

# Complaint Letter to Meta (Facebook) Legal Team – Urgent Removal of Defamatory Content

**Date:** 4 August 2025

**To:** Meta Platforms, Inc. – Legal Department (via email: [legal@fb.com](mailto:legal@fb.com))

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

**Contact Email:** [legionkillfeed@outlook.com](mailto:legionkillfeed@outlook.com)

**Re: Urgent Request for Removal of Defamatory Post and Harassment Campaign Content** (Facebook URL: <https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1EKKQXNAKi/>) – **Police Case Ref: 43250388789**

**Dear Meta Legal Team,**

I am writing to file a formal **complaint and takedown request** regarding a coordinated online harassment and defamation campaign targeting me (Anthony Brodie) and my business, **Legion Killfeed**. A specific public Facebook post (link above) by a user named **Daniel Santos** contains blatantly false and defamatory statements about my service and has become a focal point for widespread harassment against me. Multiple individuals have used that post's comments to organize and incite further attacks across platforms. This malicious content **violates Meta's Community Standards** (Harassment, Coordinating Harm, Fraud/Deception) and is causing severe damage to my business's reputation and to my mental well-being. I urgently request that Meta **remove the offending post and associated content, and take action against the responsible accounts**, as detailed below. I have reported this matter to law enforcement (Thames Valley Police, UK, Case #43250388789) and have compiled an evidence bundle (screenshots, chat logs) which I can provide upon request to support every factual assertion herein.

## Background and Ongoing Harassment Campaign

On or around **28 July 2025**, Mr. **Daniel Santos** (Facebook username "dani23COVID") published a public Facebook post maliciously attacking Legion Killfeed<sup>[1]</sup>. In this post, Mr. Santos made **slanderous assertions** about the quality and integrity of my service and staff, falsely accusing us of "*scamming*" customers and disrespecting users, and he **urged viewers to take action** against us<sup>[2]</sup>. It was immediately apparent that his intent was not genuine criticism but rather to rally others to "*take down*" my business<sup>[3]</sup>. This

defamatory post quickly became a **rallying point** for a group of other individuals who then launched a broader harassment effort against me in the comments and beyond.

In the **comment thread** of Mr. Santos's post, several individuals coordinated explicit tactics to harm my business. Notably:

- **Danny Hayes** (a UK-based individual who operates a competing service) **incited a mob attack**. He aggressively encouraged others to mass-report Legion Killfeed's online platforms and even to abuse third-party systems. In one comment, Mr. Hayes wrote: *"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..."* – effectively instructing followers to report my Discord server, our Facebook page, and to flood us with negative Trustpilot reviews[4]. He even provided a direct link to Discord's reporting page to facilitate this coordination[5]. Furthermore, Mr. Hayes openly **encouraged fraudulent disputes** against my business: he urged people to seek PayPal refunds for our services, saying *"that's the fix then 📧 PayPal refund and don't use [Legion] again!"* and expressed approval when others discussed filing chargebacks[6]. This shows a clear intent to organize economic harm by pushing **false claims of fraud** to payment processors[7]. Such coordinated attempts to sabotage my business's finances go far beyond fair criticism.
- The post's comment thread is filled with **harassing and defamatory remarks** directed at me and anyone defending my business. For example, Mr. **Daniel Santos** wrote: *"Legion will fall one way or another, you are trash, go back to school or be reborn so you can learn to respect people..."*[8]. This statement not only includes outright name-calling ("trash") but also a **menacing threat** to destroy my business ("Legion will fall one way or another") [8]. Mr. Hayes eagerly endorsed this comment, replying *"couldn't have said it better 📧"* – effectively fanning the flames[8]. Such comments make it evident that their goal is to bring about the **collapse of my service through any means necessary**, rather than address any legitimate grievance[9]. The **tone is openly threatening and bullying**.
- Another participant, **Zeus Lozano**, jumped in with a completely **false allegation** that I had "stolen" his server configuration, and he urged others to *"please report both [the] server and discord"* for Legion Killfeed[10]. This claim of theft is entirely fabricated – an attempt to portray me as engaging in misconduct with no evidence whatsoever. Mr. Lozano's inflammatory comment was clearly aimed at further rousing the Facebook group to take punitive action against us under false pretenses[10]. (One bystander even cautioned Mr. Lozano that *"there's*

*already a police investigation about this post*” – indicating outsiders recognized the severity of what was happening.) Despite this, Mr. Santos responded *“hahaha this is AWESOME,”* effectively **condoning any and all false accusations** so long as they contributed to attacking Legion Killfeed[11].

