

Re: Inbound enquiry - Other [thread::D9JR3-VQf9K2ffaX_zDXdWA::]

From Soul Legion <legionkillfeed@outlook.com>

Date Thu 2026-07-16 4:08 AM

To Do not reply <donotreply@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>; Jaywayne <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>; revenue@trustpilot.com <revenue@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>

Cc OAIC - OAIC Intake <oaicintake@oaic.gov.au>; Datatilsynet <dt@datatilsynet.dk>

2 attachments (15 MB)

the-full-story.pdf, damages-analysis.pdf,

OAIC - Office of the Australian Information Commissioner references:

- WEB-CP-26-08655
- CP26/03054

The Danish Data Protection Agency

My complaint to that authority was sent under the subject:

"GDPR complaint against Trustpilot A/S — refusal to restrict or erase, continued processing after objection, adverse processing following legal notice, automated decisions and inability to disconnect linked Google account"

This email is a further evidentiary update to both complaints.

Trustpilot's 16 July response should be treated as an express refusal to remove the profile and an ongoing failure to substantively respond to the privacy rights exercised in my earlier notices.

Trustpilot Privacy, Legal, Content Integrity and Executive Escalations.

I formally reject Trustpilot's response dated 16 July 2026.

Your response is not a substantive answer to my privacy complaints, data-subject requests, restriction demand, objection to processing or demand for erasure. It answers a different question by repeating Trustpilot's internal policy concerning the creation and retention of business profiles.

An internal policy stating that Trustpilot ordinarily does not remove business profiles does not override applicable data-protection law or remove the requirement to assess my individual requests.

I did not merely ask how Trustpilot profiles are created. I formally exercised rights concerning access, accuracy, correction, restriction, objection, erasure, recipient notification and automated decision-making. I also demanded that Trustpilot disconnect the Google account linked to my Trustpilot account and disclose the associated information, identifiers, permissions and authorisations it retains. Your response does not address any of those matters.

Review ownership does not answer Trustpilot's own processing

Your statement that reviews are user-generated content "owned by the reviewers" does not answer the legal issues raised.

I am not demanding that Trustpilot destroy a reviewer's private copy of something they wrote. I am challenging Trustpilot's own processing, including its decision to:

- create and maintain a profile identifying my sole-trader business;
- associate that profile with my name, domain and commercial reputation;
- publish and repeatedly republish disputed allegations;
- assign ratings and a TrustScore;
- rank, index, recommend and distribute the profile;
- generate snippets, structured data and automated summaries;
- restore or retain reviews following legal notice;
- alter and override profile information;
- classify my conduct as misuse;
- publish an adverse consumer warning;
- retain identifiers connected to my linked Google account; and
- refuse restriction while the accuracy and lawfulness of that processing remain formally disputed.

Those are Trustpilot's processing operations. They are not answered by asserting that the reviewers own their words.

Your own response confirms that Trustpilot exercises active control. You state that one review has been removed, another is under investigation and others will remain online following Trustpilot's decisions. Trustpilot also previously altered my profile, removed information I entered and imposed a public warning.

Trustpilot therefore cannot credibly present itself as unable to restrict or remove the profile while simultaneously exercising direct control over its content, visibility, classifications, reviews and warnings.

Formal accusations against Trustpilot

I formally accuse Trustpilot A/S of fraudulent conduct, attempted commercial coercion and retaliatory adverse processing.

These are formal allegations submitted for regulatory and, where appropriate, law-enforcement assessment. I am not asking Trustpilot to adjudicate its own liability. I am placing Trustpilot on notice of the conduct alleged and requiring preservation and disclosure of the evidence capable of proving or disproving it.

1. Fraudulent conduct

Trustpilot publicly represents its platform, moderation, ratings and TrustScores as reliable consumer information while continuing to publish and commercially process disputed material despite extensive evidence of:

- false and misleading factual claims;
- coordinated and competitor-linked review activity;
- reviewers materially rewriting allegations following reports;
- repeated removal, restoration and republication;
- automated decisions that have not been meaningfully explained;
- technical-error republication previously admitted by Trustpilot;
- contradictory moderation outcomes;
- failure to examine the cumulative evidence across connected accounts and publications; and
- serious documented commercial and reputational harm.

