathway, the supplied Meta reports evidence, the Google-controlled redirect/share URL issue, the payment and support context, the PayPal outcome, 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.

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, failed Meta moderation, 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, uses false customer claims to damage business trust, uses competitor-linked attack material to divert users, or forms part of the same connected 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.

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18rcFr9x6P/>

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/258885353225964/permalink/761525699628591/>

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: These Facebook URLs concern a false billing and cancellation allegation against the affected sole trader and service. The poster never cancelled the subscription through the actual subscription provider. The poster tried to say he had been charged for a year, when he had only subscribed the month before. The poster then left the Discord server and blamed the affected sole trader for not knowing that he wanted the subscription stopped. The subscription was self-managed through <https://ko-fi.com/>, meaning the customer had the ability and responsibility to manage or cancel the subscription through Ko-fi.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It falsely presents a self-managed subscription issue as dishonest billing, improper charging, or scam-like conduct by the affected sole trader. The customer did not cancel through the proper self-managed Ko-fi subscription pathway. The affected sole trader could not fairly be blamed because the customer left Discord and did not cancel through the subscription provider.

The false allegation creates the impression that the affected sole trader knowingly charged the customer incorrectly, charged a longer period than the customer subscribed for, ignored cancellation, or retained payment dishonestly. Those allegations are commercially serious because the affected business depends on customer trust in billing, support, subscription handling and payment fairness.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the customer did not cancel;
- the customer tried to say he had been charged for a year;
- the customer had only subscribed the month before;
- the customer left the Discord server;
- the customer blamed the affected sole trader for not knowing he wanted cancellation;
- the subscription was self-managed through <https://ko-fi.com/>;
- cancellation had to be handled through Ko-fi by the customer.

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 imputation that the affected sole trader improperly charged a customer, mishandled cancellation, or acted dishonestly in relation to subscription payments. It also contributes to an adult cyber-abuse context under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material forms part of repeated public attacks against an Australian adult and sole trader.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel and commercial disparagement issues because it asserts or implies false facts about payment handling, subscription conduct and dishonest business practice. If amplified in a competitor-linked or commercially hostile 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 falsely implying dishonest billing or scam-like payment conduct. It may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed as part of a repeated course of conduct targeting the same person and business.

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 about billing and customer payment handling are used to damage the service commercially.

- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/18eJYxhmeD/>

- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/1103015490737168/posts/1440078317030882/>

- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_puUAXuYoYOsIHToxEmMQFnoECDIQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449

- <https://share.google/2G7AjXapqQZ464Mhl>

- https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwiUrr7_puUAXuYoYOsIHToxEmMQ77oQegQINxAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.facebook.com%2Fgroups%2F1103015490737168%2Fposts%2F1440078317030882%2F%23%3A~%3Atext%3DHas%2520anybody%2520ever%2520used%2520legion%2Cremark%2520back%2520on%2520the%2520ticket.&usg=AOvVaw3WGnk1GkC93umqCwqrWaxM&opi=89978449

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: These Facebook and Google-controlled redirect/search/share URLs concern a false support, service access and payment-dispute allegation against the affected sole trader and service. The poster is completely telling lies. The poster repeatedly refused to use the proper ticket system, threw a tantrum, then claimed he did not get use of the service. The logs prove that he did get use of the service.

PayPal reviewed the dispute and ruled in favour of the affected sole trader.

WHY THIS IS UNLAWFUL / LEGALLY ACTIONABLE: This is not ordinary criticism. It falsely presents a customer's refusal to use the required support process as a failure by the affected sole trader to provide service. It also falsely implies non-delivery, scam conduct, dishonest payment retention, or refusal to provide paid service even though the service-use logs contradict that claim and PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader.

The ticket system is material. The affected service uses a ticket process so support issues can be tracked, answered, logged and handled properly. A customer who refuses to use the support pathway cannot fairly turn around and publicly claim that support was not provided, especially where logs show actual service use.

The PayPal outcome is also material. The customer raised the payment dispute through PayPal, and PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader. That directly supports the position that the customer's public Facebook allegation is not a reliable statement of fact and should not be treated by Google as a reliable consumer warning.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the customer repeatedly refused to use the ticket system;
- the customer escalated publicly instead of using the required support pathway;
- the customer falsely claimed he did not get use of the service;
- service logs prove the customer did get use of the service;
- PayPal reviewed the dispute;
- PayPal ruled in favour of the affected sole trader;
- the Facebook post and Google redirect/share URLs continue to surface the false allegation despite those facts.

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 serious false imputations that the affected sole trader failed to provide paid service, acted dishonestly, ignored support, or scammed a customer. It also contributes to targeted adult cyber-abuse under the Online Safety Act 2021 (Cth), because the material is part of repeated public attacks against an Australian adult and sole trader.

UNITED STATES: This raises state-law defamation, trade libel and commercial disparagement issues because it asserts or implies false facts about non-delivery, payment handling and dishonest business conduct. Where a false customer story is used to deter users from subscribing or to redirect them away from the affected service, it may also support unfair competition arguments depending on the surrounding facts.

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 falsely implying scam-like conduct, non-delivery of paid service, or dishonest handling of a dispute. It may also support harassment analysis under the Protection from Harassment Act 1997 if assessed with the broader repeated public campaign.

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 where false claims about paid service and support are used to damage the service commercially.

- <https://share.google/JDuWOisSV2bNGkhz0>
- <https://www.facebook.com/groups/makedayzgreatagain/posts/1481591939589293/>
- <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1Cg9kGNDKJ/>

WHAT THESE URLS ARE: 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. The Google share URL and Facebook share URL continue to surface or route users to the same defamatory Facebook material.

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 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.

The URL-specific facts are:

- the Google share URL surfaces or routes users to the defamatory Facebook material;
- the Facebook group post is in the Make DayZ Great Again / MDZGA environment;
- the Facebook share URL surfaces or routes users to the same defamatory material;
- the post claims users of the affected service risk having their server "reset looped";
- the post claims the affected sole trader will "force" players to leave their community;
- the post claims the affected sole trader "literally bragged" about forcing communities to die;
- the post is connected to a competitor-linked environment associated with Joel Walker and mdzga.com;
- the allegations attack the safety and trustworthiness of the affected service's technical access and tools.

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.

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 Facebook URLs is legally unreasonable because Google has been placed on notice that the material is false, abusive, commercially harmful, competitor-linked in part, and directly damaging to an Australian sole trader.

The affected sole trader does not merely deny the allegations. The affected sole trader has payment-platform outcomes, support-system records, service-use logs, Meta report evidence and platform context showing that the Facebook allegations are false or materially misleading. That means Google has access to credible first-party and platform-context evidence showing the Facebook material is unreliable, while the reported Facebook/Google URL content consists of unsupported defamatory allegations from hostile or competitor-linked sources with no comparable credibility.

By continuing to index, rank, preview, redirect to, or summarise the defamatory Facebook content after notice, Google is effectively giving search preference to unverified Facebook allegations over verifiable payment, support, service-use and Meta-report evidence. 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 supplied.

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 defamatory Facebook material over credible evidence supplied by the affected sole trader.

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
