

Formal Complaint to Thames Valley Police – Coordinated Online Harassment, Defamation, and Fraud Campaign

Date: 4 August 2025

To: Thames Valley Police (Attention: Sergeant Rob Allen)

From: Anthony Brodie, Owner – Legion Killfeed (Sydney, Australia)

Contact Email: legionkillfeed@outlook.com

Re: Criminal Harassment/Defamation of Australian Citizen by UK Resident – Facebook Campaign and Related Offences (Case Ref: 43250388789)

Dear Sergeant Allen,

I am writing to formally **complain and urge action** regarding a **coordinated online harassment, defamation, and fraud campaign** being waged against me, **Anthony Brodie**, an Australian citizen, by **Mr. Danny Hayes** (a UK resident) and several associates. This campaign—**organized via Facebook and spilling onto other platforms**—has targeted both myself and my business (Legion Killfeed) with vicious falsehoods, threats, and illicit incitements. I appreciate your previous responses; however, I must address the **jurisdictional misunderstanding** and **provide clear evidence** of UK law violations, in hopes that Thames Valley Police will **record, investigate, and take appropriate action** on this matter. Below, I outline the **background, evidence of offences (27 distinct violations of UK statutes)**, jurisdictional basis, and the urgent need for police intervention.

Background of the Harassment Campaign

On 28 July 2025, an individual named **Daniel Santos** (Facebook alias “dani23COVID”) published a defamatory post in a DayZ gaming Facebook group, which became the **flashpoint for a mob-like attack** against me and *Legion Killfeed*. In that public post^[1], Mr. Santos **falsely accused** my service of scamming customers and **encouraged others to “take down” my business**. The **Facebook group post** (URL: facebook.com/groups/299960322481369/posts/757760916701305/) quickly attracted a **crowd of collaborators** who amplified these false claims and escalated them into a broader harassment campaign. Notably:

- **UK-based competitor’s involvement: Mr. Danny Hayes**, a UK resident who operates a competing service, seized upon the post to **rally others** against me. He openly urged members of the group to **mass-report** Legion Killfeed on various platforms and to **flood us with negative reviews**, boasting “*Here is the report link guys... Please report to Discord 🙌 I have reported the Facebook and filed a report against scammers... as well as a bad review...*”^{[2][3]}. In essence, he was **using Facebook to coordinate a targeted attack** on my business’s online presence. Mr. Hayes even **encouraged fraudulent chargebacks**, writing “*that’s the fix then 🙌 PayPal refund and don’t use [Legion] again!*” when discussing how to hurt us

financially[4]. This shows a clear intent to **sabotage my business financially** by inducing others to **make false refund claims**.

- **Other participants:** Several others joined the pile-on. For example, one associate named **Zeus Lozano** injected a blatant lie, claiming I had “stolen” his server configuration and urging “*please report both the server and discord*” – a **completely fabricated accusation** clearly meant to incite more hatred and reports[5][6]. Another individual, **Dan Ahern**, also participated in the abusive discussions. These actions were **not isolated grievances**, but rather part of an **orchestrated group effort** to tarnish my reputation.
- **Personal grudges and extreme slander:** A particularly disturbing contribution came from **Mr. Brett Jones** (alias “MrTechN9ne”), a former affiliate of my service who bears a grudge after being removed for misconduct. Mr. Jones joined the harassment by spreading **vicious and heinous lies** about me – at one point **falsely labeling me a “pedophile”** in a chat forum[7]. This outrageous slander has absolutely no basis in truth; it was a malicious attempt to destroy my personal and professional reputation. (See Figure 2 below for a screenshot of this false accusation.) Such an accusation is not only defamatory per se, but deeply damaging and psychologically distressing.
- **Abusive insults and threats:** Throughout this campaign, I have been subjected to **harsh, obscene abuse**. I was called “trash” and a “ct” (vulgar slur), told to “*go back to school or be reborn*”, among other degrading remarks[8]. Mr. Santos explicitly threatened that “*Legion will fall one way or another, you are trash...*”, to which Mr. Hayes replied “*couldn’t have said it better 🙌*”, essentially **cheering on the threat to ruin my business**. The **tone of the discourse has been openly menacing** – they clearly state their goal is to *destroy* my service and **drive me out** of the community. When I indicated that I had involved the police, the harassers even **mocked that fact and continued their abuse**, showing brazen confidence that they would face no consequences. (See Figure 3 for examples of the profanity-laden messages and the dismissive response when police involvement was mentioned.)
- **Spread to other platforms:** What began on Facebook did not stay there. The same group of individuals **carried the smear campaign to other public platforms** in an effort to maximize harm. Notably, they **bombarded our profile on Trustpilot** (a public business review site) with **fake 1-star reviews** containing lies and insults. These “reviews” were clearly left not by genuine customers but by the same attackers from the Facebook group. For instance, one newly created account literally named “**Cunt**” posted a review accusing us of “*tak[ing] people’s money then block[ing] them*” – a **false and defamatory allegation** accompanied by crass language[9]. Another account (“WARZONE”) likewise left a malicious false review (“Trash bot... they’ll treat you like st... **These people aren’t nice at all.**”)[10]. **Mr. Danny Hayes himself posted a Trustpilot review under his real name (which has since been flagged), calling us “disgusting... nasty, toxic owners” and telling**