Trustpilot has also published an adverse warning stating:

"This company has been displaying Trustpilot content incorrectly."

That statement is false and misleading.

I was not embedding Trustpilot widgets, copying Trustpilot's design, presenting Trustpilot's TrustScore or using Trustpilot-owned branding or platform assets as claimed. I displayed customer review material on my own website using my own presentation. When the heading initially referred to "Trustpilot Reviews", I changed it to "Product & Service Reviews".

Trustpilot itself states that review content belongs to reviewers, yet it publicly accused me of incorrectly displaying "Trustpilot content". Trustpilot cannot rely on reviewer ownership when refusing removal and then treat the same review content as Trustpilot's proprietary content when threatening my business.

The accuracy, evidence, lawful basis and decision-making process behind that warning remain undisclosed.

2. Attempted commercial coercion

Trustpilot demanded that I remove material from my own website, directed me toward Trustpilot-controlled widget products and threatened warnings or an adverse consumer alert if I did not comply.

Trustpilot made that demand while:

- continuing to publish disputed allegations about me;
- refusing to remove the Trustpilot profile;
- encouraging me to respond publicly through Trustpilot;
- failing to answer my privacy and legal notices;
- restricting how I could report or challenge disputed material; and
- controlling whether I could reproduce, preserve or publicly answer the material elsewhere.

Trustpilot's position was effectively that it could continue publishing and commercially benefiting from disputed content about me, but I could not display preserved customer statements on my own website unless I used Trustpilot-controlled and potentially plan-restricted publication methods.

That is the conduct I allege amounts to attempted commercial coercion.

Trustpilot must disclose whether purchasing a subscription, upgrading a business plan or using a paid Trustpilot product would have changed its enforcement position, profile treatment, widget access, warning decision or ability to display reviews.

3. Retaliatory processing

The chronology supports a serious allegation of retaliation:

1. I repeatedly served legal and privacy notices.
2. Trustpilot failed to substantively answer them or restrict the disputed processing.
3. Because direct correspondence was being ignored, I used the editable profile fields to publicly record that Trustpilot was on legal notice.
4. Trustpilot detected those changes almost immediately.
5. Trustpilot removed or overrode the information.
6. Trustpilot classified the conduct as profile misuse.
7. Trustpilot imposed an adverse public consumer warning.
8. Trustpilot subsequently accused me of misusing the flagging system.
9. Trustpilot continued publishing the profile and disputed reviews.
10. Trustpilot still did not substantively address the underlying access, correction, restriction, objection and erasure requests.

The issue is not timing alone. Trustpilot must preserve and disclose the internal records showing:

- who or what detected the profile changes;
- whether the process was automated;
- whether my privacy demands or legal notices became enforcement or risk signals;
- which staff or systems authorised the warning;
- whether Revenue Technology influenced the action;
- whether restriction or privacy escalation was considered;
- whether my complaints affected my account or profile classification; and
- why Trustpilot acted immediately to impose adverse public processing but did not act to restrict the processing I had formally disputed.

The Ray Smith review

Your response also fails to address the substance of the current Ray Smith review.

Ray Smith was a customer. I have repeatedly made that clear. Proof of purchase does not resolve the dispute and does not establish the truth of every allegation he publishes.

The current review falsely describes Legion Killfeed as a "US-based business". Legion Killfeed is operated by an Australian sole trader in New South Wales under ABN 28 387 377 607.

The review also publicly accuses me of:

- deceptive business practices;
- intentionally making false reports;
- lying about competitor involvement;
- manipulating reviews;
- suppressing legitimate criticism;
- violating the United States FTC Trade Regulation Rule; and
- engaging in unlawful and untrustworthy conduct.

