

Forum:[Hack Forums](#)

Thread: [Most Unprofessional, Unethical, Greedy Middleman \[Cooligan UID = 1891811 \]](#)

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:25 am

Hello HF Community,

I hope everyone is doing well. Sorry for making this thread but I wanted to share one experience I had with Cooligan MM service (just because buyer wanted to use him as MM).

So [noobnoob](#) approached me to help him with a Quiz for \$350 BTC. Exactly 0.0265197 BTC (\$350 + \$17.50 = \$367.50) was sent to Cooligan to hold until I finish the Quiz. Simple MM service. Right ? Hold on.

So finally the day arrived to release the funds to me. I asked him to keep 0.0011 BTC (he assumed I tipped him), but it was for his 5% fees, I know this misunderstanding can be mutually solved. This Thread is not for this small misunderstanding but something else which is completely Unethical, Unprofessional and highlights his Greedy Nature. Please keep reading.

He sent me 0.02033863 BTC (\$330.96) .

Now here's the reason I created this thread. He sent me 0.02033863 BTC (\$330.96) and not 0.0254197 BTC (\$413) which is the real amount after deducting 0.0011 BTC (his MM fees).

Here are couple of reasons, why I deserve the 0.0254197 BTC.

? If BTC value would have dropped , MM wouldn't have paid from his pocket. He would simply cut his fees and send the remaining amount. Since, BTC value increased, I have full right to claim the right amount.

? MM always hold "BTC amount" and not "BTC Value" , take away their fee and transfer remaining funds to other party.

? One example of above scenario is an experience I had with [Kill Joy](#) , he held BTC for me and sent all the BTC amount to me after successful completion of deal. I know he can confirm this if needed. The deal was for about \$2300 and I received around \$2500+ coz the BTC price was increased. I'm pretty sure I would have received the less value if BTC Price would have dropped.

I would love to hear the opinion of Community Members. Thanks !!

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:35 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:33 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If anyone were to get the extra \$, it would be noobnoob as the contract was for you to receive the \$ amount after the work was done, not receive the \$ amount early and let the value increased.

I'm happy with this.

Zexi - November 13, 2020, 5:37 am

Middleman receives x.xx BTC amount + his fee from the buyer, middleman releases x.xx BTC amount to the seller/provider of services. It's simple as that, it's buyer's problem/luck if BTC value goes up or down.

Everybody makes mistakes i doubt Cooligan had bad intentions.

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:37 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:33 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Lots of middlemen pay \$ amount out when it's based on the \$ amount in an agreement and the value went up, but if the value goes down send the btc amount regardless. So ur being a bit of a dumdummy.
You really sure about this ?

I think otherwise. I would love to hear [Kill Joy](#) 's opinion on this as he runs a successful MM service.

Sh0w3n - November 13, 2020, 5:37 am

I don't know OP or the MM, but from my experience this is true.

? MM always hold "BTC amount" and not "BTC Value" , take away their fee and transfer remaining funds to other party.

flavoral - November 13, 2020, 5:38 am

Mind posting a screenshot of the contract?

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:41 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:36 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Is that a meme? You're a greedy, unprofessional person.

"why I deserve". sounds like all you care about is getting extra money you aren't entitled to, not that you'd be happy if noobnoob got it.

Why don't you consult with [Cooligan](#) as I have already mentioned this same thing to him around 30 minutes ago.

Either I receive the funds or [noobnoob](#) gets back. If you wanna see the convo screenshot with him, I can do that too :)

Net - November 13, 2020, 5:42 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:37 AM)Sh0w3n Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I don't know OP or the MM, but from my experience this is true.

? MM always hold "BTC amount" and not "BTC Value" , take away their fee and transfer remaining funds to other party.

Agree with this. Altho I just think this whole mess is just a lack of communication problem.

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:46 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:37 AM)Zexi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Middleman receives x.xx BTC amount + his fee from the buyer, middleman releases x.xx BTC amount to the seller/provider of services. It's simple as that, it's buyer's problem/luck if BTC value goes up or down.

Everybody makes mistakes i doubt Cooligan had bad intentions.

Yeah. Thanks for confirming :)

I have been using MM services since years. I was fairly sure that's how "Holding BTC" works.

Zexi - November 13, 2020, 5:48 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:46 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yeah. Thanks for confirming :)

I have been using MM services since years. I was fairly sure that's how "Holding BTC" works. Cooligan made a honest mistake, but noobnoob has no rights to the profits. You are the only person entitled to the funds that are left over from the deal.