readers “*you will regret purchasing*”, clearly an attempt to scare off potential customers. (Figure 1 below includes excerpts of Mr. Hayes’s Facebook and Trustpilot postings.) These coordinated reviews on Trustpilot not only violate that platform’s rules, but also serve as further evidence of the concerted defamation effort** stemming from the Facebook group[11][12].

- **Global nature of the mob:** In total, at least **five individuals across four countries (UK, USA, Canada, and Australia)** have been involved in this harassment campaign[13]. The ringleader, **Mr. Hayes, is in the UK**, while others (like Mr. Jones) appear to be in the US or elsewhere. Despite spanning multiple jurisdictions, their actions have been **highly coordinated through Facebook**, with **Mr. Hayes and the UK contingent instigating much of the unlawful conduct**. Facebook’s ubiquity means that this content is readily accessible in the UK and worldwide. Indeed, even **Meta’s own Community Standards** explicitly forbid exactly this sort of behavior (harassment, bullying, coordinating harm, and fraud) – yet the content remains online, continuing to cause damage[14][15].

Figure 1: Excerpts from the Facebook group post and Trustpilot reviews. In the Facebook thread (left), Mr. Danny Hayes urges “GET LEGION SHUT DOWN” and sympathizes with efforts to “shut down” my business, despite a bystander noting he is a competitor. On the right, samples of defamatory 1-star Trustpilot reviews from late July 2025 are shown – including Mr. Hayes’s own review (since removed for violating guidelines) and other fake reviews (“Cunt” and “WARZONE”) echoing the false “scam”/“money theft” narrative.[16][17]

Evidence of Offences and Impact

I have amassed a substantial **evidence bundle** (screenshots, chat logs, URLs) supporting every claim made here. This evidence makes clear that the conduct in question is not mere online drama or rude comments, but **targeted, malicious actions that violate the law**. Below is a summary of key evidence and the **specific offences** indicated (I have identified at least **27 distinct breaches** of UK criminal law in total):

- **Defamatory Falsehoods:** Multiple **false statements of fact** were published about me and my business with the intent to harm my reputation. For example, I was falsely accused of “scamming” customers, *stealing server files*, and even committing heinous crimes (the baseless “*pedophile*” slur) as noted above. These statements have **no truth** and have caused serious reputational harm and distress. Under the UK’s *Defamation Act 2013*, such statements meet the threshold of causing “*serious harm*” to reputation, especially given their egregious nature (accusing me of crimes)[16]. (Indeed, some allegations are so extreme that they could constitute *malicious falsehood* as well.) The **defamation is ongoing**: potential customers have cited these lies, and my business’s Trustpilot rating was temporarily dragged down by the attack[18][19].

