

Re: Update on the review you flagged - Case #03012716

From Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Date Mon 2026-07-13 10:56 PM
To Trust Support <trust.operations@trustpilot.com>; Adrian Blair - Trustpilot <adrian.blair@trustpilot.com>; amk@trustpilot.com <amk@trustpilot.com>; carolyn.jameson@trustpilot.com <carolyn.jameson@trustpilot.com>; frci@trustpilot.com <frci@trustpilot.com>; gime@trustpilot.com <gime@trustpilot.com>; Info - Trustpilot <info@trustpilot.com>; investor.relations@trustpilot.com <investor.relations@trustpilot.com>; Jawayne <jap@trustpilot.com> <jap@trustpilot.com>; kbea@trustpilot.com <kbea@trustpilot.com>; Partnerships - Trustpilot <partnerships@trustpilot.com>; Press - Trust Pilot <press@trustpilot.com>; Privacy - Trust Pilot <privacy@trustpilot.com>; publicaffairs@trustpilot.com <publicaffairs@trustpilot.com>; revenuetechnology+ceur@trustpilot.com <revenuetechnology+ceur@trustpilot.com>; sama@trustpilot.com <sama@trustpilot.com>; socialmedia@trustpilot.com <socialmedia@trustpilot.com>; Support <support@trustpilot.com> <support@trustpilot.com>; trustpilot@headlandconsultancy.com <trustpilot@headlandconsultancy.com>; Trustpilot Legal <legal@trustpilot.com>
Cc Infocentre Public Mailbox <info.centre@acc.gov.au>; OAICIntake@oaic.gov.au <oaicintake@oaic.gov.au>

2 attachments (22 MB)
2026-07-13-can-not-report-heavily-edited-criminal-accusations.mp4; ray-smiths-fraud-shit.png;

Trustpilot Privacy, Legal, Content Integrity and Escalations,
I formally reject your decision to restore the Ray Smith review.

Your response addresses only whether the review fits several narrow reporting categories. It does not address the evidence supplied, the materially misleading account published by the reviewer, Trustpilot's own false consumer warning, or my outstanding demand for the complete removal of Legion Killfeed from Trustpilot.

Ray Smith's customer status is not disputed

Ray Smith was a customer. I am not claiming otherwise.
The issue is that the review materially misrepresents the documented interaction and omits facts that directly contradict its central allegations.

The preserved Discord conversation shows that Ray Smith contacted support because he wanted Legion Killfeed to operate alongside another bot so he could use that bot's shop or trader functionality. He stated that, if this could not be done, he would remove Legion Killfeed and return when the issue was fixed.

He then removed the bot himself.
That directly contradicts his original 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 before the later argument occurred.
The review also claimed that I personally told him I did not have "the time or the crayons to explain things."

The Discord record shows that this was an automated response generated by the Legion Support Manager bot in reply to wording contained in one of my own messages. The automated response was directed at me, not written by me to Ray Smith.

I immediately explained that fact in the conversation. He continued treating the automated bot response as though it were a deliberate personal statement from me and later used that false attribution as a central part of his review.

The conversation also shows that the dispute concerned one shop or trader feature and compatibility with another bot. Legion Killfeed itself was not entirely unavailable. The feature was not sold as a separate paid subscription, and the wider bot remained operational.

I acknowledge that I became blunt and used profanity as the conversation escalated. I have never concealed that. However, that does not make the reviewer's version accurate.

His review omitted that:

- he removed the bot himself;
- I did not revoke his subscription or access;
- the "crayons" response was generated by a bot;
- the response was directed at my own message;
- he was told this during the conversation;
- the entire Legion Killfeed service was not down;
- and he personally escalated the exchange by questioning my intelligence, accusing me of arrogance and continuing the argument after removing the bot.

Describing himself as calm and measured throughout is contradicted by the preserved record.

A customer is entitled to express dissatisfaction. Customer status does not entitle someone to alter the chronology, misattribute statements or publish demonstrably false claims about how access ended.

The revised review replaces one misleading account with new allegations

The current version now alleges that I:

- engage in deceptive practices;
- knowingly make false claims about customers;
- falsely accuse customers of being competitors;
- manipulate Trustpilot's reporting system;
- intentionally suppress genuine feedback;
- violate the FTC's Trade Regulation Rule;
- commit unfair and deceptive trade practices;
- and lie to bury poor ratings.

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

These are not simply opinions about poor customer service. They are allegations of dishonesty, deliberate review manipulation and unlawful commercial conduct presented as established facts.