Only saying this because noobnoob wouldn't have sent more money if the BTC value dropped below 300\$. The risk of BTC losing value is a risk you are taking while a middleman holds your funds, no one else. If it goes up you are lucky, if it goes down you are not. You always get the same BTC amount.

Cooligan should just send you the remainder of the funds and you should put this behind you.

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:48 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:47 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) i have and that's why I believe you're a self-entitled, greedy, unprofessional bitch here.

Alright.

I respect your opinion.

flavoral - November 13, 2020, 5:49 am

Not clear terms and miscommunication as usual.

I personally think that if the deal is for \$350 regardless of the currency a \$350 should be released, but I'm no MM. However, bitcoin isn't a stable coin, which puts up in the 2 usual situations of "Who's gonna cover the difference if it goes down" and "who's gonna take the interest if it goes up".

[123](#) Seems like you already down for a resolution which is waiting for [noobnoob](#) to just confirm who takes the interest.

123 - November 13, 2020, 5:51 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:49 AM)flavoral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not clear terms and miscommunication as usual.

I personally think that if the deal is for \$350 regardless of the currency a \$350 should be released, but I'm no MM. However, bitcoin isn't a stable coin, which puts up in the 2 usual situations of "Who's gonna cover the difference if it goes down" and "who's gonna take the interest if it goes up".

[123](#) Seems like you already down for a resolution which is waiting for [noobnoob](#) to just confirm who takes the interest.

Although Zexi says I'm fully entitled to receive funds.

But I'm more than happy to be released back to [noobnoob](#) although I'm 100% sure if the BTC value would have dropped overnight, neither noobnoob would have covered anything for me nor the MM.

Zexi - November 13, 2020, 5:52 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:51 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Although Zexi says I'm fully entitled to receive funds.

But I'm more than happy to be released back to [noobnoob](#) although I'm 100% sure if the BTC value would have dropped overnight, neither noobnoob would have covered anything for me nor the MM. If the funds go back to noobnoob, this is gonna be the biggest meme ever.

Yajat - November 13, 2020, 5:54 am

I also think OP that you should receive the BTC value which is shown when you made the contract not just the USD value. This is just my vision over the things. Hope you guys resolve this !

flavoral - November 13, 2020, 5:57 am

[123](#) can you post a screenshot of the contract?

Zexi - November 13, 2020, 6:01 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:57 AM)flavoral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [123](#) can you post a screenshot of the contract?

The contract is public:

<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=230218>

No mention of BTC value but there isn't need for one, that's the only way middlemaning works.

If the nerds who are defending Cooli don't believe me wait for Kill Joy to come online and confirm the same thing.

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:02 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:57 AM)flavoral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [123](#) can you post a screenshot of the contract?

Contract is public and it was initiated by [noobnoob](#)

You can simply check in my market profile :)

Cooligan - November 13, 2020, 6:02 am

Just for context, this is the contract for the deal and the terms as stated:

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:05 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:01 AM)Zexi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The contract is public:

<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=230218>

No mention of BTC value but there isn't need for one, that's the only way middlemaning works.

If the nerds who are defending Cooli don't believe me wait for Kill Joy to come online and confirm the same thing.

Yeah. I have used countless MM services and BTC value fluctuated a lot but every MM release BTC amount.

I also gave a real experience I had with Kill Joy.

Kill Joy - November 13, 2020, 6:08 am

My opinions:

1. Cooligan knew what he was doing and takes advantage of the price difference. Very unethical and not very surprising he has done this. He should send the rest of the money back. Even if you want to get technically correct, you are ethically incorrect.

2. The user you dealt with message me but HF was going through some attacks and I was worried something would go wrong if he chose someone else.

[123](#) You should just deal with me directly every transaction.

I charge zero fees and never have. I currently have over \$20,000 in escrow for 2 members on here

and never had any issues.

I would also like to add, most middleman don't take advantage of the dollar difference. They send the whole thing because it's implied and an honest/respectful exchange.

SIM-3343347 - November 13, 2020, 6:10 am

Well, based on this events, my contracts from now on will be stated in satoshis lol

flavoral - November 13, 2020, 6:10 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:01 AM)Zexi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The contract is public:
<https://hackforums.net/contracts.php?action=view&cid=230218>

No mention of BTC value but there isn't need for one, that's the only way middlemaning works.

If the nerds who are defending Cooli don't believe me wait for Kill Joy to come online and confirm the same thing.