- Harassment (Course of Conduct):** The **persistent and coordinated nature** of these attacks – dozens of posts, comments, and messages over many days – constitutes a **“course of conduct”** designed to alarm and distress me. Under the *Protection from Harassment Act 1997*, it is a criminal offence to pursue a course of conduct that causes someone **alarm or distress**[20]. Here, the *entire pattern of behavior* (publicly vilifying me, urging others to hound me, ridiculing and threatening my business’s demise) clearly qualifies as harassment. I have endured **significant distress**: I’ve experienced anxiety, stress, and sleepless nights due to this onslaught[21]. The harassment is targeted **at me personally** (a private individual, not a public figure) and is plainly **oppressive and unreasonable**. It has gone far beyond any legitimate criticism and has become a campaign of intimidation. In fact, one bystander in the Facebook thread even warned the group that *“there’s already a police investigation about this post”* – indicating that neutral observers recognized the severity of the harassment[22]. The harassers’ response was to laugh (*“hahaha this is AWESOME”*, wrote Mr. Santos)[23], **openly flouting the law** and any potential consequences.
- Malicious Communications & Public Electronic Communications Offences:** Many of the **direct messages and public posts** in this campaign are **grossly offensive, indecent, or threatening**, and were sent with the clear intent to cause me distress and alarm. For example, I was called a *“fing...ct” and other vulgar epithets; one message sneered “I can’t wait for the cops to show up at your ... back door, ya ... potato-looking ct”, and another told me to “fk off” (pardon the language, but these quotes illustrate the severity).* (See Figure 3 for these verbatim insults.)* Such communications fall squarely under criminal communications offences: **the Malicious Communications Act 1988, Section 1 and the Communications Act 2003, Section 127** both make it an offence to send **electronic communications that are** grossly offensive, obscene, indecent, or false, with intent to cause distress or anxiety[24]. **The content here — from obscene name-calling and harassment in chats, to the spreading of known false allegations (e.g. calling a legitimate business a “scam” in order to cause damage) — fully satisfies those criteria**[25]. **The intent to cause distress is evident from the language and the coordinated nature of the attack. These messages were transmitted via** Facebook (a public online platform accessible via UK communication networks) **and also via** Discord chats, *thus engaging both Acts (for messages sent to a person and those posted publicly online).*

Figure 2: Screenshot of a Discord chat wherein Mr. Brett Jones (alias “MrTechN9ne”) falsely accuses me of being a “pedophile.” This lie was posted on July 13, 2025, shortly before Mr. Jones was removed from our community for misconduct. The image also shows an official notice of ban/removal citing this slanderous violation of our Terms of Service (which explicitly prohibit false accusations)[26]. Such a defamatory allegation constitutes libel and has no basis in reality.

- Incitement of Fraudulent Activity:** Perhaps most alarming, Mr. Hayes and others did not stop at words—they actively **incited unlawful actions** intended to financially cripple my business. As noted, Mr. Hayes urged people to **file false refund claims via PayPal** (essentially encouraging them to lie that my service was a scam in order to get their money back)[4]. This is **soliciting others to commit fraud**. Encouraging someone to dishonestly obtain a refund for a product/service that was actually provided as advertised is tantamount to inducing **Fraud by False Representation**, an offence under the *Fraud Act 2006*. Even if not everyone followed through, the **act of encouragement itself is illegal**. The *Serious Crime Act 2007* (Section 44 onwards) makes it an offence to intentionally encourage or assist the commission of a crime, even if that crime was not ultimately committed. Here, Mr. Hayes’s statements explicitly advocating chargeback fraud (and potentially others’ talk of abusing reporting systems) fulfill the elements of encouraging a crime. UK authorities and legal analysts would readily view “*incitement of false refund claims*” as an offence under these laws[17]. Indeed, **incitement to defraud** a payment processor or business is a serious matter; it shows the premeditated and **malicious intent** behind this campaign. This is not just trolling—it is **organised, criminal mischief** aimed at causing financial loss through deception[15].
- Violation of Platform Policies (Supporting Evidence):** It is worth noting that the behavior of Mr. Hayes and his collaborators flagrantly violates the terms of the platforms they used, further underlining its wrongful nature. Facebook’s Community Standards on **Harassment and Bullying** forbid targeted abuse and degrading slurs; on **Coordinating Harm** forbid organizing campaigns of harassment; and on **Fraud/Deception** forbid facilitating fraudulent activities[27][14]. All these were breached in this case. Even **our own service’s Terms of Use** for Legion Killfeed prohibit “*slandorous activities*” or *false accusations* against our staff or service[26] – a rule these individuals ignored completely. While platform policy violations are not the purview of the police, they **reinforce that the conduct was clearly inappropriate and malicious** by any standard (even the offenders’ peers have reported or flagged their content as harmful). Yet despite reports, the content remains online, and the abuse continues, **magnifying the harm** to me.