No court or regulator has determined that Legion Killfeed violated the FTC rule cited by the reviewer.

Trustpilot previously stated that the review had been edited so that it no longer contained the defamatory content reported. The reviewer was then permitted to replace that material with a different set of allegations concerning deception, illegality and regulatory breaches.

That is not meaningful moderation. It is allegation substitution.

The conduct surrounding the interaction remains relevant

The fact that Ray Smith was a customer does not prevent Trustpilot from assessing whether he deliberately prolonged a dispute and then reconstructed it into a damaging review.

He stated that he would leave and return when the feature was fixed. He removed the bot himself. He then continued the confrontation, ignored repeated explanations, relied upon an automated response after being told where it came from, questioned my intelligence, introduced external Reddit accusations and later falsely claimed that I had revoked his access.

His revised review has moved even further away from describing the service and now primarily attacks my honesty, my reporting activity and my alleged compliance with US federal regulation.

The available evidence supports a reasonable concern that the interaction was deliberately escalated and later materially misrepresented.

This review must be assessed within the wider review activity

Trustpilot has also been supplied with evidence of surrounding review activity.

On 2 July 2026, two separate one-star reviews were published four minutes apart by "Kyle" and "Killfeed review."

Both followed substantially the same structure and raised the same sequence of complaints:

- alleged problems accessing or navigating the website;
- alleged mobile-display problems;
- alleged colour and readability problems;
- and alleged design elements distracting from the content.

The timing, subject order, structure and wording were substantially similar.

I am not claiming that Ray Smith necessarily controlled those accounts. I am stating that Trustpilot has been given evidence of clustered and potentially coordinated review activity and cannot reasonably assess every publication in complete isolation.

Your latest decision gives no indication that the cumulative pattern, repeated revisions, reinstatements or surrounding review activity were properly considered.

My website did not use Trustpilot's material

Trustpilot has also published a consumer warning against Legion Killfeed concerning reviews displayed on my own business website.

The reviews on my website were displayed independently as ordinary customer comments.

The page did not use:

- Trustpilot's logo;
- Trustpilot's star graphics;
- a TrustScore;
- a Trustpilot rating;
- a TrustBox;
- Trustpilot widget code;
- Trustpilot's API;
- Trustpilot screenshots;
- Trustpilot page designs;
- or any other technical or visual Trustpilot asset.

The heading originally stated **"Trustpilot Reviews."**

I then changed that heading to **"Product & Service Reviews,"** removing the Trustpilot name entirely.

The page displayed selected positive reviews concerning my own product and service. It did not present itself as an official Trustpilot page, live integration, authorised widget or Trustpilot endorsement.

The negative reviews were not displayed on that business page because each is disputed as unlawful and is already the subject of reporting, legal correspondence or regulatory complaints. That does not give Trustpilot ownership of the positive customer statements or require my business to display every accusation published against it.

Trustpilot must identify the exact legal right it claims was infringed.

In particular, Trustpilot must explain:

1. Which specific material it claims belonged to Trustpilot.
2. Whether it claims copyright ownership over the customers' words.
3. Whether any reviewer assigned exclusive ownership of those words to Trustpilot.
4. Whether Trustpilot claims an exclusive or non-exclusive licence.
5. What Trustpilot asset remained after the heading was changed.
6. What automated process allegedly constituted "scraping."
7. What specific content was displayed inaccurately.
8. Whether the complaint concerns copyright, trade marks, database rights, contract or misleading representation.
9. What legal right permits Trustpilot to require the use of its own commercial display products.
10. Why ordinary customer statements about my own business are being treated as an exclusively controlled Trustpilot asset.

Do not describe everything published through Trustpilot as "Trustpilot content" without identifying the precise right allegedly held.

Trustpilot attempted to direct me toward plan-controlled assets

Trustpilot's enforcement email did not merely ask me to remove a logo or correct a rating.

It directed me to use widgets available through the "Share & promote" section of the Trustpilot Business account and expressly referred to TrustBox widgets that may not be included in the business's Trustpilot plan.

The email also copied:

revenue@revenue-technology.com

Trustpilot then published an adverse consumer warning against my business.

The sequence is therefore:

1. I independently displayed positive customer comments about my own business.
2. I used none of Trustpilot's technical or visual assets.
3. I removed Trustpilot's name from the heading.
4. Trustpilot demanded that the reviews themselves be removed.
5. Trustpilot directed me toward plan-controlled Trustpilot widgets.
6. A Revenue Technology address was included.
7. Trustpilot published a warning capable of damaging consumer confidence in my business.