- **Additional individuals** (such as **Dan Ahern** and **Brett Jones**) also became involved. Mr. Brett Jones (online alias “MrTechN9ne”), a former affiliate of our service, had previously been banned for unrelated misconduct and harbored a grudge; he joined this campaign by spreading vicious lies (at one point falsely calling me a “pedophile” in a chat, an utterly baseless and heinous smear)[12][13]. Mr. Jones’s involvement demonstrates the intensely personal and malicious nature of the attack. Mr. Dan Ahern likewise participated in the abusive Discord discussions and may have helped amplify the slander on social media[14]. In summary, this has become a **coordinated harassment campaign** involving at least five individuals across multiple countries (Australia, UK, U.S., and Canada), all stemming from and **facilitated by the Facebook post** in question.

This campaign is **ongoing** and not a one-time incident. Following the Facebook coordination, the same group proceeded to spread their harassment off-platform as well – for example, by posting fake, defamatory reviews on Trustpilot and attempting to raid our Discord community. In other words, the Facebook post served as the organizing hub for a sustained effort to **tarnish my business’s reputation everywhere they could**. I continue to face waves of online abuse, false accusations, and coordinated attacks on my credibility. As a direct result, my business **Legion Killfeed is suffering**: prospective customers have cited seeing these false allegations, and I have experienced a noticeable drop in new user inquiries since the smear campaign began. The damage to our reputation is **immediate and severe**, and it grows every day that the defamatory content remains accessible. On a personal level, the **emotional toll** has been significant – I have endured anxiety, stress, and sleepless nights knowing that a mob of strangers (and competitors) are publicly assailing my character and urging others to shun and harass me. The **ongoing harm to my mental health and to my livelihood** cannot be overstated. This is not mere “internet drama” or criticism; it is a concerted attack with real-world consequences.

## **Violation of Meta’s Community Standards**

The content and behavior described above **blatantly violate Facebook’s Community Standards** in multiple ways. I draw your attention to the following specific policy areas from Meta’s published standards, all of which are directly implicated:

- **Bullying and Harassment:** Meta’s policies make clear that **harassing or degrading private individuals is not tolerated**. Facebook explicitly prohibits targeted abuse, including **name-calling, insults, and calls for humiliation**[\[15\]](#). For private individuals like myself (who do not meet Facebook’s definition of a public figure), the policy provides even greater protection – “*We remove content that’s meant to degrade or shame*”[\[16\]](#). The content here is a textbook case of harassment and bullying: I have been called “*trash*”, subjected to profanity-laced insults, and even slandered as a criminal/sexual offender. There are **implicit threats** to *make my business “fall”* and an orchestrated attempt to mob me and my supporters with abuse and ridicule (e.g. using mocking emojis and piling-on by multiple people). This kind of **cyberbullying and personal harassment** is unequivocally against the rules and undermines the safe environment Facebook purports to foster[\[17\]](#)[\[15\]](#).
- **Coordinating Harm:** Facebook’s Community Standard on “*Coordinating Harm and Promoting Crime*” forbids the facilitation or organization of campaigns that harm others, whether **people or businesses**[\[18\]](#). Meta states it will **remove content** that coordinates or advocates harmful activities targeted at an individual or a business[\[18\]](#). Here, the offending post and comment thread were used to **organize a campaign of harm** against Legion Killfeed. Mr. Hayes and others literally used Facebook as a platform to coordinate mass harassment, including **brigading** (mass false reports, review bombing, and coordinated refund fraud). The post became a staging ground for a **conspiracy to damage a legitimate business**. This is precisely the sort of harmful coordinated behavior that Meta’s policies are designed to prevent[\[19\]](#). The coordination may not be violent crime, but it is a clear effort to cause **economic and reputational harm**, which falls squarely under the spirit of the Coordinating Harm policy. By allowing users to rally others to “take down” my business, the content violates this standard.
- **Fraud and Deception:** Facebook’s standards on *Fraud, Scams, and Deceptive Practices* prohibit content that **purposefully deceives or exploits others for money or property**[\[20\]](#). Meta has pledged to remove content that uses **wilful misrepresentations or fraudulent tactics** to harm others financially[\[21\]](#). The coordination in this case involved Mr. Hayes urging people to file **false claims (chargebacks/refunds)** through PayPal and to submit fabricated reports to Discord and Facebook, essentially encouraging **fraudulent behavior**. He was advocating that others engage in deception (lying to payment platforms by claiming a legitimate service was a scam) in order to hurt my business. This is a **deceptive practice** being spread and encouraged on Facebook’s platform.

