
Re: Consumer has updated review

From Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Date Mon 2026-07-13 8:22 PM

To Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>; sama@trustpilot.com <sama@trustpilot.com>; Trustpilot Legal <legal@trustpilot.com>; Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>; Privacy - Trust Pilot <privacy@trustpilot.com>; Support <support@trustpilot.com>; revenue@trustpilot.com <revenue@trustpilot.com>; gime@trustpilot.com <gime@trustpilot.com>; Jawayne Paisley <jap@trustpilot.com>; carolyn.jameson@trustpilot.com <carolyn.jameson@trustpilot.com>; amk@trustpilot.com <amk@trustpilot.com>

To Trustpilot Privacy, Legal, Content Integrity, Escalations and Revenue Technology and all the other retards working for you dogs.

Your email of 13 July 2026 is rejected. It does not resolve the Ray Smith report, and it completely ignores the substantially broader legal, privacy, restriction and site-wide removal demands already served on Trustpilot.

Describing this as “good news” because the reviewer replaced one version of the review with another is inappropriate. The revised review continues to publish serious false and misleading factual allegations about me and Legion Killfeed.

For absolute clarity, **I am not disputing that Ray Smith was a customer**. Stop reducing this matter to whether he can produce proof of purchase. His customer status does not make every factual allegation he publishes true, nor does it excuse a materially misleading reconstruction of the support interaction.

The actual Ray Smith dispute

The preserved Discord record shows the following sequence.

Ray Smith contacted support asking whether Legion Killfeed could operate alongside another bot because he wanted to use that other bot's shop or trader functionality. He said that, if it could not, he would cancel and return when the issue was fixed.

I answered that the shop or trader feature was still being worked on, that threatening to cancel would not change the progress of that work, and that Legion Killfeed would not operate alongside DayZ++ in the manner requested.

Before the later argument occurred, Ray Smith had already removed Legion Killfeed from his server himself.

This directly contradicts his review's claim that:

“my access to the bot was revoked despite having 16 days left on my paid subscription.”

I did not revoke his access. He removed the bot. The review converts his own decision into an allegation that I cut off a paying customer mid-subscription.

The review also claims that I personally told him I did not have “the time or the crayons to explain things” while he was merely asking a reasonable question.

The preserved record shows that this line was generated by the **Legion Support Manager bot**, not personally directed by me to Ray Smith. It was automatically triggered by wording in my own message. I immediately explained in the same conversation that the response had come from the bot and had been directed at my message.

Ray Smith continued treating that automated response as though it had been deliberately written and sent by me to insult him. The later review then repeated that misattribution as a central part of its narrative.

That is not a minor difference of interpretation. It changes who made the statement, who it was directed toward, and the context in which it appeared.

The record also contradicts the review's assertion that Ray Smith remained “measured throughout.” He:

- accused me of arrogance;
- questioned my intelligence;
- said I lacked the ability to understand basic reasoning;
- repeatedly characterised the entire bot as being down;
- continued arguing after being told that only a specific unfinished feature was affected;
- relied on the automated bot response after being expressly told that it was not a personal response to him;
- introduced external Reddit allegations into the dispute;
- and continued provoking a confrontation after he had already removed the bot himself.

I did respond bluntly and used profanity during the escalating argument. I have never concealed that. However, admitting my own language does not require me to accept a review that falsely states I revoked access, falsely attributes an automated bot message to me, omits that the reviewer removed the bot himself, and depicts the reviewer as entirely calm while the evidence shows reciprocal hostility and deliberate escalation.

The support record also distinguishes between:

- the Legion Killfeed service as a whole;
- a particular shop or trader feature that was not fully functional;
- and compatibility with a separate competitor's bot.

Ray Smith repeatedly collapsed those separate matters into the claim that “the bot” was down. Legion Killfeed itself had continued operating. The affected or incomplete feature was not a separate paid product, and the subscription included the available features collectively rather than charging Ray Smith separately for that unfinished component.