I allege that this was an attempt to pressure me into using Trustpilot-controlled, potentially paid assets to display statements made about my own business.

Trustpilot must answer:

1. Why Revenue Technology was included.
2. What role that team had in the decision.
3. Whether my Trustpilot plan level was considered.
4. Whether the recommended display method required a paid plan.
5. Whether upgrading or purchasing a plan would have permitted the comments to remain displayed.
6. Whether the warning could be removed without purchasing anything.
7. Whether any revenue, sales, conversion or upgrade data was consulted.
8. Whether Trustpilot expected the warning to encourage a plan purchase or upgrade.
9. Why a commercial product was mentioned in an enforcement communication.
10. Why Trustpilot imposed public reputational pressure instead of addressing my demand to leave its platform completely.

Trustpilot has no right to present its own paid or plan-controlled product as the compulsory means through which I may reproduce ordinary customer comments, unless it can establish a specific enforceable right over those comments.

Trustpilot is directly responsible for its consumer warning

Trustpilot publicly stated:

"This company has been displaying Trustpilot content incorrectly."

That statement was created and published by Trustpilot.

It is not a customer review or third-party opinion. It is Trustpilot speaking in its own voice and presenting an adverse factual conclusion to potential customers.

Trustpilot is directly responsible for:

- the accuracy of the warning;
- the evidence relied upon;
- the legal basis for the statement;
- the context omitted from it;
- the decision to publish it;
- its duration and audience;
- and any reputational or financial damage resulting from it.

The warning is false or materially misleading because it does not disclose that:

- the comments appeared on my own business website;
- no Trustpilot widget, API, logo, star graphic, rating or TrustScore was used;
- the Trustpilot name was removed from the heading;
- Trustpilot had not established exclusive ownership of the customers' words;
- the alleged legal basis was disputed;
- Trustpilot directed me toward plan-controlled assets;
- Revenue Technology was included in the communication;
- and the warning was imposed while Trustpilot was already on formal notice that I demanded complete removal from its platform.

Trustpilot cannot avoid responsibility for this publication by referring to policies governing third-party reviews. The warning is Trustpilot's own statement.

Trustpilot was already on notice that I demanded complete removal

I do not want Legion Killfeed or my personal and sole-trader information associated with Trustpilot.

I do not wish to participate in Trustpilot's platform or be described as part of its "community."

I have reported Trustpilot's conduct as unlawful and potentially criminal. I do not consent to continued association with a platform whose conduct is the subject of those complaints.

My demand covers the removal of:

- the entire Legion Killfeed profile;
- every positive and negative review;
- all ratings;
- the TrustScore;
- review counts;
- public business replies;
- the consumer warning;
- categories and classifications;
- structured data;
- search snippets and previews;

- API and widget output;
- automated summaries;
- Trustpilot-controlled cached or syndicated material;
- and every automated process capable of recreating the profile or association.

This is not a request to close my dashboard while continuing to publish the business profile.

It is a demand to remove the public association itself.

Instead of addressing that demand, Trustpilot inspected the profile, reversed profile edits, sent enforcement correspondence, copied Revenue Technology, directed me toward plan-controlled widgets and created a new adverse warning about my business.

That demonstrates Trustpilot's ability to actively control the profile while refusing to use that control to remove the association I have repeatedly rejected.

Telling me to reply publicly is not a remedy

Your suggestion that I "tell my side of the story" does not resolve the matter.

A public reply cannot correct Trustpilot's internal treatment of the review as valid. It cannot prevent the review from affecting ratings, TrustScores, structured data, search visibility or automated summaries.

I have already supplied the underlying evidence directly to Trustpilot.

Trustpilot cannot knowingly retain materially disputed information and then transfer responsibility to me to repair the resulting damage through another public argument with the reviewer.

Automated assessment

Your email states that automated detection technology, human reviewers or a combination of both may have been used.

Trustpilot must disclose:

1. Whether automation was used in this decision.
2. Whether any part of the decision was entirely automated.
3. Whether a human reviewed the complete Discord transcript.
4. Whether that reviewer understood that Ray Smith removed the bot himself.
5. Whether that reviewer understood that the "crayons" response came from an automated bot.
6. Whether every version of the review was assessed together.
7. Whether the wider review pattern was assessed.
8. Which guideline provisions were applied.
9. Why the decision discusses personal information and advertising but does not address the documented false chronology.
10. Whether the matter was referred to Privacy or Legal after the formal notices were received.