Furthermore, the **false allegations** being broadcast (e.g. calling me a scammer, claiming we “steal” from customers) are themselves a form of fraud and deception – they are *knowingly false statements* intended to mislead the public and turn people against my service. Using Facebook to encourage **fraudulent disputes and false reports** is a clear violation of the Fraud/Deception policies, as it involves coordinating dishonest conduct that could defraud my business of revenue[22].

In addition to the above, the content likely violates several other Meta standards. For instance, some comments might breach the **Violence and Incitement** policy to the extent they can be interpreted as threats (the threat to make my business “fall” could be seen as incitement of action, albeit not violent). While there is no explicit hate speech identified, the use of extreme derogatory language and the sheer viciousness of the attack contravene the overall spirit of Facebook’s rules that aim to **maintain civility and safety** on the platform[17]. It is worth noting that **Meta has taken action in the past against organized harassment campaigns**, and this situation is a clear-cut example that calls for the same decisive response.

Given these **clear Community Standards violations**, Meta is *both authorized and obligated* to enforce its rules by removing the offending content and penalizing the accounts involved[23]. Facebook’s Terms of Service and Community Standards exist specifically to protect users from abuse like this[24]. Allowing this post and its comment thread to remain live not only causes ongoing harm to me, but also sets a dangerous precedent that such blatant policy violations are tolerated. I urge Meta to uphold its own rules in this case to demonstrate its commitment to user safety and a harassment-free platform.

## **Legal Context and Liability Considerations (Australia, UK, US, Canada)**

This situation is not only a policy violation; it is also **unlawful under numerous international laws**. I ask Meta’s Legal team to consider the following legal context, as it underscores the seriousness of the matter and Meta’s responsibility to act once notified:

- **Australia (Sender’s Jurisdiction):** I am an Australian citizen and my business operates in Australia, where the impact of this attack is being felt[25]. Under Australian law, it is a **criminal offence to use a carriage service (internet) to menace, harass, or cause offence**. Specifically, *section 474.17 of the Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth)* prohibits online harassment and carries penalties of up to 3

years imprisonment[26]. The coordinated online abuse here – including threats like “*Legion will fall...*” and insults like “*you are trash*” – clearly meets the elements of this offence[27]. Additionally, Australian civil law provides remedies for defamation. False statements that harm a person’s or a small business’s reputation (e.g. calling me a fraud or pedophile) are actionable under the *Uniform Defamation Act 2005* (as adopted in NSW and other states)[28]. Such statements are defamatory *per se* (especially allegations of serious misconduct) and have no defense, as they are outright false[29]. Notably, in Australia even a company can sue for defamation if it’s a small business like mine (under 10 employees). Furthermore, if any of the perpetrators are business competitors (which at least one, Mr. Hayes, is), their conduct may violate the *Australian Consumer Law* – Section 18 of the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 prohibits misleading or deceptive conduct in trade[30]. A competitor spreading false claims to damage my service could be liable under that provision as well. Lastly, Australia’s **Online Safety Act 2021** empowers the eSafety Commissioner to compel removal of “adult cyber-abuse” material. The content in question – extreme harassment and intimidation targeting an adult (myself) – very likely qualifies as cyber-abuse under that law[31]. I am prepared to file a complaint with the eSafety Commissioner if necessary. In short, Australian law **forbids what these individuals have done**, and expects intermediaries to assist in stopping it.

- **United Kingdom:** A significant part of this campaign involves the UK (Mr. Hayes is UK-based, and many posts are accessible there). The UK has robust laws against online harassment, malicious communications, and defamation. Under the **Protection from Harassment Act 1997**, a sustained course of conduct causing alarm or distress can constitute a criminal offence[32]. The group’s repeated posts and messages encouraging others to harass me could fall under this (potentially even as a conspiracy to harass). The **Malicious Communications Act 1988** (Section 1) and the **Communications Act 2003** (Section 127) criminalize sending electronic communications that are grossly offensive, indecent, or false with intent to cause distress[33][34]. The obscene insults and menacing statements sent via Facebook/Discord clearly fit this description – they were *intended* to cause distress and alarm[33]. On the civil side, the UK’s **Defamation Act 2013** applies to the defamatory statements posted. The false allegations (e.g. claims that I “*take people’s money and then block them*”, or implying I’m a scammer/thief) have caused or are likely to cause **serious harm** to my reputation and serious financial loss, which satisfies the statutory threshold for defamation[35]. Truth is obviously not a defense here (the statements are lies),

