

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Lie on my rep. \[User claiming I scammed him, claims the same on many others\]](#)

?M???????? - October 29, 2013, 2:44 pm

On my rep a user has lied to make me look like a scammer;

He has done it to plenty of members and it was actually used as blackmail to one member;

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=3789253>

User was then negged by a few members such as myself who were disgusted with his behaviour. Is there a way I can have his rep removed? I wouldn't mind a rep from him, just not a lie that might hurt business later on.

Edit 1:

(Oct 29, 2013 03:11 PM)?M???????? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So a bunch of you are under the impression that for it to be considered abuse, I'd have to mention 'stolen' or 'scammed'?

So I can post on all your reputation saying

Code Sent me 450\$ for my product, then charged back, LQ!No. It's still an abuse of reputation if its not true, whether or not he mentioned 'scam' or 'stolen'.

Also, Judge Dredd is no longer an admin/Deals with reputation so I made this thread.

Edit 2:

Dre™ - October 29, 2013, 2:46 pm

Yea this is considered rep abuse.

Just wait for a staff member to see this and he will be dealt with.

Hayley Williams - October 29, 2013, 2:47 pm

I don't get it.

Why the fuck do people make these threads? You'd be better off sending a message to the correct admin so they can actually SEE IT, and you can track whether they see it through the tracking system.

Peter - October 29, 2013, 2:51 pm

It's not actually rep abuse towards you.

The policy states among other things that rep abuse is limited to when someone calls you a scammer. In this case, he did not call you a scammer but LQ because he apparently sent you money.

From. My interpretation, this is fine and it's not rep abuse.

Source: <https://hackforums.net/misc.php?action=help&hid=20>

Alexander - October 29, 2013, 2:54 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 02:51 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's not actually rep abuse towards you.

The policy states among other things that rep abuse is limited to when someone calls you a scammer. In this case, he did not call you a scammer but LQ because he apparently sent you money.

From. My interpretation, this is fine and it's not rep abuse.

Source: <https://hackforums.net/misc.php?action=help&hid=20>

He claims that the OP received money from him and claimed that his Paypal account got limited, rendering him unable to forward the money to a 3rd party. In other terms, he called him a scammer.

Dre™ - October 29, 2013, 2:55 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 02:51 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's not actually rep abuse towards you.

The policy states among other things that rep abuse is limited to when someone calls you a scammer. In this case, he did not call you a scammer but LQ because he apparently sent you money.

From. My interpretation, this is fine and it's not rep abuse.

Source: <https://hackforums.net/misc.php?action=help&hid=20> He did basically call him a scammer by saying "M???????? took/stole/has \$130 of his money.

By calling LQ at the end could just be a way to bypass it so he doesn't get called for RA.

Peter - October 29, 2013, 2:58 pm

He never explicitly used the words "stole or scam" he just said: I sent him the money and his paypal is limited? Yeah right.

It might be to ones interpretation that it does indicate he is calling him a scammer but I would more then anything say admins and staff take a literalist approach when actually understanding what the person wrote.

Cyrus - October 29, 2013, 2:59 pm

No one inforces reputation rules currently, so just deal with it.

Nas - October 29, 2013, 3:02 pm

This is considered Rep abuse, this is the reps he given.

Peter - October 29, 2013, 3:03 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:02 PM)-Nas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is considered Rep abuse, this is the reps he given.

Yes, that is rep abuse itself.

Spamming the same thing to multiple members like that.

bandors - October 29, 2013, 3:04 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:02 PM)-Nas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This is considered Rep abuse, this is the reps he given.

This rep does not flame and does not mention the word 'scammer' or 'scammed' it is not rep abuse, however he's still an ass.

Nas - October 29, 2013, 3:06 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:04 PM)Bandors Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This rep does not flame and does not mention the word 'scammer' or 'scammed' it is not rep abuse, however he's still an ass.

In his sentence, he says " Said he'd be my PP holder, sent him \$130 and all of a sudden his PP is

limited? Lol yeah right. LQ! " Which indirectly means hes calling the person a scammer. I'm pretty sure Omni and/or other staff are not retarded and can understand. OP i would report to Omni, but it's on your head.