A generic statement that automation may have been involved is not an adequate explanation of this specific decision.

Required action

Trustpilot must now:

1. Remove the Ray Smith review.
2. Immediately restrict the complete Legion Killfeed profile.
3. Remove the complete profile and every associated public output.
4. Remove Trustpilot's consumer warning.
5. Prevent automatic restoration or recreation of the profile.
6. Withdraw the allegation that I improperly used Trustpilot material.
7. Identify the exact rights Trustpilot claims over the customer comments.
8. Explain why plan-dependent widgets were included in the enforcement communication.
9. Explain the involvement of Revenue Technology.
10. Confirm whether payment or a plan upgrade would have changed the outcome.
11. Provide the complete consumer-warning decision record.
12. Provide the complete Ray Smith moderation record.
13. Transfer this matter to Trustpilot Privacy and Legal.
14. Address the outstanding access, correction, restriction, objection and erasure demands.
15. Preserve all evidence required for regulatory, police and legal proceedings.

Preservation notice

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

- every version of the Ray Smith review;
- every edit and timestamp;
- all reports and appeals;
- all automated assessment inputs and outputs;
- all human-review notes;
- authenticity and account-linkage signals;
- proof-of-purchase and identity documents;
- Trustpilot's assessment of those documents;
- the "Kyle" and "Killfeed review" records;
- all similarity and coordination assessments;
- the full consumer-warning decision record;
- profile audit and edit logs;
- website-monitoring records;
- communications involving Revenue Technology;
- historic and current plan information;
- sales, conversion and upgrade data associated with the enforcement;
- structured-data, search, API and syndication records;
- and all internal Privacy and Legal correspondence.

Public removal does not authorise the destruction of records required as evidence.

This decision, the consumer warning and Trustpilot's continued refusal to address the site-wide removal demand will be added to the existing regulatory complaints.

Do not send another instruction to flag individual wording, select another category or merely reply publicly.

Please confirm that:

- the profile has been restricted;
- the Ray Smith review has been removed;
- the consumer warning has been removed;
- Privacy and Legal have taken control of the matter;
- the complete site-wide removal demand is being addressed;
- and all relevant records have been preserved.

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

Trustpilot disabled my ability to report the materially rewritten review for defamation

There is a further serious issue omitted from your decision.

After Ray Smith materially rewrote the review and replaced the previous allegations with new accusations of dishonesty, deceptive practices, review manipulation and breaches of United States federal regulation, I attempted to submit a fresh defamation report against the current publication.

Trustpilot prevented me from doing so.

In the Trustpilot Business reporting interface, I selected **"Harmful or illegal."** The **"Defamation"** option was disabled, and the interface displayed:

"This review has already been flagged for this violation."

The Continue button was unavailable for that category.

This occurred despite Trustpilot's own **Review versions** interface showing separate tabs for:

- **Original review;** and
- **Current review.**

Trustpilot's own interface expressly states:

"The review that's currently online. This could be different from when we closed the report, since reviews can be updated at any time."

Trustpilot therefore recognises that the publication currently online may be materially different from the version previously reported and assessed. Nevertheless, its reporting system treated the old defamation report as though it also covered every new allegation subsequently added by the reviewer.

It did not.

The current review introduced a substantially different title and new factual and legal allegations, including that:

- Legion Killfeed engages in deceptive practices;
- I knowingly make false claims about genuine customers;
- I falsely identify customers as competitors;
- I intentionally manipulate Trustpilot reports;
- I suppress legitimate consumer feedback;
- I violate the FTC's Trade Regulation Rule;
- I engage in unfair and deceptive trade practices;
- I lie to bury poor ratings;
- and consumers cannot trust my business.

Those allegations were not the same publication previously reported. They required a fresh defamation assessment based on the wording currently online.

Instead, Trustpilot created a procedural barrier under which a reviewer can:

1. publish disputed allegations;
2. have those allegations reported;
3. materially rewrite the review;
4. introduce new allegations after the original report;
5. retain the same review identifier;
6. and prevent the business from reporting the new wording under the relevant category because the old version was previously flagged.

This effectively allows a reviewer to evade fresh assessment by editing an existing review rather than publishing a separate one.

The remaining reporting categories were not appropriate for the new allegations. When I attempted to use another available category because Defamation had been disabled, Trustpilot's submission interface warned that misuse of reporting could result in further action or suspension of my business account.

