

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [What constitutes a "Valid" Deal Dispute?](#)

Armada - June 27, 2017, 12:24 am

So, I know this sounds like a pretty weird question, but reading through the Marketplace discussion and all the Imposter reports going around with the Serial scammer ripping everyone off using well repped members, it led me to wonder what exactly is determined officially as a Valid Deal Dispute.

So to explain my somewhat confusion here.

Rules state, all deals should be done on site on Hack forums to constitute a valid dispute in the event something goes wrong.

Further Omni backs this up here:

Quote:5. Deal must have originated on HF and be tied to an HF member with a thread or PM.

So, the confusion I am having here. For example, Many if not majority of the Merchants on Hack Forums either use their own 3rd party website for product sales and advertisement, but almost everyone uses a 3rd party processor for payments.

That being said, majority of us do not know which of our customers are HF members or not. I for one in general only know my customers e-mail address to send their license key off to, unless that is they offer me their HF username or further information.

But as an example, in the event say the licensing system fails and the user never receives their license, or the seller simply does not want to render the services. Being the transaction was done offsite and had no communication directly with the buyer.

Another probable example would be a member referring another member to a site (They possibly setup themselves) to scam money from a user.

User1: "I need a BTC exchanging site"

User2: "Try this site" (Scripted to take User1's money)

User1 loses X amount of \$ to User2 and their 3rd party site.

Would these examples officially be considered a valid deal dispute report?

I know people file disputes for pretty much everything and majority from what I have recently seen are usually Skype or Discord deals. Which obviously should not happen to start. But none the less they are still filed, and with good reason. However being the deal happened offsite, the user is just that much more up the creek without a paddle, so to speak.

Despite the fact its obvious Staff do not get involved in disputes etc.

That being said, its not uncommon for these type of reports to get filed. But in all technical and official context are these type of Disputes actually considered valid reports in the eyes of site staff, or not?

Jimmie - June 27, 2017, 12:26 am

if you meet a member on this forum and scam them then it would be a valid scam report.

Now if I sent you a Bitcoin seller for example on Skype and he scammed you then that would probably be a off site deal regardless if he is a hackforums member as you didn't actually meet him on hackforums.

Armada - June 27, 2017, 12:35 am

(Jun 27, 2017 12:26 AM)jimmie Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) if you meet a member on this forum and scam them then it would be a valid scam report.

Now if I sent you a Bitcoin seller for example on Skype and he scammed you then that would probably be a off site deal regardless if he is a hackforums member as you didn't actually meet him on hackforums.

I mean I kind of figured, if the product or service is advertised here and the deal falls through regardless of method of communication I would think the seller would be held liable. But for Example #2, lets say I sent you to a scam site through Skype, and there is no mention of it on the Hack forums.

In that instance there would be no ties to Hack forums at all other than the fact the members are both from here.

Would that be considered a valid report?

Personally if a member loses out and gets scammed a dispute should be opened regardless of what or how it happened. But again I am more wondering the official position of what a Valid dispute constitutes, in specific with 3rd party websites.

Jimmie - June 27, 2017, 12:40 am

(Jun 27, 2017 12:35 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I mean I kind of figured, if the product or service is advertised here and the deal falls through regardless of method of communication I would think the seller would be held liable. But for Example #2, lets say I sent you to a scam site through Skype, and there is no mention of it on the Hack forums.

In that instance there would be no ties to Hack forums at all other than the fact the members are both from here.

Would that be considered a valid report?

Personally if a member loses out and gets scammed a dispute should be opened regardless of what or how it happened. But again I am more wondering the official position of what a Valid dispute constitutes, in specific with 3rd party websites.

This thread is actually really interesting because even tho I didn't scam you and sent you the contact the deal would still be tied to me according to that quote from Omni so maybe you could file a scam report on me?

Armada - June 27, 2017, 12:43 am

(Jun 27, 2017 12:40 AM)jimmie Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) This thread is actually really interesting because even tho I didn't scam you and sent you the contact the deal would still be tied to me according to that quote from Omni so maybe you could file a scam report on me?

Well, that is where the confusion for me comes in.

I send you to a site and you get scammed. First it could be very hard to prove it was intentional, or I was even responsible for the scam, but more so. Who is held liable in that event?