and they are presented as factual assertions, not opinions, so they are not protected as honest opinion[36]. Each perpetrator could be sued for libel in UK courts. Moreover, some statements (like falsely calling me a pedophile) are so malicious and egregious that they could even qualify as *malicious falsehood*. Importantly, encouraging others to file false refund claims could implicate UK **fraud laws**. Urging people to dishonestly obtain money back for a legitimate service is essentially inciting fraud – which is criminal under the *Fraud Act 2006* and the *Serious Crime Act 2007* (offences of encouraging or assisting crime)[37]. In summary, UK law provides ample grounds for both criminal and civil action against the harassers.

- **United States:** I understand that Meta is a U.S.-based company. Several aspects of this campaign touch the U.S. as well (Facebook’s servers, and possibly one perpetrator, Mr. Brett Jones, resides in the U.S.). The U.S. has federal laws against cyberstalking and interstate threats – for instance, **18 U.S.C. §2261A(2)** makes it a crime to use electronic communications to engage in a course of conduct that causes substantial emotional distress to someone[38]. The relentless personal harassment I’ve experienced could be seen as violating this, should any conspirator be in the U.S., given the interstate nature of online communications. There are also federal fraud statutes (like **18 U.S.C. §1343, Wire Fraud**) that might apply to the scheme of orchestrating false chargeback claims via PayPal[39]. Even if those might be stretches, nearly every U.S. state has its own laws against harassment and criminal defamation. For example, California – where Meta is headquartered – has laws against harassing electronic communications (Cal. Penal Code §653m) and recognizes civil **defamation per se** (accusing someone of serious crimes is defamation per se under California law)[40][41]. Texas (if Mr. Jones is in TX) has harassment laws, etc. The uniform point is that **U.S. legal systems do not condone this kind of coordinated, malicious harassment**[42][43], even if enforcement often requires victim initiative. I acknowledge that under U.S. law (47 U.S.C. §230, Communications Decency Act), online platforms like Facebook generally enjoy immunity from civil liability for user-generated content[44]. However, that immunity **does not apply to federal criminal law enforcement** (so the FBI or other agencies could investigate the harassers’ conduct as crimes), and crucially, Section 230 does **not protect the individual perpetrators** in any way – I can still pursue civil suits against the individuals in U.S. courts if jurisdiction can be established[44][45]. In any event, Meta’s immunity under U.S. law does not prevent it from acting; indeed, it places the onus on Meta to **self-regulate harmful content**.

- **Canada:** At least one individual (possibly Mr. Lozano or Mr. Ahern) might be in Canada, or some of the harmful communications occurred through servers in Canada. Canadian law, like the UK's, strongly protects victims of defamation and harassment. The **Criminal Code of Canada** §264 criminalizes harassing behavior that causes someone to fear for their safety (which could conceivably include severe cyberbullying)[\[46\]](#). It also has provisions (§372) against sending indecent or harassing communications via telecommunication[\[47\]](#). The vitriolic messages and false allegations here could fit those categories. Notably, Canada still has a crime of "**Defamatory Libel**" (Criminal Code §§298-301) which makes it an offence to publish a defamatory statement you know is false[\[48\]](#). Falsely branding someone a fraud or pedophile in a public forum, with clear malicious intent, is exactly the kind of egregious case that law was meant for (it carries up to 5 years imprisonment)[\[48\]](#). On the civil side, Canadian defamation law is plaintiff-friendly: there is no requirement to prove actual damage if the statements are plainly defamatory (which they are)[\[49\]](#). Canada, like the UK and Australia, does **not** provide a broad immunity like Section 230 to platforms[\[50\]](#). Online service providers can be held responsible if they knowingly disseminate defamatory material. Indeed, all common-law jurisdictions (UK, Canada, Australia) hold that once a platform is **notified** of defamatory content, it may be considered to be "publishing" that content if it fails to remove it within a reasonable time, potentially exposing it to liability[\[51\]](#)[\[52\]](#).