Nobody is defending anyone here. We're trying to find a way to resolve this whole miscommunication. It's the MM grey area situation. Each MM have their own terms for it I think.

There are few resolutions :mutual quick agreement between [123](#) and [Cooligan](#) to end this miscommunication and go 50 50 on the intrest.

noobnoob gets the interest back.

123 gets it

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:15 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:10 AM)flavoral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Nobody is defending anyone here. We're trying to find a way to resolve this whole miscommunication. It's the MM grey area situation. Each MM have their own terms for it I think.

There are few resolutions :mutual quick agreement between [123](#) and [Cooligan](#) to end this miscommunication and go 50 50 on the intrest.

noobnoob gets the interest back.

123 gets it

Now after hearing [Kill Joy](#) and [Zexi](#) opinions who run the successful Middleman Service I should receive the remaining funds.

But if Cooligan doesn't wanna do this, he can simply return the remaining funds to noobnoob .

Kill Joy - November 13, 2020, 6:16 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:15 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Now after hearing [Kill Joy](#) and [Zexi](#) opinions who run the successful Middleman Service I should receive the remaining funds.

But if Cooligan doesn't wanna do this, he can simply return the remaining funds to noobnoob . Maybe this is an example of a potential rework for contracts where MM's can insert their own terms? [Xerotic](#)

Yajat - November 13, 2020, 6:19 am

This will be a shame if it doesn't get resolved..

Zexi - November 13, 2020, 6:24 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:16 AM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Maybe this is an example of a potential rework for contracts where MM's can insert their own terms? [Xerotic](#)
Hopefully the middleman statistics along side it too..

SIM-3343347 - November 13, 2020, 6:27 am

I might not be the bright person here but the contract didn't state satoshi but value. There's a difference right?

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 6:35 am

I told Cooligan this:

[123](#) gets \$20 to get to the \$350 and [noobnoob](#) get's the remaining funds.
Case solved.

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:39 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:35 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I told Cooligan this:

[123](#) gets \$20 to get to the \$350 and [noobnoob](#) get's the remaining funds.
Case solved.

(Nov 13, 2020 06:48 AM)Zexi Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Cooligan made a honest mistake, but noobnoob has no rights to the profits. You are the only person entitled to the funds that are left over from the deal.

Only saying this because noobnoob wouldn't have sent more money if the BTC value dropped below 300\$. The risk of BTC losing value is a risk you are taking while a middleman holds your funds, no one else. If it goes up you are lucky, if it goes down you are not. You always get the same BTC amount.

Cooligan should just send you the remainder of the funds and you should put this behind you. One of the successful Middleman on-site answered this.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 6:40 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:39 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#)

One of the successful Middleman on-site answered this.

Your reply is literally empty.

Not sure if you mean the quote, but stop being money greedy. You were told \$350, I gave the resolution to get \$350.

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:42 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:40 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Your reply is literally empty.

Not sure if you mean the quote, but stop being money greedy. You were told \$350, I gave the resolution to get \$350.

I'm just stating straight up facts of "Holding BTC" confirmed by Kill Joy and Zexi.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 6:43 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:42 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I'm just stating straight up facts of "Holding BTC" confirmed by Kill Joy and Zexi.

I do not care about what they are saying.

YOU said you would be good with Noobnoob getting the funds back.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342026#pid60342026>

Now I am proposing a solution which even gets you \$20 more and you are like "NAH I WANT THE FULL AMOUNT".

Stop being a money-hungry cock and accept the cards that are being dealt.

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:56 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:43 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I do not care about what they are saying.

YOU said you would be good with Noobnoob getting the funds back.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342026#pid60342026>

Now I am proposing a solution which even gets you \$20 more and you are like "NAH I WANT THE FULL AMOUNT".

Stop being a money-hungry cock and accept the cards that are being dealt.

Okay. First of all this -3 popularity over different opinions is what 10 Year old's do. You're a member of Infamous and hold respect in my eyes.

I can give you -5 but that's not a mature thing.

I have stated that already what you suggested but after reading opinions of successful Middleman Service providers I stated I have a right to receive the remaining funds.

I have stated this in my post already but looks like you haven't seen it yet.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342054#pid60342054>

SIM-2273342 - November 13, 2020, 6:58 am

Just my \$0.02: on the one hand, I think that it is reasonable to assume that if BTC were to drop significantly over the course of the deal, Cooligan would have been forced to do 1 of 2 things.

