
Re: We've received your inquiry - Case #02997903

From Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Date Sat 2026-07-11 4:50 PM

To Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>

Cc sama@trustpilot.com <sama@trustpilot.com>; frci@trustpilot.com <frci@trustpilot.com>; Privacy - Trust Pilot <privacy@trustpilot.com>; Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>; Trustpilot Legal <legal@trustpilot.com>; Support <support@trustpilot.com>

Bcc Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>; Trustpilot Legal <legal@trustpilot.com>; Privacy - Trust Pilot <privacy@trustpilot.com>; Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>; Support <support@trustpilot.com>

Trustpilot Privacy, Legal, Content Integrity, Trust & Safety and Escalations,

WITHOUT PREJUDICE SAVE AS TO COSTS

This is not another review flag, moderation appeal, request for an AI assessment, or invitation to apply Trustpilot's internal guidelines again.

This is a formal exercise of my rights as a data subject under Articles 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21 and, where applicable, 22 of the General Data Protection Regulation. It is also a formal access and correction request under Australian Privacy Principles 10, 11, 12 and 13, together with a formal objection to Trustpilot's continued public processing and dissemination of inaccurate, retaliatory, identity-linked personal information.

I require Trustpilot to immediately restrict and then erase every public Trustpilot association with:

- Anthony Gordon Brodie
- Anthony Brodie
- Anthony "Soul" Brodie
- Soul
- Legion Killfeed
- killfeed.co
- ABN 28 387 377 607
- legionkillfeed@outlook.com
- legion.killfeed@gmail.com
- my domains, services and sole-trader business identity

This demand includes the entire Legion Killfeed business profile, all positive and negative reviews, ratings, TrustScores, review counts, reviewer pages where linked to my business, public replies, review URLs, profile URLs, snippets, category listings, structured data, schema, APIs, widgets, syndicated copies, search-engine previews, cached public copies, recommendation systems, automated summaries and every other Trustpilot-controlled public output associating my identity or sole-trader business with Trustpilot.

TRUSTPILOT HAS NOW RECEIVED MORE THAN ENOUGH NOTICE

Trustpilot cannot continue treating each review, flag reason, account and ticket as an isolated complaint.

Trustpilot has received extensive evidence showing a connected pattern of fake, coordinated, retaliatory, non-customer and competitor-linked review activity, followed by repeated removal, restoration, reinstatement and republication decisions.

The latest evidence analysis now records:

- 2,480 archived evidence files;
- 2,463 indexed evidence records;
- 479 dated entries;
- 23 indexed negative Trustpilot review records;
- 928 cumulative Trustpilot review-days;
- 432 Trustpilot email-like records;
- 395 Trustpilot report, notice or ticket-like records; and
- 72 documented Trustpilot reinstatements or republications.
- 158 unique ticket numbers.

28160552, 2792148, 28160563, 28203846, 28404349, 394429555, 4244928184, 28528230, 28528963, 28534570, 868175761, 28609776, 28529892, 28652546, 2819333, 69099323, 29744153, 30557692, 395832037, 395811633, 395818496, 30380870, 6039589379, 6439581626, 30727397, 1144725979, 49395833417, 32705219, 32803720, 572818122, 00133145, 34628817, 34879453, 35389509, 00211291, 35804849, 36068000, 35805033, 36629468, 477648, 00236061, 36723684, 532218705, 36717486, 36717487, 65284234, 20299857, 36755418, 36755424, 477702, 477703, 00238048, 00238051, 00239391, 20298579, 68930795, 36822738, 36813814, 36825856, 36814421, 87520717, 00239419, 30757397, 36874026, 36887964, 3688797, 36887971, 36820213, 98747292, 36869833, 36870620, 00235919, 00236099, 36723702, 36723701, 159021570, 68960356, 6897666658536, 20276303, 8115909026785, 479283, 37034853, 00243680, 479284, 00243681, 65476697, 37049350, 00243840, 479303, 00243917, 159012813448, 3682278, 20292485, 36755412, 202782458093165, 9861015587, 37161848, 202975934, 480518, 033188836, 480519, 37313875, 37334669, 37617523, 00211219, 484088, 37940331, 38210515, 38336233, 38355990, 38355991, 38355992, 38355995, 38357538, 00401535, 38924219, 00401546, 00678931, 00697534, 00695808, 00708120, 00709529, 00709906, 00710485, 00709812, 00710446, 00713084, 00713193, 00716002, 00718641, 00718647, 00713224, 00725903, 00725905, 00734872, 508859, 00743229, 39666891, 39666963, 39648298, 00751042, 00749991, 00843340, 00843231, 00780964, 00982400, 01086918, 01067484, 01067477, 01161135, 01179644, 01164210, 01164686, 38931812, 02649286, 02924287, 02920251, 02950802, 02961099