**In summary**, across all four jurisdictions – **Australia, the UK, the US, and Canada** – the actions of these individuals are unlawful[\[53\]](#). Their posts and reviews constitute criminal harassment and communications offences, as well as civil defamation (and even fraud incitement in parts). The **international nature** of the misconduct does not insulate the perpetrators; it simply means they are breaking multiple laws at once. I have already involved law enforcement in the UK, and I am prepared to involve Australian authorities as well (e.g. via the eSafety Commissioner or local police) because of the severity and cross-border scope[\[54\]](#). From Meta's perspective, please note that **once you have been notified of the defamatory content, your platform could also incur legal exposure** in some jurisdictions if you choose to ignore it. Under UK law, for example, the *Defamation Act 2013* (Section 5) provides a defense to website operators for user-posted defamation **only if** the operator responds appropriately to a notice of complaint[\[52\]](#). I am hereby giving formal notice of the defamatory content. If Facebook does not swiftly remove or otherwise **deal with** this content, it could lose that safe-harbor defense and be treated as a publisher of the defamation in the UK (especially if the actual posters are anonymous or not readily identifiable)[\[52\]](#). Likewise, in Australia, the High Court's ruling

in *Fairfax Media v. Voller (2021)* held that page owners (and by extension potentially platforms) can be considered publishers of third-party comments once they have knowledge of them[55]. Australian authorities have signaled an increasing willingness to hold social media companies accountable for leaving harmful content up (there has even been proposed anti-trolling legislation to that effect)[55]. In short, now that Meta has **actual knowledge** of the unlawful, injurious content, you would be well advised to act promptly. Removing the content now will not only fulfill Meta's legal and ethical responsibilities, but also mitigate any risk of Meta itself being seen as facilitating its continued publication after this notice.

## Requested Actions and Next Steps

I respectfully request that Meta take the following actions immediately:

1. **Remove the Defamatory Facebook Post and Comment Thread:** Take down the Facebook post located at *URL*:  
<https://www.facebook.com/share/p/1EKKQXNAKi/> (along with all accompanying comments). This post is the nucleus of the defamation and harassment campaign. Its removal is urgently needed to halt further dissemination of false claims and to stop the coordination of attacks through that thread. The post has no legitimate value – it violates policies and law – and keeping it online serves only to continue harming my business and personal well-being.
2. **Remove/Suppress Related Harassing Content:** In addition to the main post, **remove or disable any related content** that has stemmed from this campaign on your platform. This includes any shares of the post, any reposts, or separate posts in which these individuals are harassing or defaming Legion Killfeed or myself. I trust Meta's content moderation team can identify if the harassment spread to other groups or pages on Facebook and take appropriate action to delete such content as well. The goal is to comprehensively purge Facebook of this coordinated defamatory campaign.
3. **Permanent Account Actions for Key Offenders:** I request that Meta **suspend or ban the accounts** of the individuals who have egregiously violated the Community Standards in this campaign. In particular: **Daniel Santos, Danny Hayes, Brett Jones (MrTech9), Dan Ahern, and Zeus Lozano**. Each of these persons has participated in severe harassment, coordinated harmful action, and/or fraud incitement. They have **abused Facebook's platform** to organize a malicious brigade. Meta's policies indicate that such behavior can result in account suspension or removal, especially for repeat or serious offenses[23]. Given the clear evidence of their misconduct, banning them (at least from

Facebook, if not all Meta services) would be an appropriate enforcement outcome. This would also send a message that Meta does not tolerate coordinated harassment. At minimum, I ask that you evaluate their conduct under your **“repeat violator”** or **“dangerous organizations/individuals”** policies, if applicable, and apply strict penalties. Please also consider that one offender (Mr. Hayes) is actually a business competitor who weaponized your platform to eliminate competition – a bad-faith use of Facebook by any measure.

4. **Internal Escalation and Monitoring:** Please ensure this complaint is escalated to the appropriate **Trust & Safety and Content Policy teams** within Meta for awareness. The cross-platform nature of the attack (Facebook to Trustpilot to Discord, etc.) might warrant a broader look at how these users coordinated off-platform as well. Meta might choose to liaise with Trustpilot or law enforcement to share information on these offenders. Additionally, I ask Meta to **monitor for any reappearance** of similar content. The individuals may attempt to post new defamatory comments or use alternative accounts. A proactive stance (such as flagging any mention of “Legion Killfeed” by these users going forward) would help intercept further abuse.
5. **Confirmation and Information Sharing:** I request a written confirmation once the content is removed and the account actions are taken. Please outline to me what steps were implemented. Additionally, if possible, please provide me with any relevant information that could aid in identifying the anonymous profiles (should I need it for legal action). I understand privacy policies may limit this, but UK’s Defamation Act procedures (and possibly Australian law) encourage platforms to either remove defamatory material or furnish identifying details so the victim can pursue the authors<sup>[52]</sup>. Even an assurance that Meta will cooperate with any police or court requests for data on the offenders would be appreciated.