*Figure 3: Harassing messages and response. This screenshot captures an excerpt of the obscene insults and threats directed at me by the perpetrators, as well as a portion of an email from Sgt. Rob Allen on 1 August 2025 declining to investigate due to “jurisdiction.” In the chat (left), one attacker says “**fing idiot, I can’t wait for the cops to show up at your bh boy’s back door ya fing potato looking ct**” in response to my warning that police are involved. I replied, “**I don’t f around... cops are legit involved...**”, to which they responded with more abuse. On the right is a snippet of Sgt. Allen’s email stating that the report “*cannot/will not be investigated*” (apparently because the victim is overseas). This juxtaposition highlights how the **attackers felt emboldened**, even mocking my resort to law enforcement, and why **police action is needed to deter them**.**

Impact on the Victim: The impact of this orchestrated attack on me has been **devastating – both professionally and personally**. Professionally, Legion Killfeed’s reputation has been deliberately besmirched in public forums. We have lost business: **prospective customers hesitate or walk away** after seeing the slanderous claims (e.g. one of the Trustpilot trolls wrote “you will regret purchasing” to scare others off). Our Trustpilot page was spammed with 1-star reviews, dragging down our TrustScore until we could get some removed. I’ve seen a **drop in new user sign-ups** since this campaign began, correlating with the spread of these false allegations[28][29]. This is **real economic harm** caused by lies. Personally, I cannot overstate the **emotional toll**. I am a private individual and small business owner who suddenly found himself the **target of a hate mob**. I have been dealing with **intense anxiety, stress, and nights of lost sleep** knowing that strangers (and competitors) are vilifying me as a thief, scammer, and worse in front of thousands of onlookers[21]. The feeling of humiliation and powerlessness – watching malicious actors attempt to “**destroy**” my hard-earned reputation while my pleas for help initially went unanswered – has been overwhelming. I am genuinely fearful that if this continues unchecked, it could escalate to even more severe consequences (e.g. self-harm or retaliatory actions by some unhinged follower). **This is not a trivial internet spat; it is a concerted assault on my livelihood and mental well-being.**

Violations of UK Law (Statutory Offences)

The conduct described is not only immoral – it is **unequivocally illegal under UK law**. I wish to emphasize that **UK statutes provide ample tools to address this behavior**, and that the **actions occurred substantially within UK jurisdiction** (more on jurisdiction below). In my initial report and communications, I identified **27 specific violations** across multiple UK laws. In summary, the following **criminal offences** are clearly implicated:

- **Harassment – Protection from Harassment Act 1997:** This law makes it an offence to pursue a **course of conduct** which **harasses** another (causes alarm or distress) on at least two occasions. The sustained, coordinated campaign against me – involving repeated posts, messages, and actions aimed at causing distress – fits this definition *exactly*. It is a **criminal harassment** situation, potentially even a conspiracy to harass. UK law is clear that such sustained distressing conduct is punishable[20][30]. Here we have far more than two incidents; it’s dozens of acts of harassment in concert.
- **Malicious Communications – Malicious Communications Act 1988, Section 1:** This provision (as amended) criminalizes sending any letter, electronic communication or article with the intent to cause distress or anxiety, if the content is indecent, grossly offensive, or contains falsehoods. The **direct messages** and comments sent by the perpetrators – laced with profanity, insults, and knowing lies – clearly violate this Act[24]. They were **intended to cause me distress**, evidenced by their content and context, thus satisfying the mens rea. (Notably, threats are also covered, but even absent explicit death threats, the **menacing tone** and language meet the “grossly offensive” criterion.)