Trustpilot has also previously been informed of a 56% revenue decline, active subscriptions falling from 139 to 72, and 23 customers lost following the publication of one "ABSOLUTE SCAM" review. These figures establish that the damage is not theoretical, minor or confined to one dissatisfied reviewer.

THE JULY 2026 REVIEW-BOMBING PATTERN

On 2 July 2026 at 8:16 AM, an account named "Kyle" published a one-star review:

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a4572011fcac4675daf6489>

Four minutes later, at 8:20 AM, an account named "Killfeed review" published another one-star review:

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a457305a8a2ed5debe10bdb>

On 3 July 2026, an account using my own first name, "Anthony", submitted another one-star review:

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a46fba336d191dad04c0abc>

All three publications used generic website-design complaints. They did not identify a subscription, invoice, Discord account, Nitrado server, support ticket, bot interaction, customer account, payment, service period or other genuine transaction with Legion Killfeed.

The "Kyle" and "Killfeed review" publications appeared four minutes apart and used substantially overlapping complaints about:

- mobile display;
- website colours;
- difficulty reading content;
- layout problems; and
- distracting design elements.

The "Anthony" publication followed the next day with another generic complaint about colours, layout, spacing and an outdated design.

That timing and similarity are not incidental. Trustpilot was already on notice of the existing campaign when these reviews appeared.

DIRECT ACCOUNT-LINKAGE EVIDENCE IGNORED BY TRUSTPILOT

The "Killfeed review" Trustpilot profile contains an earlier TeamViewer review dated 1 July 2023.

TeamViewer's public reply to that account begins: "Hi Mathew"

That is direct account-linkage evidence identifying the person behind or associated with the "Killfeed review" profile as Mathew.

Trustpilot had already been supplied evidence connecting that account to Mathew Trojanowski and to repeated competitor-linked attacks involving a competing DayZ killfeed service.

This is not speculation created after the review appeared. The identifying evidence exists on Trustpilot's own platform, inside the reviewer's own public review history.

Trustpilot nevertheless ran the publication through its AI-powered defamation process, declared it non-defamatory, restored it and told me to “tell my side of the story”.

Trustpilot's assessment ignored:

- the reviewer-profile evidence;
- the TeamViewer reply identifying “Mathew”;
- the four-minute timing;
- the substantially overlapping review language;
- the absence of any customer transaction;
- the direct competitive context; and
- the extensive prior history already supplied to Trustpilot.

THE “KYLE” HISTORY WAS ALSO ALREADY KNOWN

Trustpilot was previously given evidence concerning a “Kyle” review against my related DayZ Multi Tool service.

That earlier review remained visible for approximately 559 days and generated:

- 91 emails;
- six reinstatements; and
- 18 associated ticket numbers.

It was eventually removed only after extensive evidence and repeated correspondence concerning fabrication and competitor linkage.

The July 2026 “Kyle” publication against Legion Killfeed cannot reasonably be assessed as though Trustpilot had never seen the name, history or evidence before.

Trustpilot's own public page also displayed a banner stating that its automated software had flagged the current “Kyle” review for containing harmful or illegal content.

Despite that automated warning and the previous history, the publication remained accessible.

THE NEW RAY SMITH PUBLICATION IS EXPRESSLY RETALIATORY

On 10 July 2026, “Ray Smith” published a further one-star review:

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a4fa6d6a8376e6c23bb2e6d>

This was not simply a repetition of an earlier customer allegation. The new publication expressly states:

“Want to make sure this is still visible as he reported it for illegal content which it's not.”

That sentence establishes that continued publication following my legal report was itself an objective of the new review.

The publication further alleges that I:

- revoked access with sixteen paid days remaining;
- became abusive and threatening;
- lied about poor reviews being competitor-linked;
- tracked the reviewer's location to the United Kingdom; and
- attempted to make a false police report.