His original review therefore presented several disputed assertions as established fact:

- that I revoked his access;
- that the complete bot service was down;
- that I personally directed the “crayons” statement at him;
- that he remained measured throughout;
- and that the dispute began merely because a reasonable customer asked for an estimated repair time.

The preserved conversation contradicts each of those material parts of the account.

The revised review is not a correction

The new version does not correct the misleading account. It abandons much of the original service narrative and replaces it with allegations that I:

- engage in deceptive practices;
- knowingly make false claims about customers;
- dishonestly label customers as competitors;
- intentionally manipulate Trustpilot reports;
- unlawfully suppress consumer feedback;
- violate the FTC’s Trade Regulation Rule;
- commit unfair and deceptive trade practices;
- lie to bury poor ratings;
- and cannot be trusted.

It also incorrectly describes Legion Killfeed as a “US-based business.” Legion Killfeed is operated by an Australian sole trader under ABN 28 387 377 607.

The reviewer is not merely expressing dissatisfaction. He is asserting dishonesty, deliberate evidence manipulation, regulatory violations and unlawful commercial conduct as facts.

Trustpilot’s position appears to be that a reviewer can avoid one defamation complaint by replacing the challenged allegations with an entirely new set of criminal, regulatory and dishonesty allegations. That is not meaningful moderation.

Trustpilot must not mark this report resolved merely because the wording changed.

The reviewer’s conduct supports an inference that the confrontation and review were deliberate

I accept that Ray Smith had a genuine subscription. That is not the disputed point.

The concern is that his conduct supports the inference that he was attempting to create and prolong a confrontation that could later be converted into a negative review.

He had already indicated that he would remove the bot and return later. He then removed it himself. Despite that, he continued the argument, repeatedly distorted the distinction between the entire service and one feature, continued relying on an automated message after its origin was explained, accused me of lacking intelligence, and later published a review stating that I had revoked his access.

His subsequent revisions increasingly moved away from any genuine description of the service and toward attacking my honesty, my reporting of reviews and my supposed violation of US federal regulation.

That pattern is relevant whether or not he was originally a paying customer. Customer status is not immunity from scrutiny where the evidence indicates that the interaction was deliberately escalated and then materially misrepresented.

Trustpilot must assess the surrounding review activity cumulatively

This review does not exist in isolation.

On 2 July 2026, two separate accounts published one-star reviews four minutes apart:

- “Kyle” at 8:16 AM; and
- “Killfeed review” at 8:20 AM.

Both reviews used strikingly similar structures and complaints. Each claimed to have browsed the website, encountered multiple access or navigation problems, found that mobile viewing did not display properly, objected to colour choices affecting readability, and complained about elements distracting from the main content.

The wording was not merely negative in the same general way. The topics, ordering and sentence structure substantially overlapped.

I am not claiming that the timing alone conclusively proves that Ray Smith controlled those accounts. I am stating that Trustpilot had already been given evidence of clustered, repetitive and potentially coordinated review activity and was required to examine the cumulative pattern rather than isolate each review and produce standardised decisions.

Ray Smith’s escalating revisions, the four-minute review pair, the other disputed accounts and the documented history of reinstatements and republications are all relevant to whether Trustpilot’s systems have enabled organised misuse of my business profile.

Trustpilot cannot simultaneously

- refuse to assess the wider pattern;
- isolate each review from the others;
- allow reviewers to repeatedly rewrite allegations;
- describe each rewrite as a successful resolution;
- and then publish an adverse warning against my business when I preserve and display the resulting evidence.

You have ignored the actual demand: complete site-wide removal

My formal notices did not merely request another review assessment.

I demanded complete restriction and removal of every Trustpilot-controlled public association with:

- Anthony Gordon Brodie;
- Anthony Brodie;
- Anthony “Soul” Brodie;
- Soul;
- Legion Killfeed;
- killfeed.co;
- ABN 28 387 377 607;
- my connected email accounts;
- my connected Google account;
- and my identifiable sole-trader business.