Those are factual accusations of dishonesty, regulatory misconduct and unlawful commercial conduct. They are not merely statements that the reviewer disliked my tone.

The preserved conversation also shows that:

- Ray Smith stated that he would remove Legion Killfeed and return when the relevant feature was fixed;
- he removed the bot himself before the later argument;
- I did not initially terminate his access merely because he asked a support question;
- the "crayons" statement was generated by an automated Discord bot in response to wording contained in one of my own messages;
- the automated origin of the response was explained during the conversation;
- the disagreement concerned a particular trader or shop feature and compatibility with another bot, not the complete Legion Killfeed service; and
- the exchange involved hostility from both sides, contrary to the reviewer's presentation of himself as entirely calm and measured.

Ray Smith was served with a formal Letter of Claim and cease-and-desist notice on 15 July 2026. That notice requires removal, correction, preservation of evidence and a substantive response.

Trustpilot has now been directly notified that the publication is the subject of formal legal proceedings and a preservation demand. Trustpilot must preserve every version, edit, report, moderation decision, internal note, automated assessment and account record relating to that publication.

Required action

Trustpilot must now:

1. Immediately restrict public access to the complete Legion Killfeed profile while the accuracy, lawfulness and proportionality of the processing are assessed.
2. Remove the false consumer warning stating that Legion Killfeed displayed Trustpilot content incorrectly.
3. Remove or suspend the Ray Smith review and preserve every historical version while the legal dispute and evidence are assessed.
4. Erase and de-index the complete public association between Trustpilot and Anthony Brodie, Soul, Legion Killfeed, killfeed.co and ABN 28 387 377 607, or provide a particularised legal refusal addressing each processing operation separately.
5. Identify the precise lawful basis relied upon for the profile, reviews, ratings, TrustScore, warning, indexing, structured data, recommendations, snippets, syndication and continued republication.
6. Provide every legitimate-interest assessment, balancing assessment and erasure exception upon which Trustpilot relies.
7. Provide the complete personal-data access package previously requested, including moderation records, profile history, account-linkage assessments, automation outputs, staff notes, warning records, recipient information and Google-account connection data.
8. Correct inaccurate personal information and public statements, including the false description of Legion Killfeed as US-based and Trustpilot's unsupported consumer warning.
9. Explain which decisions were automated, human or combined and provide meaningful information about the principal factors and logic used.
10. Provide a clear and effective method of disconnecting my Google account and identify every Google-derived identifier, permission, token or authorisation retained by Trustpilot.

11. Preserve all relevant evidence, including review histories, account data, profile edits, warning decisions, risk classifications, Revenue Technology communications, moderation records, internal communications and automated-system outputs.
12. Identify a named senior Privacy or Legal representative responsible for the substantive response.

Do not send another generic explanation of Trustpilot's guidelines, another instruction to flag individual wording, another suggestion that I publicly "tell my side", or another statement that Trustpilot does not normally remove profiles.

The question is no longer what Trustpilot normally does.

The question is what lawful basis Trustpilot relies upon to continue processing, scoring, publishing, indexing and adversely classifying personal information about an identifiable Australian sole trader after repeated objections, restriction requests, correction requests, erasure demands, regulatory complaints and formal legal notice.

I require immediate confirmation that interim restriction and evidence-preservation measures have been applied. The complete privacy response remains due within the applicable statutory period calculated from the original requests.

Any continued publication, restoration, republication, warning, adverse classification or account restriction following this notice will be provided to the OAIC and Danish Data Protection Agency as further evidence of deliberate continued processing after notice.

Nothing in this correspondence waives any claim, complaint, remedy or right.

Consolidated evidence attached

I attach two consolidated records in support of this notice and the regulatory complaints copied here:

1. the-full-story.pdf

A 40-page chronological record covering February 2020 to 15 July 2026. It documents the coordinated harassment and commercial interference campaign, the people and accounts involved, cross-platform publication, repeated platform notices, Trustpilot's review handling, the July 2026 consumer warning, the Ray Smith publications and Trustpilot's continued actions after formal legal and privacy notice. The document indexes **2,534 preserved evidence files across 497 dated evidence points**.