These are factual allegations about an identifiable natural person. They concern my alleged conduct, communications, supposed use of location information, supposed interaction with police, professional integrity and personal character.

They are therefore personal data about me, regardless of whether Trustpilot presents them beneath my sole-trader business profile.

The reviewer also directs readers toward Reddit, thereby using Trustpilot to amplify the separate hostile Reddit campaign already repeatedly reported.

Trustpilot cannot reasonably call this an independent review when it expressly announces an intention to preserve visibility after an illegal-content report and republishes allegations concerning the reporting process itself.

TRUSTPILOT'S REPEATED REINSTATEMENT DECISIONS

Trustpilot has repeatedly restored or maintained the Ray Smith, Killfeed review and related publications through different ticket pathways.

Trustpilot stated that the Ray Smith review was assessed using an "AI-powered defamation tool". Trustpilot determined that the material was not defamatory, reinstated it and told me to reply publicly.

On 9 July 2026, Trustpilot stated that it had again assessed the Ray Smith publication for:

- harmful or illegal content;
- personal information; and
- advertising or promotional content.

Trustpilot again put the review online.

Trustpilot disclosed that it may use automated detection technology, human experts or a combination of both, but did not identify:

which method was actually used;

- whether a human read the complete evidence;
- what information was supplied to the automated system;
- what information the system ignored;
- what score, classification or confidence level was produced;
- whether the account history was examined;
- or whether the July review was compared with the earlier removed or disputed versions.

Cases #02920251 and #02924287

Trustpilot assessed the disputed publications under narrowly separated flag categories, declared them compliant and restored or maintained them.

Trustpilot stated that reviews are "owned by the users themselves" and that Trustpilot cannot remove them unless its own guidelines are breached.

That response is legally irrelevant to this privacy demand.

A reviewer may author words, but Trustpilot determines the purposes and means of:

- collection;
- storage;
- publication;
- ranking;
- TrustScore calculation;
- search visibility;
- structured-data distribution;
- moderation;
- restoration;
- reinstatement;
- recommendation;
- indexing; and
- continued dissemination.

Trustpilot is responsible for Trustpilot's processing. It cannot avoid controller responsibility by saying the reviewer owns the words.

Case #02961099

Trustpilot confirmed reactivation, declared the decision final, closed the case and instructed me not to reply because the address was not monitored.

Case #02950802

Trustpilot initially refused to investigate the appeal because another investigation was allegedly still in progress. This left the matter circulating through overlapping, isolated and contradictory procedures while Trustpilot retained control of publication.

Other-company report

Trustpilot refused action because it considered the review sufficiently connected with my business and stated that a reviewer need not have purchased anything.

That generic position does not answer evidence that an account was fabricated, coordinated, retaliatory or linked to a competitor.

A person does not need to complete a purchase to have a genuine experience, but Trustpilot cannot use that principle to disregard evidence that no genuine experience occurred at all.

TRUSTPILOT'S DELIBERATE PROCEDURAL FRAGMENTATION

Trustpilot repeatedly instructs me to flag the same publication again under a different reason.

Trustpilot then assesses only the selected checkbox and refuses to examine the combined evidence.

Trustpilot has separately processed the same or related material as:

- defamation;
- harmful or illegal content;
- personal information;
- advertising or promotional content;
- a review of another business;
- hate speech or discriminatory content; and
- proof of a genuine experience.

This fragmentation permits Trustpilot to repeatedly state that one specific category was not breached while avoiding the cumulative evidence of:

- false identity;
- duplicate or coordinated accounts;
- competitor linkage;
- retaliatory purpose;
- repeated republication;
- non-customer content;
- commercial sabotage;
- false factual allegations;
- privacy-invasive allegations;
- prior platform notice; and
- serious financial harm.

Trustpilot then closes cases, disables replies, redirects me to another form and starts the process again.

That is not a meaningful remedy. It is procedural obstruction controlled entirely by Trustpilot.

RETALIATION THROUGH BRAND, FLAGGING AND "SCRAPING" THREATS

On 17 September 2024, under ticket #28609776, Trustpilot accused me of misusing its brand.

On 22 September 2024, under ticket #28652546, Trustpilot admitted that a disputed review had been "mistakenly brought back online" because of a "technical error".

That admission proves that Trustpilot's own systems can republish disputed material independently of a new publication decision by the reviewer.