That demand includes:

- the complete business profile;
- every positive and negative review;
- all ratings and TrustScores;
- review counts;
- public business replies;
- consumer alerts and warnings;
- categories and classifications;
- structured data;
- search-result material;
- API and widget output;
- cached and syndicated copies under Trustpilot’s control;
- automated summaries and recommendations;
- and every mechanism capable of restoring or recreating the association.

Your email about one edited review does not acknowledge, answer or determine any part of that demand.

I expressly object to Trustpilot continuing to describe me as “part of the Trustpilot community.” I have demanded removal from that community and cessation of the forced public association.

Trustpilot is now responsible for its own false and damaging publication

Trustpilot may attempt to distance itself from statements written by reviewers by characterising itself as a neutral review platform.

That position cannot dispose of the **consumer warning created and published by Trustpilot itself**.

The warning states:

“This company has been displaying Trustpilot content incorrectly.”

When expanded, it communicates or implies that my business has engaged in conduct including displaying reviews without permission, improperly using Trustpilot material, displaying inaccurate ratings or otherwise misusing Trustpilot’s platform.

That consumer warning is not Ray Smith’s statement. It is not user-generated content. It is Trustpilot’s own adverse publication about my identifiable sole-trader business.

Trustpilot therefore bears direct responsibility for:

- the accuracy of the warning;
- the factual and legal basis for it;
- the decision to publish it;
- the audience to which it was communicated;
- the period for which it remains visible;
- the effect it has on my reputation and income;
- the systems and personnel involved;
- and any loss resulting from publication after Trustpilot was expressly placed on notice that the warning was disputed.

Whatever position Trustpilot adopts concerning liability for third-party reviews, that position does not convert Trustpilot’s own warning into third-party content.

You were already on formal notice that I disputed the profile, the review handling, the continued processing of my information and Trustpilot’s claimed control over reviews concerning my own business. Trustpilot nevertheless chose to create and publish an additional adverse statement

of its own.

Trustpilot has therefore moved beyond passively hosting disputed statements. It has become the publisher of its own disputed allegation and has exposed itself to potential direct liability for that publication and its consequences.

The consumer warning was imposed in circumstances creating an appearance of commercial pressure

The chronology is significant.

On 11 July 2026:

- at approximately 4:50 PM and 4:51 PM, Trustpilot received the further formal legal, privacy, restriction and erasure notices;
- at 5:35 PM, Trustpilot sent its brand-misuse warning and stated that it was adding a consumer alert;
- that email copied revenue@trustpilot.com;
- the email expressly referred to TrustBox widgets that may not be included in a business's Trustpilot plan;
- it instructed me to use only widgets available through the "Share & promote" section of my Trustpilot Business account;
- and it threatened additional action if I did not remove the preserved reviews from my website.

Trustpilot's own published brand guidance states that reviews belong to the reviewers while Trustpilot holds a licence to display them. Its guidance also connects some uses of Trustpilot content with paid plans.

I had displayed genuine reviews written about my own business while documenting Trustpilot's handling of them. Trustpilot responded by publishing a damaging consumer warning, directing me toward plan-controlled Trustpilot widgets and copying a revenue-technology address.

I regard that sequence as an attempt to use reputational pressure to force my business into Trustpilot-controlled, plan-restricted methods of displaying reviews and, potentially, into paying Trustpilot for the ability to display material concerning my own business.

If Trustpilot denies any commercial motive or intended pressure to purchase or upgrade a plan, it must answer the following directly:

1. Why was a revenue-technology address copied into the enforcement email?
2. What role did Revenue Technology have in the investigation, decision or warning?
3. Why did the warning expressly refer to widgets that were not included in my Trustpilot plan?
4. Was any paid product, upgrade, subscription or sales opportunity associated with the recommended method of compliance?
5. Could I have removed the consumer warning without purchasing any Trustpilot product?
6. Would purchasing or upgrading a Trustpilot plan have allowed me to display the same underlying reviews?
7. Did any Trustpilot employee or system assess the likelihood that the warning would cause me to purchase or upgrade a plan?
8. Were commercial-account, revenue, conversion or sales records consulted?
9. Was the warning generated or selected based on my current plan level?
10. Why did Trustpilot answer formal privacy demands with rapid public enforcement rather than restriction of the disputed processing?