Is it me for directing you to the scam site, either knowingly or unknowingly.
Or you for doing the deal off site in the first place. ?

Jimmie - June 27, 2017, 1:01 am

(Jun 27, 2017 12:43 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, that is where the confusion for me comes in. I send you to a site and you get scammed. First it could be very hard to prove it was intentional, or I was even responsible for the scam, but more so. Who is held liable in that event?

Is it me for directing you to the scam site, either knowingly or unknowingly.

Or you for doing the deal off site in the first place. ?

I think people should be held responsible for their account and actions regardless if the scam was intentional or not.

Carl Elias - June 27, 2017, 3:47 am

That is a very good point. I do feel all should be reported though still.

Technically though with the quote you provided, many deals in your question do originate from HF. The thread where the deal/object is advertised falls in that. So that argument can be made.

I'm curious to see what the official word is on this though because it brings up some very valid points.

-Ty

Armada - June 27, 2017, 6:33 am

(Jun 27, 2017 03:47 AM)tyisobred Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) That is a very good point. I do feel all should be reported though still.

Technically though with the quote you provided, many deals in your question do originate from HF. The thread where the deal/object is advertised falls in that. So that argument can be made.

I'm curious to see what the official word is on this though because it brings up some very valid points.

-Ty

Yea, that one was not really the portion in question.

If the product or service is being advertised here and it leads to an off site resource, the deal still originated on the site. So the seller would obviously be responsible. The question is more towards in the factor of a 3rd party resource or entity causing the problem in the transaction.

It is more the Second Example I provided where it seems to get to be a real grey line, which is what I am trying to clarify.

M?xim - June 27, 2017, 1:46 pm

Quote:But as an example, in the event say the licensing system fails and the user never receives their license, or the seller simply does not want to render the services. Being the transaction was done offsite and had no communication directly with the buyer.

Technically the deal was originated on-site. But there's no proof.

However, we all have seen like "<name> RAT not working \$30", do they get marked as valid? Most likely not.

Quote:I know people file disputes for pretty much everything and majority from what I have recently seen are usually Skype or Discord deals. Which obviously should not happen to start. But none the less they are still filed, and with good reason. However being the deal happened offsite, the user is just that much more up the creek without a paddle, so to speak.

But they often do have on-site proof of the Discord/Skype ID.

Like a PM "Add my Discord: Maxim#9030 to make this deal"

Armada - June 27, 2017, 3:31 pm

(Jun 27, 2017 02:31 PM)- Sam - Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If the member was scammed off-site from a product here on HF then a dispute is still worthy.

Just because a dispute is open against a member that doesn't necessarily mean they are guilty.

Lets say a member did get scammed off-site then that's the buyers fault. You should make sure you do all deals on HF to avoid these type of imposter complications. I tend to stay away from the members who have hundreds of social media contacts for a marketplace product for this exact reason.

Members shouldn't be using off-site communications in regards of product here. There is a fully functional private messaging system yet people prefer to deal over Skype which has so many vulnerabilities, that's an accident waiting to happen and it happens everyday unfortunately.

For an advertised product here, wether the purchase happens off site, yes it still originated on hack forums to start, but this is where my real question is and still no clear answer.

(Jun 27, 2017 12:43 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, that is where the confusion for me comes in. I send you to a site and you get scammed. First it could be very hard to prove it was intentional, or I was even responsible for the scam, but more so. Who is held liable in that event?

Is it me for directing you to the scam site, either knowingly or unknowingly.
Or you for doing the deal off site in the first place. ?

SIM-3386134 - June 27, 2017, 3:35 pm

Quote:5. Deal must have originated on HF and be tied to an HF member with a thread or PM.

People who have 3rd party websites that also target market HF users will 100% most likely have;

- 1) A sales thread linking to said site.
- 2) A signature/user title linking to said site.
- 3) At some point send a message/PM linking said site.

All three of those, tied with the fact BOTH of you are HF members would mean its a valid deal dispute if it was posted.

If you're thinking somebody can advertise their site offering services on HF, then technically 'deal' offsite to purposely scam members and get away with it then no, thats not the case. You're out of luck Armada.