On 10 August 2025, under ticket #37049350, Trustpilot accused me of misusing its flagging system after repeated attempts to report fake and defamatory content. My reporting access was restricted while disputed material remained publicly available.

On 3 July 2026, immediately after further formal legal notices, Trustpilot accused me of "scraping" reviews displayed on my own website.

Trustpilot demanded that I remove the material within seven days, instructed me to use Trustpilot-controlled widgets and threatened:

- a warning; and
- a consumer alert on my Trustpilot profile.

Trustpilot made those demands while failing to substantively answer the legal notices concerning the false reviews it was publishing.

Trustpilot's position was effectively:

- Trustpilot may continue publishing disputed material about me;

- Trustpilot may restore and rank that material after notice;
- Trustpilot may direct me to publicly reply on Trustpilot;

but I must remove preserved review material from my own website and use Trustpilot's controlled, potentially paywalled publication methods or face enforcement against my profile.

I treat that conduct as retaliatory pressure arising directly from my preservation and publication of evidence concerning Trustpilot's conduct.

GDPR APPLICATION

Trustpilot A/S is established in Denmark.

GDPR Article 3(1) applies to processing carried out in the context of the activities of an EU establishment regardless of whether the particular processing operation occurs inside or outside the European Union.

The GDPR protects natural persons regardless of nationality or residence where their personal information is processed in the context of an EU establishment.

Legion Killfeed is my sole-trader identity. It is not a separate incorporated person detached from me. Publications concerning my conduct as the owner and operator, my alleged communications, my alleged police reports, my alleged tracking of another person and my alleged dishonesty are information relating directly to me as an identifiable natural person.

ARTICLE 5 – PRINCIPLES AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Trustpilot must demonstrate that its processing is lawful, fair, transparent, limited to legitimate purposes, limited to necessary data, accurate and retained no longer than necessary.

Trustpilot's repeated publication and republication of disputed identity-linked material after extensive accuracy challenges engages the accuracy, fairness and accountability requirements in Article 5.

Trustpilot must identify and document:

- the purpose of every relevant processing operation;
- the lawful basis relied upon;
- the necessity of continuing public publication;
- the accuracy-verification process used;
- the balancing of my rights against any claimed legitimate interest;
- and the measures used to prevent repeated false or retaliatory republication.

ARTICLE 6 – LAWFUL BASIS

Trustpilot must identify the exact Article 6 lawful basis relied upon for every category of processing.

If Trustpilot relies on Article 6(1)(f), it must provide the legitimate-interest assessment showing:

- the precise legitimate interest pursued;
 - why every processing operation is necessary for that interest;
 - how less harmful alternatives were considered;
 - what weight was given to the false-account and competitor-linkage evidence;
 - what weight was given to the serious commercial and personal harm;
 - and why Trustpilot claims its interests override my rights and freedoms after repeated notice.
- A generic statement about transparency, consumer opinion or Trustpilot's guidelines is not a legitimate-interest assessment.

ARTICLE 21 – FORMAL OBJECTION

I formally object to every processing operation based on Article 6(1)(e) or Article 6(1)(f), including:

- public profile publication;
- review publication;
- reviewer association;
- ranking;
- TrustScore calculation;
- indexing;
- search visibility;
- profiling;
- recommendation;

- structured-data output;
- AI assessment;
- restoration;
- reinstatement;
- and republication.

Trustpilot must stop the processing unless it demonstrates compelling legitimate grounds overriding my rights, interests and freedoms, or establishes that the processing is necessary for legal claims.

Trustpilot's commercial interest in maintaining review volume, search traffic, TrustScores, profile pages, widgets or subscriptions does not automatically override my rights.

ARTICLE 18 – IMMEDIATE RESTRICTION

I contest the accuracy of the personal data and the lawfulness of the processing. I have also objected under Article 21.

Article 18 therefore requires restriction while Trustpilot verifies accuracy and determines whether its claimed legitimate grounds override mine.

I require public processing to be restricted within 48 hours as an urgent interim measure.

During restriction, Trustpilot must cease:

- public display;
- ranking;
- TrustScore use;
- indexing;
- recommendation;
- syndication;
- snippet generation;
- structured-data delivery;
- API delivery;
- widget delivery;
- and all other public dissemination.

Trustpilot may preserve a segregated, non-public evidentiary copy where genuinely necessary for legal claims. Evidence preservation is not a basis for leaving the material publicly accessible.