Until those matters are answered, the combination of a public reputational warning, plan-restricted compliance directions and the involvement of a revenue-related address creates a serious and reasonable appearance of commercially motivated pressure.

The warning is also inaccurate and misleading

The warning presents Trustpilot's disputed legal characterisation as though it were an established fact.

Trustpilot has not identified:

- the exact review text over which it claims ownership;
- any assignment of copyright from the reviewers;
- whether its claimed licence is exclusive;
- the distinction between review text and Trustpilot's logos, page design, database or software;
- why preservation and publication for criticism and evidence are treated as commercial "scraping";
- what specific content was allegedly inaccurate;
- what rating or TrustScore was allegedly falsely represented;
- or why the warning was proportionate.

The warning tells consumers that misconduct has occurred without explaining that:

- the material consisted of genuine reviews concerning my own business;
- the reviews were being preserved as part of an active evidence and legal dispute;
- Trustpilot had already received demands to remove the entire association;
- Trustpilot's ownership and permission claims were expressly disputed;
- and the consumer alert was imposed shortly after Trustpilot received further formal notices.

Publishing Trustpilot's contested position as an unqualified consumer warning is itself misleading.

Trustpilot cannot enforce instantly while claiming it cannot restrict or remove

Trustpilot detected the profile changes, reversed them, issued enforcement correspondence and imposed a public alert almost immediately.

That proves Trustpilot has active technical and administrative control over:

- profile information;
- classifications;
- warnings;
- review visibility;

- TrustScore visibility;
- business-account access;
- and public presentation.

Trustpilot cannot credibly claim that it lacks the ability to restrict or remove the public association while simultaneously exercising that level of immediate control to alter the profile and impose adverse public processing.

The decision to use that control against me, rather than to restrict disputed processing while the legal requests were assessed, is now part of the regulatory record.

Trustpilot's exposure is no longer confined to the reviewer's statements

Trustpilot has now been repeatedly notified of:

- the false and misleading chronology in the Ray Smith review;
- the reviewer's own removal of the bot;
- the false allegation that I revoked his access;
- the misattribution of an automated bot response;
- the wider clustered review activity;
- the complete site-wide removal demand;
- the objection to continued processing;
- the privacy and data-access requests;
- the dispute over Trustpilot's claimed rights in review text;
- the consumer warning's inaccuracy;
- and the apparent connection between enforcement and plan-restricted commercial products.

Continued publication after notice increases Trustpilot's exposure concerning:

- the revised review;
- the underlying profile;
- its own consumer warning;
- continued processing of my personal information;
- failure to restrict while accuracy and lawfulness are contested;
- automated or inadequately reviewed decision-making;
- downstream publication and search dissemination;
- and demonstrable reputational or financial loss.

Trustpilot is no longer being asked merely to moderate someone else's words. It is being required to account for its own decisions, its own warning, its own commercial enforcement process and its own continued publication after repeated notice.

Required action

Trustpilot must now:

1. Immediately withdraw the statement that the Ray Smith matter has been successfully resolved.
2. Restrict public access to the complete Legion Killfeed profile while the legal and privacy requests are assessed.
3. Remove the complete business profile and every associated review, rating, TrustScore, count, reply, classification and public output.
4. Remove the Ray Smith review in every version as part of that site-wide removal.
5. Remove the consumer warning immediately.
6. Prevent automatic restoration, republication or recreation of the profile and reviews.
7. Confirm that Ray Smith's customer status is not being treated as proof that his factual allegations are accurate.
8. Preserve and disclose the complete moderation history for every version of his review.
9. Preserve the two reviews published four minutes apart on 2 July 2026 and all records concerning any linkage or pattern assessment.
10. Provide the complete Article 15 and APP 12 access response previously demanded.
11. Correct inaccurate and misleading personal information under Article 16 and APP 13.
12. Explain the lawful basis relied upon for continued processing after objection.
13. Provide the Article 17 exception and Article 21 balancing assessment relied upon, if Trustpilot refuses erasure.
14. Explain all automated and human involvement in the review, profile and consumer-warning decisions.
15. Identify every Trustpilot employee, team, contractor and automated system involved in publishing the warning.
16. Explain the involvement of revenue@trustpilot.com.
17. Confirm whether any purchase, plan upgrade or paid service would have changed Trustpilot's enforcement position.
18. Notify recipients, processors and search services of any applicable restriction, correction or erasure.
19. Preserve all evidence required for the OAIC, Danish Data Protection Agency and any other regulatory or legal proceedings.
20. Provide a substantive response from Privacy and Legal rather than another standardised review-moderation message.

Preservation notice

Trustpilot must preserve without deletion, alteration, merging or overwriting:

- every version of the Ray Smith review;
- the original and revised review metadata;
- his submitted proof-of-purchase and identity material;
- Trustpilot's assessment of that material;
- reviewer-account records;
- timestamps;
- IP, access, device and linkage signals;

- all moderation reports;
- AI defamation-tool inputs and outputs;
- authenticity and suspicious-pattern assessments;
- internal risk or confidence scores;
- human-review notes;
- internal messages;
- legal and privacy referrals;
- reinstatement and republication decisions;
- the 2 July 2026 “Kyle” and “Killfeed review” records;
- all records assessing similarities between those reviews;
- the consumer-warning decision;
- all alert drafts and classifications;
- profile-edit logs;
- brand-misuse records;
- website-monitoring records;
- communications involving Revenue Technology;
- current and historical Trustpilot plan information;
- any sales, conversion or upgrade data associated with the enforcement;
- TrustScore and ranking effects;
- structured-data, API, search and syndication records;
- and records identifying when each Trustpilot team became aware of the legal notices.

Public removal does not authorise destruction of the segregated evidentiary record.

Regulatory record

The GDPR complaint filed with the Danish Data Protection Agency and the Australian privacy complaint filed with the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner will be updated to include:

- Trustpilot’s 13 July “good news” email;
- the latest Ray Smith review;
- Trustpilot’s failure to address the review’s new allegations;
- the preserved Discord record;
- the proof that Ray Smith removed the bot himself;
- the automated origin of the “crayons” response;
- the four-minute review pair;
- the false consumer warning;
- the warning’s timing after the formal notices;
- the copied Revenue Technology address;
- and the connection made in Trustpilot’s own email between compliance and plan-controlled widgets.

Do not send another instruction to flag individual wording, select another reporting category, tell my side publicly or wait for another automated assessment.

The matter is now a complete site-wide privacy, removal, accuracy, commercial-pressure, consumer-warning and evidence-preservation dispute.

Please confirm by return email that:

- the entire public profile has been restricted;
- the consumer warning has been removed;
- the matter has been transferred to Privacy and Legal;
- no disputed review or profile material will be restored;
- all relevant evidence is preserved;
- and the complete site-wide removal demand is being addressed.

Nothing in Trustpilot’s latest email resolves, limits, replaces or waives any previous demand, complaint, objection, allegation of loss or legal right.

Anthony “Soul” Brodie
Owner and sole trader — Legion Killfeed
ABN 28 387 377 607

From: Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>
Sent: Monday, 13 July 2026 6:41 AM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: Consumer has updated review

Hi Anthony Brodie,
Thanks for your inquiry about the [review](#) by Ray Smith, which you flagged for containing defamatory content.
Good news — they’ve updated their review so that it no longer contains the content you highlighted as defamatory. You can see the updated review on your profile page.
Thanks for being part of the Trustpilot community. If you have any questions, please let us know by replying to this email.
Thanks,