1. Make the difference up out of his pocket, or
2. Advise noobnoob to send the necessary difference to reach the agreed-upon price.

Given that assumption, I see why he should have sent the BTC value, rather than the \$ value. On the flip side, I see why he would have sent the \$ value, as agreed upon in the terms, and pocketed the rest. Seems a bit questionable with regards to ethics; although, no prior agreement or discussion was had.

For the sake of ease and clearing this up promptly, I'd imagine Cooligan would pay you the sum you're asking. I could be wrong.

123 - November 13, 2020, 6:58 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:57 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) you know popularity literally means fugg all and you should not be complaining about it. immaturity is you and this thread.

Well we have a slightly different opinion on "MATURITY" then.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 6:59 am

Appreciate the post, will avoid this dog if I ever am in need of an MM :)

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:00 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:59 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) immaturity is complaining about a neg mate. Alright.

I respect your opinion.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 7:02 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:56 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Okay. First of all this -3 popularity over different opinions is what 10 Year old's do. You're a member of Infamous and hold respect in my eyes.

I can give you -5 but that's not a mature thing.

I have stated that already what you suggested but after reading opinions of successful Middleman Service providers I stated I have a right to receive the remaining funds.

I have stated this in my post already but looks like you haven't seen it yet.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342054#pid60342054>

I can -3 whomever I want. Doesn't matter if I am in Infamous or not. I -3'd you because you are being a money-hungry ass and aren't even looking to get this resolved.

You started this thread because of Cooligan holding the funds, then you start off by saying that it's fine for [noobnoob](#) to get his funds back and because [Zexi](#) and [Kill Joy](#) say otherwise you assume that is what you are owed and that's how the situation is? let me tell you that is not how life works.

I gave you the most fair solution of them all. You get an extra \$20 to get to your owed \$350 and noobnoob gets the remainder of his money back. That way both parties are happy (apparently not you) and Cooligan only gets his % of the fee.

This thread has gone far beyond [Cooligan](#) and has turned into you just trying to get more money.

So, stop being a money-hungry ass and try to resolve this. My -3 stays until you do.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 7:03 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:59 AM)RIP KING VON Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Appreciate the post, will avoid this dog if I ever am in need of an MM :)

You're post way too soon before even reading any of the replies. You're a dog yourself.

Net - November 13, 2020, 7:04 am

Can I just add something.

Would this thread exist if the BTC price went down instead of up?

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:05 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:03 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're post way too soon before even reading any of the replies. You're a dog yourself.

I did read the replies, if nothing was said, your dog friend would have just kept the remainder.

In what world would that be the norm?

???? do you think your HF rep and deals translate to real-life skills? I can read, you're defending a bum LMAO

flavoral - November 13, 2020, 7:05 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:02 AM)RIP KING VON Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) How does the MM believe he is in the right by taking \$80 in funds rather than the agreed upon \$17.50?

Legit bum LOL

not sure how many brain cells you have lost in the 10 years you been on HF

Cooligan isn't taking the funds, he's trying to find who should get the interest, the buyer or the seller.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:06 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:04 AM)Net Ninja Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Can I just add something.

Would this thread exist if the BTC price went down instead of up?

Nope.

I would have accepted the money. This has happened to me countless times where I lost few \$ coz price went down.

That is what "Holding BTC" means by Middleman.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 7:07 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:05 AM)RIP KING VON Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I did read the replies, if nothing was said, your dog friend would have just kept the remainder.

In what world would that be the norm?

???? do you think your HF rep and deals translate to real-life skills? I can read, you're defending a bum LMAO

Not sure what you are on about mate. [123](#) Never once asked [Cooligan](#) to see what would happen to the remaining funds before making this thread. You are making up things. Shut up and leave the thread you clown.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:08 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:05 AM)flavoral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) not sure how many brain cells you have lost in the 10 years you been on HF

Cooligan isn't taking the funds, he's trying to find who should get the interest, the buyer or the seller. [flavoral](#) I would have to differ on this. I discussed with Cooligan either to send extra funds to noobnoob or me before opening this thread.

But he denied either thing and he said he would hold extra funds.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:10 am

All these clowns circle jerking each other are legit brainless. If the agreed upon funds were sent to escrow it doesn't matter if it appreciates or depreciates after that point. That's on the seller who is agreeing to sell his products or services through escrow. No one would expect the buyer to pay in more funds if it depreciates before the deal completes.