ARTICLE 16 – RECTIFICATION

I require rectification, without undue delay, of inaccurate personal data alleging or implying that I:

- dishonestly revoked paid access;
- failed to provide paid service;
- refused legitimate support;
- made unlawful threats;
- tracked a person's physical location;
- misused location information;
- made a false police report;
- dishonestly handled payments or subscriptions;
- operate a fraudulent or unsafe service;
- fabricated competitor-linked review concerns;
- or engaged in any other alleged factual misconduct contained in the disputed publications.

Where the allegations cannot be verified as accurate, deletion and cessation of public processing are the only effective rectification.

ARTICLE 17 – ERASURE

I require erasure under Article 17(1), including because:

- the data is no longer necessary for the purposes claimed;
- I have objected under Article 21 and Trustpilot has not demonstrated overriding grounds;
- the material has been unlawfully processed;
- the material is inaccurate, retaliatory, excessive or misleading;
- and continued processing is no longer proportionate following extensive notice.

Because Trustpilot made the information public, Article 17(2) requires reasonable steps concerning other controllers processing links, copies or replications.

Trustpilot must therefore take reasonable steps to notify:

- search engines;
- syndication partners;
- widget recipients;
- structured-data recipients;
- contractors;
- affiliates; and
- any other recipients of Trustpilot's public distribution.

If Trustpilot relies on Article 17(3) (a), it must not merely state "freedom of expression".

Trustpilot must identify why each separate processing operation is necessary for expression or information, including:

- the original review text;
- the star rating;
- the TrustScore effect;
- the public profile;
- the indexed URL;
- the search snippet;
- the structured data;
- the syndication;
- the recommendation system;
- the repeated reinstatement;
- and the continued dissemination after notice.

The claimed expressive interest in a review does not automatically justify every additional commercial processing operation performed by Trustpilot.

ARTICLE 15 – COMPLETE ACCESS REQUEST

I require a complete electronic copy of all personal data concerning me and Legion Killfeed, including:

- every review and every version of each review;
- creation, edit, deletion, hiding, restoration and reinstatement timestamps;
- reviewer-account linkage and duplicate-account assessments;
- fraud, authenticity and coordinated-behaviour signals;
- country, referral, invitation and verification metadata capable of lawful disclosure;
- all moderation flags and outcomes;
- all staff notes and escalation notes;
- all legal and privacy reviews;
- all automated-detection results;
- all AI-powered defamation-tool inputs, prompts, outputs, classifications, scores and confidence values;
- all information provided to or withheld from the automated system;
- the identity or role of every human reviewer;
- all records showing whether each decision was automated, human or combined;
- all TrustScore calculations and adjustments;
- all profile-ranking and visibility records;
- all search-engine, schema and structured-data records;
- all recipients and categories of recipients;
- all international transfers and safeguards;
- all retention periods;
- all source information;
- all Article 6 lawful-basis assessments;
- all legitimate-interest assessments;
- all Article 21 balancing assessments;
- all internal communications concerning my legal notices;

- all records concerning tickets #02649286, #02920251, #02924287, #02950802 and #02961099;
- all records concerning #28609776, #28652546, #37049350, #01164686, #38931812 and #00239391;
- all records concerning the "Kyle", "Killfeed review", "Anthony" and "Ray Smith" accounts;
- all records concerning the TeamViewer profile evidence identifying "Mathew";
- all records concerning the July 2026 four-minute review sequence;
- all records concerning the scraping allegation;
- all records concerning the threatened warning and consumer alert;
- and all information concerning internal deletion, alteration or loss of flagging and republication records.

Where disclosure would affect another person's rights, redact only what is strictly necessary. Preserve the complete unredacted information for regulators, police, discovery and court process.

ARTICLE 22 AND AUTOMATED DECISION-MAKING

Trustpilot has expressly stated that it used an AI-powered defamation tool and may use automated detection technology.

Trustpilot must state:

- whether any refusal, reinstatement, ranking or publication decision was based solely on automated processing;
- whether automated processing produced legal or similarly significant effects;
- what human intervention occurred;
- what data and rules were used;
- what logic and principal factors determined the outcome;
- whether account-linkage and timing evidence was supplied to the system;
- and how I may challenge the actual automated determination rather than merely select another flag category.