?M???????? - October 29, 2013, 3:11 pm

So a bunch of you are under the impression that for it to be considered abuse, I'd have to mention 'stolen' or 'scammed'?

So I can post on all your reputation saying

Code Sent me 450\$ for my product, then charged back, LQ!No. It's still an abuse of reputation if its not true, whether or not he mentioned 'scam' or 'stolen'.

Also, Judge Dredd is no longer an admin/Deals with reputation so I made this thread.

Peter - October 29, 2013, 3:16 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:11 PM)?M???????? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So a bunch of you are under the impression that for it to be considered abuse, I'd have to mention 'stolen' or 'scammed'?

So I can post on all your reputation saying

Code Sent me 450\$ for my product, then charged back, LQ!No. It's still an abuse of reputation if its not true, whether or not he mentioned 'scam' or 'stolen'.

Also, Judge Dredd is no longer an admin/Deals with reputation so I made this thread.

You can call it what you like, the policies state clearly what reputation abuse is and what he said to you is not abuse of the system.

The fact whether it is true or not should be determined by a deal dispute and not rep. You can say what you like on the rep system, whether it be true or not, as long as it does not violate the policies.

Saying it isn't true is like me saying you like to play girls sports. Whether it is true or not is half irrelevant. As long as it does not violate the policies, it is not an abuse of rep.

The policies should be taken for their true meaning and not interpreted by using other words thrown into the context. It is clearly construed in this case.

630 - October 29, 2013, 3:18 pm

There is currently no rep abuse support. This is an extreme case though since he has done it to several members. If you PM a staff member something be be done. No guarantees.

'An0ny - October 29, 2013, 3:19 pm

I suggest you to contact Omniscient, he deal with rep for me so i assume he'll do it for you too.

?M???????? - October 29, 2013, 3:30 pm

He seems to look in this section alot.

He will see it sooner or later, I'll let him deal with it in his own time.

bandors - October 29, 2013, 3:36 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:06 PM)-Nas Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) In his sentence, he says " Said he'd be my PP holder, sent him \$130 and all of a sudden his PP is limited? Lol yeah right. LQ! " Which indirectly means hes calling the person a scammer. I'm pretty sure Omni and/or other staff are not retarded and can understand. OP i would report to Omni, but it's on your head.

(Oct 29, 2013 03:11 PM)?M???????? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) So a bunch of you are under the impression that for it to be considered abuse, I'd have to mention 'stolen' or 'scammed'?

So I can post on all your reputation saying

Code Sent me 450\$ for my product, then charged back, LQ!No. It's still an abuse of reputation if its not true, whether or not he mentioned 'scam' or 'stolen'.

Also, Judge Dredd is no longer an admin/Deals with reputation so I made this thread.
No, it is not reputation abuse. It is very mean and evil, however by the standards he placed is is allowed.

Alexander - October 29, 2013, 3:51 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 02:58 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He never explicitly used the words "stole or scam" he just said: I sent him the money and his paypal is limited? Yeah right.

It might be to ones interpretation that it does indicate he is calling him a scammer but I would more then anything say admins and staff take a literalist approach when actually understanding what the person wrote.

The staff are humans with common sense (well, some of them), and they can see as clearly as anyone the rep giver is implying that the receiver has scammed him.

Layla - October 29, 2013, 3:56 pm

He gave me this rep too.. Please do something about this asshole.

bandors - October 29, 2013, 4:08 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:51 PM)Alexander Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The staff are humans with common sense (well, some of them), and they can see as clearly as anyone the rep giver is implying that the receiver has scammed him.

That does not matter. Of course they can tell what he is saying. What I am saying is it is not against the rules. According to what I have read in the [Help Docs](#).

Peter - October 29, 2013, 4:12 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:51 PM)Alexander Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The staff are humans with common sense (well, some of them), and they can see as clearly as anyone the rep giver is implying that the receiver has scammed him.

Common sense does not relate to this as common sense is practical rather then theoretical. Off topic.

The policies CLEARLY state among other things that rep abuse is when someone calls you a scammer and did not leave the report on the rep.

He did not once, call him a scammer. All he said was "Sent this member X amount of money and his paypal got limited. LQ". How can you ASSUME by those words that he was calling him a scammer? Did he once say you're a scammer? How can you not assume that he was calling him LQ because he doesn't know how to properly handle his funds?