Dumb. Dogs. Trying to dictate funds that aren't yours. Get real. LMAO.

Edit: Learn how to use your brain before offering middleman services. Dog.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:13 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:07 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Not sure what you are on about mate. [123](#) Never once asked [Cooligan](#) to see what would happen to the remaining funds before making this thread. You are making up things. Shut up and leave the thread you clown.

Hey [SIM-1729678](#) you're extremely wrong about this. I said whether he sends remaining funds to me or noobnoob whomever he decide "BEFORE STARTING THIS THREAD" but he said it'll not happen and he'll keep it.

Then I replied, " Then I'll let Community decide what's right and what's wrong" .

Then I started this thread.

Everything was discussed on-site via HF Convo.

Cooligan - November 13, 2020, 7:15 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:08 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [flavoral](#) I would have to differ on this. I discussed with Cooligan either to send extra funds to noobnoob or me before opening this thread.

But he denied either thing and he said he would hold extra funds.
This is entirely and absolutely incorrect.

After I said that you never replied and posted this thread..

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 7:17 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:08 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [flavoral](#) I would have to differ on this. I discussed with Cooligan either to send extra funds to noobnoob or me before opening this thread.

But he denied either thing and he said he would hold extra funds.
Are you just going to ignore my reply? great. Shows something.
Take the deal, take the \$20, let the rest go to noobnoob and don't deal with Cooligan again, easy.
You are making this so much more complicated than it has to be.

(Nov 13, 2020 08:13 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hey [SIM-1729678](#) you're extremely wrong about this. I said whether he sends remaining funds to me or noobnoob whomever he decide "BEFORE STARTING THIS THREAD" but he said it'll not happen and he'll keep it.

Then I replied, " Then I'll let Community decide what's right and what's wrong" .

Then I started this thread.

Everything was discussed on-site via HF Convo.

Ignore my last post, HF loading times being a pain in my ass again.
Anyway, how about you show us the screenshots or you just export the logs and upload it? I wanna see it.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:17 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:13 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) the agreed upon funds were \$350, so based on your own "it doesn't matter if it appreciates or depreciates", 123 should only receive \$350. sounds good.
The agreed upon funds were \$350 BTC, a BTC amount determined on that day (not today, not 3 days later, is this hard for you to comprehend?), that was sent directly into escrow.

You don't change the terms after the fact. You can't go back when it's time to release funds and reassess the value of funds that have been held for X amount of time for the seller and decide that you're going to distribute it elsewhere LOL

Learn how an escrow works, I understand that NONE of you deal elsewhere apart from here, but get real.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:19 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:17 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Are you just going to ignore my reply? great. Shows something.

Take the deal, take the \$20, let the rest go to noobnoob and don't deal with Cooligan again, easy. You are making this so much more complicated than it has to be. I'm not ignoring anyone. I have already replied.

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342266#pid60342266>

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 7:22 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:13 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Hey [SIM-1729678](#) you're extremely wrong about this. I said whether he sends remaining funds to me or noobnoob whomever he decide "BEFORE STARTING THIS THREAD" but he said it'll not happen and he'll keep it.

Then I replied, " Then I'll let Community decide what's right and what's wrong" .

Then I started this thread.

Everything was discussed on-site via HF Convo.

Ignore my last post, HF loading times being a pain in my ass again, that post was meant to be posted way earlier ?

Anyway, how about you show us the screenshots or you just export the logs and upload it? I wanna see it.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:27 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:22 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Ignore my last post, HF loading times being a pain in my ass again, that post was meant to be posted way earlier ?

Anyway, how about you show us the screenshots or you just export the logs and upload it? I wanna see it.

This screenshot is in regard of my previous claim where I said I asked him to either send funds to me or noobnoob.

Mon3aan - November 13, 2020, 7:30 am

How has this discussion gone on for 5 pages?

He got sent a BTC amount +5% fees. Surely, when both parties are satisfied with the deal and money gets released by the MM, all that needs to be done by him is: deduct 5% from the satoshi value sent and fork the rest over to the other party?

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:31 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:22 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) the agreed-upon funds were for a dollar value of btc, not a satoshi value.

You're an actual idiot.

You guys are all grasping at straws because you are legitimately brainless and can't comprehend how an escrow works.

THE MOMENT THE MM TOOK THE \$350 BTC TO HOLD FOR THE SELLER UNTIL THE TASK IS COMPLETED IT BECAME THE AGREED UPON FUNDS. IF IT DEPRECIATED, THE BUYER WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN LIABLE TO PAY IN MORE. SO WHY WOULD THE REVERSE BE FEASIBLE?