**Escalation if Ignored:** I truly hope Meta will address this swiftly and satisfactorily. However, I must state clearly that if **Facebook fails to act** on this notice, I will have no choice but to **pursue all available remedies**. This includes (but is not limited to) filing formal complaints with relevant regulatory authorities and exploring legal action to protect my rights. For example, I am prepared to seek an injunction and/or initiate defamation proceedings against the appropriate parties. This could extend to Meta Platforms itself in jurisdictions where you may not be shielded by Section 230 once you have been notified (such as Australia or the UK)<sup>[52][55]</sup>. I will also elevate this issue to Meta’s **Oversight Board** or any other escalation channel available for content disputes. Furthermore, I will cooperate fully with law enforcement investigations, which may involve requests for Meta’s records or testimony regarding this content. My sincere

hope, of course, is that none of this will be necessary and that Meta will do the right thing promptly.

Thank you for your urgent attention to this matter. By removing this defamatory and harassing content and enforcing your policies, Meta will not only be preventing further harm to me and my business, but also reaffirming its commitment to a safe and trustworthy platform for all users. I appreciate your time and prompt action. I am available to answer any questions or provide further evidence as needed.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter. By acting decisively, Meta will not only help remedy the injustice done to Legion Killfeed, but also demonstrate its commitment to maintaining a fair and safe platform for all users. I look forward to your response and the resolution of this issue.

**Sincerely,**

Anthony Brodie

Owner – Legion Killfeed

Email: [legionkillfeed@outlook.com](mailto:legionkillfeed@outlook.com)

Sydney, NSW, Australia

[\[1\]](#) [\[2\]](#) [\[3\]](#) [\[4\]](#) [\[5\]](#) [\[6\]](#) [\[7\]](#) [\[8\]](#) [\[9\]](#) [\[10\]](#) [\[11\]](#) [\[12\]](#) [\[13\]](#) [\[14\]](#) [\[15\]](#) [\[19\]](#) [\[20\]](#) [\[22\]](#) [\[23\]](#) [\[24\]](#) [\[25\]](#) [\[26\]](#)  
[\[27\]](#) [\[28\]](#) [\[29\]](#) [\[30\]](#) [\[31\]](#) [\[32\]](#) [\[33\]](#) [\[34\]](#) [\[35\]](#) [\[36\]](#) [\[37\]](#) [\[38\]](#) [\[39\]](#) [\[40\]](#) [\[41\]](#) [\[42\]](#) [\[43\]](#) [\[44\]](#) [\[45\]](#)  
[\[46\]](#) [\[47\]](#) [\[48\]](#) [\[49\]](#) [\[52\]](#) [\[53\]](#) [\[54\]](#) [\[55\]](#) [\[68\]](#) [\[71\]](#) [\[72\]](#) [\[16\]](#) [\[17\]](#)

Bullying and Harassment | Transparency Center

<https://transparency.meta.com/policies/community-standards/bullying-harassment/>

[\[18\]](#) Coordinating Harm and Promoting Crime | Transparency Center

<https://transparency.meta.com/policies/community-standards/coordinating-harm-promoting-crime/>

[\[21\]](#) Fraud, Scams, and Deceptive Practices | Transparency Center

<https://transparency.meta.com/policies/community-standards/fraud-scams>

[\[50\]](#) [\[70\]](#) Online Defamation Laws: U.S. vs. Canada | Sternberg Law Firm

<https://www.thedefamationattorney.com/blog/2023/12/online-defamation-laws-u-s-vs-canada/>

[51] When bad reviews get worse: online review sites and the Defamation Act 2013

<https://www.gosschalks.co.uk/blog/2023/09/19/when-bad-reviews-get-worse-online-review-sites-and-the-defamation-act-2013>

[56] [64] Trustpilot Legal - Terms of Use for Consumers

<https://legal.trustpilot.com/for-reviewers/terms-of-use-for-consumers>

[57] [58] [59] [60] [61] [62] [63] [65] [66] [67] Trustpilot Legal - Guidelines for Reviewers

<https://legal.trustpilot.com/for-reviewers/guidelines-for-reviewers>

[69] Trustpilot tackles false reviews with AI - TechInformed

<https://techinformed.com/trustpilot-tackles-review-bombing-with-ai/>