Until otherwise justified by either a valid comment or a staff members decision, this is otherwise construed to the literal meaning of both the rep and the policy.

Alexander - October 29, 2013, 4:26 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:12 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Common sense does not relate to this as common sense is practical rather then theoretical. Off topic.

The policies CLEARLY state among other things that rep abuse is when someone calls you a scammer and did not leave the report on the rep.

He did not once, call him a scammer. All he said was "Sent this member X amount of money and

his paypal got limited. LQ". How can you ASSUME by those words that he was calling him a scammer? Did he once say you're a scammer? How can you not assume that he was calling him LQ because he doesn't know how to properly handle his funds?

Until otherwise justified by either a valid comment or a staff members decision, this is otherwise construed to the literal meaning of both the rep and the policy.

Actually, you misquoted him. He is not saying that the receiver's Paypal account was in fact limited, but rather that the receiver claims it to be.

Here is the actual comment: Said he'd be my PP holder, sent him \$130 and all of a sudden his PP is limited? Lol yeah right. LQ!

In common slang, the term "yeah right" is synonymous with terms like "I do not believe this", "You are lying", and "In saying so, you are being dishonest".

By saying "yeah right", the reputation issuer calls the receiver a liar, and thereby also a scammer.

Common sense will always apply

?M???????? - October 29, 2013, 4:50 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:26 PM)Alexander Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Actually, you misquoted him. He is not saying that the receiver's Paypal account was in fact limited, but rather that the receiver claims it to be.

Here is the actual comment: Said he'd be my PP holder, sent him \$130 and all of a sudden his PP is limited? Lol yeah right. LQ!

In common slang, the term "yeah right" is synonymous with terms like "I do not believe this", "You are lying", and "In saying so, you are being dishonest".

By saying "yeah right", the reputation issuer calls the receiver a liar, and thereby also a scammer.

Common sense will always applyThank you, this is exactly what I mean't, I'm glad someone better with words could clear it up.

?

Peter - October 29, 2013, 4:53 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:26 PM)Alexander Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Actually, you misquoted him. He is not saying that the receiver's Paypal account was in fact limited, but rather that the receiver claims it to be.

Here is the actual comment: Said he'd be my PP holder, sent him \$130 and all of a sudden his PP is limited? Lol yeah right. LQ!

In common slang, the term "yeah right" is synonymous with terms like "I do not believe this", "You are lying", and "In saying so, you are being dishonest".

By saying "yeah right", the reputation issuer calls the receiver a liar, and thereby also a scammer.

Common sense will always apply

And it's posts like this that correctly justify a statement.

Props to you.

I concede the fact that this member is right and in fact I did over-look the words "Yeah right".

Although, when we look at this from an admin perspective, we are trying to read his comment in a contextual approach. The policy does state something to the effect of "If a member reps another by calling them a scammer then a link to the report must be written as well". In any place such as policies and/or legislation is that the words are read in a purposive approach but not within the context of the situation it applies to as this emulates a subjective intention. The words are read by using the surrounding words or what therefore it was intended by the policy maker for. In this case, Omni intended that if someone calls you a scammer they just link the report. If he wanted to include scammer AND any words they may be read within the context meaning a scammer such as you have pointed out then he would have listed so. Because he did not then the policy does not apply. He intended for the word 'scammer' to be used for its strict wording and not its contextual wording.

Unless you would like to justify that as well? Feel free to. I'm always happy to read the insight of other members.

Tutelary - October 29, 2013, 4:56 pm

This is Rep Abuse but you can't report it to anyone. Sorry. (Actually, maybe try PMing Omni about it?)

Peter - October 29, 2013, 4:57 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:50 PM)?M????????? Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thank you, this is exactly what I mean't, I'm glad someone better with words could clear it up.

?

It was pretty clear what you meant: He made you look like a scammer.

Whether it can be defined as rep abuse in accordance with the policies is what is an issue here.

Alexander - October 29, 2013, 5:12 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:53 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) And it's posts like this that correctly justify a statement. Props to you.

I concede the fact that this member is right and in fact I did over-look the words "Yeah right".