- **Improper Use of Public Communications Network – *Communications Act 2003, Section 127***: This law makes it an offence to send, via a public electronic communications network, a message that is grossly offensive, indecent, obscene, or menacing, or to send false information **for the purpose of causing annoyance, inconvenience or anxiety**. The public Facebook posts and Trustpilot reviews authored by the offenders are exactly that – **grossly offensive and false messages broadcast on the internet (a public network)**[24]. They were intended to not just annoy but to deeply damage and alarm me (and to mislead the public). This statute squarely applies to their online posts. The fact that Facebook is accessible in the UK (indeed, the content was downloaded/viewed in the UK by users including the perpetrators themselves) means these communications occurred within UK jurisdiction for purposes of this law[31].
- **Defamation – *Defamation Act 2013 (civil offence, but relevant)***: While defamation in the UK is typically a civil matter, I note it here because the **Defamation Act 2013** sets a high bar (“serious harm”) which is plainly met in this case[16]. The false allegations (e.g. calling me a scammer, thief, or pedophile) have caused serious harm to my reputation and business. They are stated as purported facts, not opinions, and have no factual basis[32]. Each person who published these lies is liable for libel. I am prepared to pursue civil defamation claims as needed; however, I recognize the police focus is on criminal aspects. I mention defamation because it underscores the severity of the lies – these are not minor insults, they are **reputation-destroying falsehoods**. (Furthermore, some particularly malicious lies could even invoke the rarely-used criminal libel statutes or Malicious Communications provisions if deemed “grossly offensive.”)
- **Fraud and Encouraging Offences – *Fraud Act 2006 and Serious Crime Act 2007***: As described, Mr. Hayes encouraged others to engage in fraud (specifically, to **make false representations to PayPal** or other payment services in order to obtain unwarranted refunds). This **incitement to commit fraud** is itself illegal. Under the Fraud Act, it is a crime to **dishonestly make a false representation to make gain or cause loss** – which is exactly what a false refund claim entails. While Mr. Hayes may not have personally filed all such claims, his urging others to do so brings in the *Serious Crime Act 2007* (which criminalizes encouraging or assisting an offence). Section 44 of the SCA 2007 covers an intent to encourage or assist the commission of an offence (even if the offence was not actually committed). By **egging on a crowd to defraud my business/PayPal**, Mr. Hayes (and anyone who echoed or assisted that suggestion) violated these laws[17]. This is a critical point: **the plan to “brigade” my business with false reports and refunds is not just mean-spirited – it’s unlawful conspiracy to defraud**. The fact that this was done openly on Facebook makes it all the more egregious.
- **(Potentially) Other Offences**: Depending on further investigation, there may be other UK offences applicable as well. For instance, if any **direct threats** to harm me

or my property were made (implicating laws against threats or menacing communications), or if the conduct is deemed severe enough, **public order offences** or **communications-based hate crimes** could be considered. However, the above list covers the core illegal acts evidenced so far.

In summary, **UK law robustly prohibits** the conduct that Mr. Hayes and his cohorts have engaged in[33][34]. This is not a case of “internet free speech” or a civil dispute – it is a coordinated criminal harassment campaign involving defamation, malicious communications, and even incitement of fraud. **Each perpetrator’s actions satisfy multiple offence criteria.** They have **broken the law repeatedly (at least 27 times by count of each unlawful communication and act of encouragement)**, and they should be held accountable under UK statutes.

Jurisdiction: Why Thames Valley Police *Can and Should Act*

I understand from your prior email correspondence (specifically Sgt. Rob Allen’s email dated 1 August 2025) that there was reluctance to proceed on the basis of jurisdiction, given that I (the victim) am located in Australia. I respectfully submit that this is a **misinterpretation of the jurisdictional facts and law**, and I urge you to reconsider in light of the following:

- **Location of Suspect and Conduct:** The principal offender, **Mr. Danny Hayes, is physically located in the UK (believed to be in Thames Valley’s catchment)**. The offensive communications in question **originated from the UK** – e.g. Mr. Hayes posted defamatory material and coordinating messages while in the UK, using internet services accessible in the UK. Under UK law, what matters is that a **“substantial part of the conduct”** occurred within England/Wales for the courts to have jurisdiction[35]. Here, we have a UK perpetrator using a globally accessible platform to target a victim abroad. English case law (e.g. *R v. Perrin* [2002] and *R v. Waddon* [2000]) has established that content posted online can be subject to UK jurisdiction **if it is accessed/downloaded in the UK**, even if hosted elsewhere[31][36]. In this case, the Facebook post and subsequent comments were undoubtedly accessed by users in the UK (including Mr. Hayes himself and others in the group). Thus, the **acts were “published” in the UK**, and the UK has jurisdiction to prosecute offences arising from them. Crucially, **the suspect’s presence in the UK** gives UK authorities clear authority over his actions, regardless of my location. The crimes (harassment, malicious communications, etc.) do not cease to be crimes simply because the victim is overseas.
- **Extraterritorial Harm – Not a Bar to Jurisdiction:** UK law does not require the victim to be UK-based if the offender’s conduct is based in the UK. The *Protection from Harassment Act*, *Malicious Communications Act*, etc., apply to protect **any person** harassed or targeted by someone in England/Wales. Indeed, the Crown Prosecution Service’s guidance on communications offences notes that courts have jurisdiction as long as a substantial measure of the activity took place in the

UK[35]. Here, the “**substantial measure**” is the planning and publication of harmful content by UK individuals via UK-accessible networks. The fact that I read the messages in Australia or that my business is Australian does **not oust UK jurisdiction**. On the contrary, this is akin to, for example, a UK individual mailing harassing letters or making abusive calls to someone abroad – it is well accepted that the UK sender can be prosecuted for those acts. The internet is simply a medium; jurisdiction follows the offender. Additionally, Facebook is a platform that operates in the UK (with UK users and arguably UK data centers), which further underlines that these communications *occurred in* the UK sphere.

- **Jurisdictional Cooperation:** Even if there were any doubt or if transnational elements complicate direct prosecution, Thames Valley Police **should still record and investigate the complaint**, then coordinate with international counterparts as needed. There exist mechanisms (INTERPOL channels, Mutual Legal Assistance, etc.) to refer matters to foreign authorities or to jointly address crimes that span borders. For instance, if ultimately an Australian court needed to take some action for the protection of the victim (me), that can be facilitated **only if UK police have documented the offences and shared evidence**. Simply dismissing the case as “out of jurisdiction” would leave a serious crime entirely unaddressed by anyone – an outcome neither British nor Australian law would countenance. In this case, because the primary actors are in the UK, the **appropriate lead jurisdiction is the UK**; Australian Federal Police would likely defer to a UK investigation of a UK suspect, albeit ready to assist. I urge you not to let the **international aspect** become a reason for inaction, when in fact *UK courts have dealt with online harassment cases involving foreign victims before*[37]. The key point is: **a UK citizen using UK-based resources to commit offences is within UK jurisdiction**. If needed, I can also lodge a report with Australian authorities to mirror this complaint; however, they will likely point to the UK as the proper venue since the offender is under your jurisdiction.

To summarize, **there is no legal barrier preventing Thames Valley Police from pursuing this case**. The **onus is on the origin of the offending conduct**, not the residency of the victim. Your earlier indication that the report “*will not/cannot be investigated*” due to jurisdiction is something I implore you to reconsider in light of the above facts. Dismissing the case would send a dangerous message that anyone in the UK can prey on foreign individuals online with impunity. UK law and precedent say otherwise – such conduct *can* be prosecuted here[31]. At minimum, an official investigation on the UK side could **gather evidence and preserve options** for either UK prosecution or handing over to Australian or US authorities if appropriate.