ARTICLE 19 – RECIPIENT NOTIFICATION

Trustpilot must communicate every rectification, erasure and restriction to each recipient to whom the personal data was disclosed unless it proves that notification is impossible or disproportionate.

I require identification of those recipients or recipient categories.

ARTICLE 12 – RESPONSE DEADLINE

Trustpilot must respond without undue delay and within the statutory GDPR period.

If Trustpilot claims an extension because of complexity, it must notify me within the initial one-month period and give specific reasons.

A generic Content Integrity response, review-guidelines response or instruction to flag again will not constitute a response to this data-subject request.

If Trustpilot refuses any part of this request, it must identify:

- the controller responsible;
- the precise request refused;
- the factual reason;
- the Article 6 lawful basis;
- the Article 17(3) exception, if any;
- the legitimate-interest assessment;
- the Article 21 balancing analysis;
- the retention period;
- the complaint mechanism;
- the competent supervisory authority;
- and my right to judicial remedy.

AUSTRALIAN PRIVACY ACT 1988

Trustpilot conducts business involving Australian users, businesses, profiles and commercial traffic.

Section 5B extends the Privacy Act to overseas acts and practices where the statutory Australian link is established, including an organisation carrying on business in Australia.

Section 15 prohibits an APP entity from breaching an Australian Privacy Principle. Section 13 treats an APP breach as an interference with privacy.

APP 6 limits the use and disclosure of personal information.

APP 10 requires reasonable steps to ensure personal information collected, used or disclosed is accurate, up-to-date, complete and relevant.

APP 11 requires reasonable protection against misuse, interference, loss, unauthorised access, modification and disclosure. Where information is no longer needed for a permitted purpose and no retention exception applies, reasonable steps must be taken to destroy or de-identify it.

APP 12 requires access to personal information held about me.

APP 13 requires reasonable steps to correct personal information that is inaccurate, out-of-date, incomplete, irrelevant or misleading.

I formally request access under APP 12 and correction under APP 13.

If Trustpilot refuses correction, it must provide written reasons and information about available complaint mechanisms. I also require a statement to be associated with any retained information recording that I dispute its accuracy, completeness, relevance and lawfulness.

That statement is not an acceptable substitute for restriction or erasure where those remedies are required.

AUSTRALIAN CONSUMER LAW

I reserve all rights and regulatory complaints under the Australian Consumer Law, including:

- section 18 concerning misleading or deceptive conduct;
- sections 20–22 concerning unconscionable conduct;
- section 29 concerning false or misleading representations;
- section 34 concerning misleading conduct as to the nature or characteristics of services; and
- section 50 concerning harassment or coercion in connection with the supply of services or payment.

The conduct requiring assessment includes Trustpilot presenting profiles, reviews, TrustScores, moderation and reinstatement outcomes as trustworthy consumer information while possessing extensive evidence of fake identities, competitor linkage, coordinated timing, technical republication and unreliable moderation.

It also includes Trustpilot demanding that I remove preserved review material, use Trustpilot-controlled widgets and comply within seven days while threatening warnings or a consumer alert after I served legal notices concerning Trustpilot's own publication conduct.

CRIMINAL CONDUCT ALREADY RAISED FOR INVESTIGATION

I do not withdraw the criminal allegations already raised.

Final criminal liability is a matter for police, prosecutors and courts. Trustpilot does not determine criminal liability by applying its internal guidelines.

Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), section 529 – criminal defamation

Section 529 applies where a person, without lawful excuse, publishes defamatory matter concerning a living person, knowing it is false and intending serious harm or being reckless as to that harm.

The records requiring preservation include every decision by which an employee or contractor, after receiving evidence of falsity, identity manipulation, competitor linkage and serious harm:

- authorised publication;
- refused removal;
- reactivated a review;
- restored a review;
- reinstated a review;
- or knowingly maintained its public distribution.

Whether each person possessed the necessary knowledge and intent is a matter for investigation. Trustpilot must preserve the evidence capable of proving or disproving those elements.

Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), section 249K – unwarranted demand with menaces

Section 249K concerns an unwarranted demand with menaces made with the intention of obtaining a gain, causing a loss or influencing a public duty.

I have raised for investigation Trustpilot's demand that I:

- remove preserved review material from my website;
- stop alleged scraping;

- use Trustpilot-controlled widgets; and
- comply within seven days,
- my threatened warnings and a consumer alert against my business profile.