2. damages-analysis.pdf

A 35-page consolidated analysis of the publication history, platform involvement, business interruption, customer loss, mitigation burden and resulting financial harm. It separately examines Trustpilot's role, including disputed review publications, restoration and republication decisions, the public consumer warning, the direction toward Trustpilot's paid display products and the continuation of publication after notice. It records a continuing campaign period of **1,116 days, 3,976 to 7,952 hours** of mitigation work and damages models ranging from **A\$1,400,064 to A\$2,624,634**, or **A\$1,519,344 to A\$3,380,074** using the alternative developer opportunity-cost model.

These attachments are not submitted as a substitute for the notices and requests already served. They consolidate the chronology, evidence references, platform decisions, commercial effects and damages that Trustpilot has repeatedly avoided addressing as a connected matter.

Trustpilot is therefore no longer entitled to pretend that this dispute consists of isolated review flags, ordinary disagreement with reviewers or a generic request to close a business account. The attached record identifies the publications, actors, accounts, notices, moderation outcomes, platform actions, continuing availability and resulting harm in substantial detail.

The damages analysis is supplied to demonstrate the seriousness and accumulated effect of the conduct. The figures remain subject to independent forensic accounting and legal assessment, but Trustpilot is now expressly notified that its continued publication, restoration, warning and commercial-pressure conduct forms part of the documented causation and aggravation case.

Anthony "Soul" Brodie

Trading as Legion Killfeed

ABN 28 387 377 607

New South Wales, Australia

legionkillfeed@outlook.com

From: Do not reply <donotreply@trustpilot.com>

Sent: Thursday, 16 July 2026 2:23 AM

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

Subject: Inbound enquiry - Other [thread::D9JR3-VQf9K2ffaX_zDXdWA::]

Hi,

Thanks for contacting us about your business profile page on Trustpilot. We understand your concerns, and we'd like to clarify how profiles are created on our platform and why we don't remove them.

How your profile was created

A business profile is automatically created when someone searches for your website on Trustpilot. This allows consumers to share reviews based on their recent experiences with your business.

Why we don't remove business profiles

Trustpilot is an open platform where consumers can share their genuine experiences and where businesses can use this feedback to engage, learn, and improve what they offer.

We understand some businesses may not wish to actively use Trustpilot. However, because reviews are user-generated content owned by the reviewers, we don't remove business profiles or reviews unless they go against our guidelines—even if a business profile is unclaimed, no longer in use, or under new ownership. Keeping this content visible helps consumers make informed decisions and gives businesses the chance to show how they respond to feedback.

Engage with reviewers

We encourage businesses to **engage and respond to reviews**, which helps build trust and credibility. Reviewers can also edit their reviews if their experience changes.

However, if you believe a review goes against our guidelines, you can flag it for our team to investigate. Please check this article to find **reasons businesses can flag reviews for**.

If you want to delete your Trustpilot Business account

If you've claimed your business profile, you can choose to delete your business account. This will return the profile to an unclaimed state, but it won't remove the profile itself or any of the reviews.

Regarding this review -

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a4572011fcac4675daf6489> , we can see that you have flagged the review and the investigation is taking place, once the investigation is completed, you will receive and update regarding the outcome of the investigation.

Regarding this review -

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a457305a8a2ed5debe10bdb> , we can see that the outcome of the investigation has been shared with you in ticket no - 02997338 as the review follows our guidelines and the review will remain online, please contact us back from that ticket so that we can assist you further.

Regarding this review -

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a46fba336d191dad04c0abc> we can see that the review has already been taken offline and removed from your business profile.

Regarding this review -

<https://www.trustpilot.com/reviews/6a4fa6d6a8376e6c23bb2e6d> , we can see that the outcome of the investigation has been shared with you in ticket no - 03012716 and the review will remain online, please contact us back from that ticket so that we can assist you further.

Thanks and regards,