Request for Police Action

I **formally request** that Thames Valley Police take the following actions:

1. **Officially record this complaint and the attached evidence** as a crime report, linked to **Case Reference 43250388789** (or a new reference if needed). The offences should be recorded under harassment and malicious communications at the least, with the suspects (where identifiable) named.
2. **Initiate an investigation** into the individuals responsible, chiefly **Mr. Danny Hayes (UK)**, and others mentioned (who may be abroad). This should include preserving digital evidence (the Facebook post/comments, Trustpilot reviews, Discord chats, etc.), taking statements (I am ready to provide a detailed statement and swear to the truth of these allegations), and identifying any additional perpetrators.
3. **Evaluate charges under UK law** for the offences outlined. The evidence strongly suggests violations of multiple statutes (Harassment Act 1997, MCA 1988, CA 2003, Fraud Act 2006, SCA 2007, etc., as detailed above). I ask that you liaise with the Crown Prosecution Service if necessary on the applicability of these charges to the facts at hand. Even if certain charges (like defamation) are civil, the core criminal elements (harassment, malicious communications, encouraging crime) are clearly present.
4. **Consider an Interpol or cross-jurisdiction referral** for any offenders outside the UK. For example, if Mr. Brett Jones is confirmed to be in the United States or Canada, coordinate with law enforcement there for potential action under their laws (e.g., U.S. cyberstalking or Canada's harassment/defamatory libel laws). I will concurrently be notifying Australian authorities of the situation (as the victim in their jurisdiction), and they may also reach out to you for cooperation. A joint approach would ensure no offender finds a safe haven. I recognize this case has international aspects, but as noted, that is all the more reason to **proactively cooperate**, not to drop the matter.
5. **Provide guidance on next steps:** Please advise me of any **additional information or formalities** you require. I have a comprehensive evidence dossier (including the Facebook group post content, screenshots of comments, chat logs, copies of the Trustpilot reviews, etc.) which I can transmit to investigating officers. If a formal statement in person is needed, I am willing to work with my local police in Australia to give a statement under oath that can be passed to you. I am also willing to identify and/or testify against the perpetrators if prosecutions ensue. In short, I will do whatever is needed from my side to assist.

Finally, I must highlight the **urgency** of intervention. The harassment is **ongoing** – these individuals are still at large, likely feeling confident after seeing an initial lack of police action. **Each day that passes without action is another day my reputation and mental health suffer, and another day the perpetrators grow bolder.** I fear that continued inaction could encourage them to escalate their attacks, possibly inspiring more people to join or pushing them towards even more extreme false allegations. I am trying my best to cope, but the **stress and anxiety are mounting.** I respectfully remind you that one key

purpose of harassment law is to prevent exactly this kind of prolonged, damaging campaign before it results in irrevocable harm.

I trust that Thames Valley Police does not want a situation where an Australian citizen is driven to despair or harm due to the actions of a UK cyber-harasser that went unaddressed. I am **pleading for your protection and assistance** under the law. This is a good opportunity to demonstrate that **jurisprudence has caught up with the digital age** – borders are not a shield for online abusers.

In conclusion, I **urge you to take this complaint seriously** and take appropriate enforcement action. If there are legitimate jurisdictional or procedural obstacles, please communicate them to me along with any alternative avenues I can pursue. I am determined to see those responsible held accountable, for my own peace of mind and to send a message that such malicious behavior has consequences. I greatly appreciate your time and consideration of this letter and the evidence provided.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter. I look forward to a prompt response and to working with you to ensure that justice is served.

Sincerely,

Anthony Brodie
Owner, Legion Killfeed
Sydney, Australia
Contact Email: legionkillfeed@outlook.com

Attachments/References: Evidence screenshots (Facebook post, comments, chat logs, Trustpilot reviews), Trustpilot page for Legion Killfeed[18][38], Legion Killfeed Terms of Service excerpt[26], and relevant legal citations as noted above. (Full evidence dossier available on request.)

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [20] [21] [22] [23] [24] [25] [27] [28] [29] [30] [32] [33] [34] Meta_Complaint_04Aug2025.pdf

[9] [10] [18] [19] [38] Legion Killfeed - DayZ Discord Bot Reviews | Read Customer Service Reviews of killfeed.co

<https://www.trustpilot.com/review/killfeed.co>

[26] Legion Killfeed

<https://killfeed.co/legal>

[31] [35] [36] [37] Communications Offences | The Crown Prosecution Service

<https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/communications-offences>