Trustpilot therefore placed me in an impossible position:

- the correct reporting category was disabled;
- the current review contained new allegations that had never been assessed under that category;
- unrelated categories did not accurately describe the complaint;
- and attempting to use another category exposed me to a threat of enforcement for alleged reporting misuse.

Trustpilot then restored the review and sent me an email claiming that it had been carefully checked.

That is not a fair or meaningful moderation process. It is a system that prevents the target of a materially revised publication from challenging the new allegations while allowing the reviewer to continue rewriting the content.

Your latest email also confirms that Trustpilot assessed the review for harmful or illegal content, personal information and advertising or promotional material. It does not confirm that the **current version** received a new defamation assessment after its substantial rewrite.

You must therefore answer:

1. Why was the Defamation category disabled for the materially rewritten review?
2. Was the restriction applied solely because the same review identifier had previously been reported?
3. Does Trustpilot's system distinguish between different versions of the same review when determining whether a reporting category remains available?
4. Was the current version assessed for defamation, or was Trustpilot relying on a decision concerning an earlier version?
5. What exact version and wording were before the reviewer who made the reinstatement decision?
6. Did the reviewer compare the original and current versions?

7. Did the reviewer assess each newly introduced allegation?
8. Why does Trustpilot permit reviewers to update reviews after a report while preventing businesses from filing a new report about the changed content?
9. Is this restriction generated automatically?
10. Can Trustpilot manually reopen the Defamation category for a materially revised publication?
11. Why was I exposed to a warning concerning reporting misuse when Trustpilot's own system had disabled the correct category?
12. How is a business expected to report newly introduced defamatory content under these circumstances?
13. Was Privacy or Legal informed that the reporting system prevented a fresh defamation complaint?
14. How many other versions of this review were assessed, and what decision was reached for each version?

The current Ray Smith publication must be treated as a new and distinct publication for assessment purposes. A closed report concerning earlier wording cannot reasonably determine the status of allegations introduced afterward.

Additional action required

Trustpilot must now:

1. Reopen the Defamation reporting category for the current version.
2. Register the current wording as a fresh defamation complaint dated from the time the revised publication became available.
3. Conduct a full human assessment of the current review rather than relying on the decision concerning an earlier version.
4. Remove or restrict the review while that assessment occurs.
5. Confirm exactly which version was assessed before the latest reinstatement.
6. Explain whether the category restriction was automated.
7. Correct the reporting system so that material review edits permit a new report about newly introduced content.
8. Confirm that no action will be taken against my account for attempting to report the revised allegations using the only categories Trustpilot left available.
9. Preserve the complete screen, event and audit records showing that the Defamation option was disabled.
10. Preserve every original and current version of the review and every moderation decision connected to each version.

Additional preservation requirements

Trustpilot must preserve:

- the complete version history for the Ray Smith review;
- the exact text and title present when each report was submitted;
- the exact text and title present when each decision was made;
- the internal identifier attached to every version;
- records showing when the Defamation category became unavailable;
- the rule, setting or automated decision that disabled it;
- all interface and event logs connected to my attempted report;
- the alternative category selections made after Defamation was disabled;
- the warning presented concerning reporting misuse;
- all human and automated assessments of each review version;
- and all records showing whether the latest reviewer was shown the original wording, current wording or both.

The screen recording made on 13 July 2026 preserves the disabled Defamation option, the message that the review had "already been flagged," the inability to continue under that category, Trustpilot's warning concerning alternative reporting and the separate original and current review versions.

Your reinstatement decision is therefore not merely substantively incorrect. Trustpilot's own system prevented me from submitting the correct complaint against the publication you restored.

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 10:29 PM
To: legionkillfeed@outlook.com <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>
Subject: Update on the review you flagged - Case #03012716

Hi Anthony,
We're following up about the [review](#) by Ray Smith, which you flagged for containing harmful or illegal content.

Our decision
We've carefully checked the review and found that it doesn't go against our guidelines for containing harmful or illegal content.
We also checked the review for personal information or advertising or promotional content, and we didn't find anything that goes against our guidelines for those reasons either. That's why we've put the review back online.

Tell your side of the story
We encourage you to [respond to the review](#) if you haven't already. Your reply appears right next to the review, offering a complete picture of the experience from both your side and the reviewer's. Replying can help build trust and credibility with potential customers.
If you have any questions or believe we've made a mistake, please reply to this email.

Thanks,
Please note that depending on the situation, we may use automated detection technology, a team of experts, or a combination of both to assess content on the Trustpilot platform.