Armada - June 27, 2017, 3:48 pm

(Jun 27, 2017 03:35 PM)USD. Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) People who have 3rd party websites that also target market HF users will 100% most likely have;

- 1) A sales thread linking to said site.
- 2) A signature/user title linking to said site.
- 3) At some point send a message/PM linking said site.

All three of those, tied with the fact BOTH of you are HF members would mean its a valid deal dispute if it was posted.

If you're thinking somebody can advertise their site offering services on HF, then technically 'deal' offsite to purposely scam members and get away with it then no, thats not the case. You're out of luck Armada.

Why reply with the answer I have already noted?

Please re-read my last post instead of repeating what has already been noted.

Omniscient - June 28, 2017, 2:03 pm

Quote: So, the confusion I am having here. For example, Many if not majority of the Merchants on Hack Forums either use their own 3rd party website for product sales and advertisement, but almost everyone uses a 3rd party processor for payments.

It's not confusing at all. Rule states that the sale must have originated here which is likely a sales thread or even just a PM between members. It does not say it had to be processed here and that's simple too because we don't do any processing on HF at all. All payment processing occurs off-site.

Really not sure the point of your thread.

Armada - June 28, 2017, 2:49 pm

(Jun 28, 2017 02:03 PM)Omniscient Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's not confusing at all. Rule states that the sale must have originated here which is likely a sales thread or even just a PM between members. It does not say it had to be processed here and that's simple too because we don't do any processing on HF at all. All payment processing occurs off-site.

Really not sure the point of your thread.

I understand this, I mean if the seller originates from here, has a sales thread etc, it is only natural they would be liable. I mean virtually no one processes their own payments, even the site does not itself, it uses Coinpayments as the processor.

The question was more posed around the second more unusual scenario

(Jun 27, 2017 12:24 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Another probable example would be a member referring another member to a site (They possibly setup themselves) to scam money from a user.

User1: "I need a BTC exchanging site"

User2: "Try this site" (Scripted to take User1's money)

User1 loses X amount of \$ to User2 and their 3rd party site.

(Jun 27, 2017 12:43 AM)Armada Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, that is where the confusion for me comes in. I send you to a site and you get scammed. First it could be very hard to prove it was intentional, or I was even responsible for the scam, but more so. Who is held liable in that event?

Is it me for directing you to the scam site, either knowingly or unknowingly.

Or you for doing the deal off site in the first place. ?

In this scenario, 2 users would have made reference to a site not listed or referred to on the forums here. Which in this example turns out to be a scam site.

In this type of scenario, Being although both users may originate from the forums, and likely met through here. Being it was entirely offsite when it happened. Although I know a dispute likely would still be filed, are these type of disputes actually considered valid as per your/the sites definition?

Regards.

CPA Exposé - June 28, 2017, 6:03 pm

Sounds like if there was proof the user is spreading a scam site, that would be a community alert worthy topic.

A deal dispute has a clear agreement between 2 people, and one side did not fulfill their end, or for whatever reason isn't happy with the outcome.

The one requirement is that this agreement happened on hack forums.

I think you may be overthinking this. o.o

M?xim - June 28, 2017, 6:05 pm

(Jun 28, 2017 06:03 PM)Crumbs Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think you may be overthinking this. o.o
I think that we are on to something.

Armada - June 28, 2017, 6:13 pm

(Jun 28, 2017 06:03 PM)Crumbs Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Sounds like if there was proof the user is spreading a scam site, that would be a community alert worthy topic.

A deal dispute has a clear agreement between 2 people, and one side did not fulfill their end, or for whatever reason isn't happy with the outcome.

The one requirement is that this agreement happened on hack forums.

I think you may be overthinking this. o.o

Eh, that would clarify things enough for my liking.

Never been involved in a situation like this but when I get bored I go read the Marketplace and disputes sections and there always seem to be some real funky ways people go about this stuff.

Just really got me wondering what and where lines are drawn on a valid report or not. Being staff as it is do not even get involved in disputes. Although there are guide lines.

(Jun 28, 2017 06:05 PM)Maxim Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I think that we are on to something.
What can I say, curiosity killed the cat, but they were at least inquisitive. ?? (Not sure if that makes much sense)

Anyways, thanks for the clarification.