Although, when we look at this from an admin perspective, we are trying to read his comment in a contextual approach. The policy does state something to the effect of "If a member reps another by calling them a scammer then a link to the report must be written as well". In any place such as policies and/or legislation is that the words are read in a purposive approach but not within the context of the situation it applies to as this emulates a subjective intention. The words are read by using the surrounding words or what therefore it was intended by the policy maker for. In this case, Omni intended that if someone calls you a scammer they just link the report. If he wanted to include scammer AND any words they may be read within the context meaning a scammer such as you have pointed out then he would have listed so. Because he did not then the policy does not apply. He intended for the word 'scammer' to be used for its strict wording and not its contextual wording.

Unless you would like to justify that as well? Feel free to. I'm always happy to read the insight of other members.

My puny 15 year old mind was only barely able to comprehend what you just wrote, but I think I got it ?

This is what the help documents say, copied & pasted

Also, a reputation accusing someone of being a scammer must be followed with a link to the scam report thread that you have made.

It says that a reputation accusing someone of being a scammer, which I think we all agree that the reputation at hand does, needs to contain a link to the scam report. If it said, for example, "calling someone a scammer", I could see your point, but in this case, I think the description in the help documents match with the reputation that OP received

BlueSlidePark - October 29, 2013, 5:18 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 04:12 PM)P?ter Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Until otherwise justified by either a valid comment or a staff members decision, this is otherwise construed to the literal meaning of both the rep and the policy.

Could you please provide a source for where it states that the policies found in the help documents must be interpreted literally and literally only?

If a person must state the word "scammer" for it to be rep abuse, then a multitude of statements which do in fact call someone a "scammer" but do not use the exact word "scammer" could be used.

E.g.

"Sent this person 130 dollars and stole it from me!"

"This person is a scam artist. Took my Bit Coins."

"This PP holder likes to scam people. BEWARE!"

Loomaanaatii - October 29, 2013, 5:19 pm

Yea that's common. I would just -3 him back. There's not much staff can do about it.

iNviZ - October 29, 2013, 5:26 pm

I suggest closing the thread and add the link on his rep. By the looks of it he screwed himself on this.

Peter - October 29, 2013, 5:27 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 05:12 PM)Alexander Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) My puny 15 year old mind was only barely able to comprehend what you just wrote, but I think I got it ?

This is what the help documents say, copied & pasted

Also, a reputation accusing someone of being a scammer must be followed with a link to the scam report thread that you have made.

It says that a reputation accusing someone of being a scammer, which I think we all agree that the reputation at hand does, needs to contain a link to the scam report. If it said, for example, "calling someone a scammer", I could see your point, but in this case, I think the description in the help documents match with the reputation that OP received

Not to sure of thats a bad or good thing. If it was poorly written, feel free to tell me, I can edit it. I just wanted to be more concise without pulling out any principles on rules of interpretation and policy/legislature writing.

You're correct, although calling someone a scammer and accusing someone of being a scammer is the same thing. Either way you need to support your claim. The only real theoretical difference is that the accuser as compared to the person establishing they are of a particular trait is that the accuser, in this context the person accusing of them scamming as to establishing they are a scammer is that the accuser has a condemning conscious and to correctly evaluate this you will partake in an infallible test. That is going a little extreme but my point is that the person accusing another of being a scamming such as "I think you're a scammer or the actions you took resulting in me being scammed" is because the accuser is infallible.

If they are to establish another is a scammer "You're a scammer" then they are strict on what they know as to what they think.

That was going way off track but I'm underlying the difference between accusing and establishing. They are they same thing, they both need to be proven and both just be disproven or rebutted.

Hence my interpretation behind the policy. Accusing someone of scamming as to establishing someone is a scammer is one of the same thing.

OT: In my view, we can't assume what the rep issuer implied but what we know from the face of it and not the prima facie.

Positive - October 29, 2013, 5:28 pm

(Oct 29, 2013 03:19 PM)AnonyWS Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I suggest you to contact Omniscient, he deal with rep for me so i assume he'll do it for you too.

In a case like this, he will take care of it.

OP, it is safe to message the big man. ?

Omniscient - *October 31, 2013, 10:51 pm*

Dealt with.