The demand was issued after legal notice and while Trustpilot continued publishing the material in dispute.

Whether the statutory elements are established is for the proper authorities, not Trustpilot.

Crimes Act 1900 (NSW), section 192E – fraud

Section 192E concerns dishonest deception used to obtain property or a financial advantage, or to cause financial disadvantage.

I have raised for investigation the continued commercial presentation of Trustpilot profiles, ratings, TrustScores, review authenticity and moderation outcomes as reliable consumer information while Trustpilot possessed evidence of:

- coordinated reviews;
- false accounts;
- competitor-linked activity;
- technical-error republication;
- repeated reinstatement;
- and serious financial harm.

Again, whether every element is established is for investigators and courts.

PRESERVATION NOTICE

Trustpilot and every recipient of this notice must preserve:

- review content and prior versions;
- reviewer-account records;
- login and access records;
- IP and device-linkage records;
- duplicate-account analysis;
- fraud and authenticity signals;
- timestamps;
- flagging records;
- moderation records;
- automated-tool inputs and outputs;
- human-review notes;
- legal-review notes;
- privacy-review notes;
- staff identities;
- internal communications;
- TrustScore records;
- ranking records;
- structured-data records;
- search-engine delivery records;
- reinstatement records;
- technical-error logs;
- consumer-alert deliberations;
- scraping and brand-enforcement records;
- and every other record relevant to publication, removal, restoration, refusal, retaliation and resulting damage.

Do not delete, alter, overwrite, merge or destroy evidence because a review is removed or an account is closed.

Trustpilot must now:

- Immediately restrict the Ray Smith, Kyle, Killfeed review, Anthony and every other disputed publication.
- Erase every public Trustpilot association with Anthony Brodie, Soul, Legion Killfeed and killfeed.co.
- Remove the entire Legion Killfeed business profile.
- Remove every positive and negative review, rating, TrustScore and review count.
- Remove all profile pages, review pages, public replies, snippets, structured data, API output, widget output and syndicated content.

- Notify search engines and other recipients of the restriction or erasure.
- Prevent automatic recreation, restoration or republication.
- Provide the complete Article 15 and APP 12 data package.
- Correct all inaccurate or misleading personal information.
- State whether each disputed decision was automated, human or combined.
- Provide every legitimate-interest and balancing assessment.
- Withdraw the scraping accusation and threatened consumer alert.
- Preserve a segregated evidentiary copy only where legally necessary.
- Identify every controller, processor, recipient and international transfer involved.
- Confirm in writing that no further review, score, profile or Trustpilot association will be published concerning my identity or sole-trader business.

I will not submit another review flag.

I will not select another checkbox.

I will not accept another AI-powered defamation assessment.

I will not accept another instruction to publicly argue beneath material Trustpilot has chosen to publish.

I will not accept "our guidelines" as an answer to statutory rights.

I will not accept the claim that reviewers own Trustpilot's processing.

I will not permit Trustpilot to continue forcing the same material through disconnected flag categories while refusing to examine the evidence cumulatively.

If Trustpilot refuses, delays or provides another template response, I will provide the complete record to:

- the Danish Data Protection Agency;
- the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner;
- the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission;
- NSW Police and any other competent law-enforcement authority; and
- the courts or tribunals with jurisdiction over access, correction, restriction, erasure, compensation, injunctions and unlawful processing.

I reserve all rights under GDPR Articles 77, 79 and 82, the Privacy Act 1988, the Australian Consumer Law, defamation law and criminal law.

No further reinstatement.

No further republication.

No further template response.

Remove everything and confirm completion.

Anthony "Soul" Brodie

Owner and sole trader, Legion Killfeed

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

Sent: Saturday, 11 July 2026 4:38 PM

To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Subject: We've received your inquiry - Case #02997903

Hi Anthony,

Thanks, we've received your inquiry entitled 'Inbound enquiry - Other' and we'll look into it shortly. We aim to get back to you within 3 days.

In the meantime, you can check our [Help Center](#) for some useful information.

If you have any updates or additional details to share, just reply to this email without changing the subject line.

Thanks again for contacting us.

Best,



We are rated **4.4** out of 5

Trustpilot trades on the London Stock Exchange under the ticker **TRST**

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

Trustpilot A/S

Pilestraede 58, 5th floor, 1112 Copenhagen K, Denmark

Company no. 30276582