This isn't a hard concept to grasp, I understand that it may take you some time to wrap your head around the idea that you are completely 100% wrong.

In any other marketplace with an escrow service that had an inkling of understanding of how the world works (you need this to be professional, morons.) this issue wouldn't occur.

Kill Joy - November 13, 2020, 7:35 am

If the agreed upon funds were dollar value, they would have used US DOLLAR as the contract value, not Bitcoin.

BTC was selected as the currency exchanged. The dollar value displayed in the contract is the estimated current value if the BTC was liquidated at that time.

Just saying.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:40 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:35 AM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If the agreed upon funds were dollar value, they would have used US DOLLAR as the contract value, not Bitcoin.

BTC was selected as the currency exchanged. The dollar value displayed in the contract is the estimated current value if the BTC was liquidated at that time.

Just saying.

They can't comprehend this.

They see \$350 BTC and think \$350 worth of BTC, no, it was \$350 BTC transacted and determined on THAT DAY.

Angel - November 13, 2020, 7:41 am

The simple solution to resolve this headache, the MM needs to send the BTC value not the \$ value, seems like he tried to make some quick \$ and he is in the wrong here in my opinion.

SIM-2273342 - November 13, 2020, 7:52 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:30 AM)Mon3aan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) How has this discussion gone on for 5 pages?

He got sent a BTC amount +5% fees. Surely, when both parties are satisfied with the deal and money gets released by the MM, all that needs to be done by him is: deduct 5% from the satoshi value sent and fork the rest over to the other party?

This is the simplest and most reasonable resolution. A 5% surcharge of the BTC value for Cooligan, and the remaining value sent to the designated party.

123 - November 13, 2020, 7:53 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:22 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) the agreed-upon funds were for a dollar value of btc, not a satoshi value.

You're absolutely wrong about this.

When you choose BTC while making a contract, it states exact number of BTC amount at that point of time and display the approximate value of BTC at that time.

So the MM was holding BTC amount as it was chosen in contract. He would take away his 5% fee (0.0011 BTC) and transfer remaining funds to other party (me).

If Dollar amount was to be chose, this discussion wouldn't have been started.

This is the exact same thing said by Kill Joy above.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 7:54 am

(Nov 13, 2020 08:41 AM)James Wrote: [CITE](#) nah ur the fricker here mister. i knew there was a reason I already negged you. did you also see the part where the contract says if there wasn't a middleman that he'd be sent \$350 once the work was done? no? ok

"The amount I will send to middleman or user is \$350 he will receive payment once assignment is complete.'

He sent \$350 in BTC to the middleman. The value of the BTC was determined the day he sent it into escrow, the full amount to be released when the contract was completed.

Again, learn how an escrow works, you absolute clueless nonce. Devolving into degeneracy and typing nonsense when you are mentally defeated (soundly, I might add, you are quite literally the most brainless child on this forum) is hilarious.

The second the BTC funds that were determined to be worth \$350, agreed upon by both parties, were put into escrow the amount was decided.

If the funds depreciated in value, would there be a justified scam report if the seller who agreed that the funds were adequate on the day the transaction occurred and put into escrow decided he wanted more? No. Because both parties agreed upon the value in the transacted BTC when it was put into escrow and the deal began.

Use your brain for longer than 30 seconds, or pay someone more knowledgeable about marketplaces to formulate a response for you, you represent yourself poorly, dog.

Kill Joy - November 13, 2020, 8:01 am

ScreemS is posting our findings that concludes what I have posted is correct and that Cooligan should have indeed sent the full amount. We did a little test contract.

SIM-2273342 - November 13, 2020, 8:04 am

There is no need for back and forth debate. It's straight forward. Cooligan take 5% of the BTC value and send the remainder. Everyone is happy.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 8:05 am

Here are some findings. Which I think it's worth tagging [Xerotic Omniscient](#) for.

When the contract between 123 and Noobnoob was made, the currency BTC was selected and the amount of \$350 was put into the amount box.

Image for reconstruction.

The contract system output 0.0XXXXXXX amount of BTC as well as the \$350 even showing a

calculation.

Cooligan was then added as a middleman to this deal.

When clicking continue, the contract once again states the amount of BTC that has to be sent besides the \$ value.

Image for reconstruction.

But when the contract is finished and accepted, the BTC amount is lost and not shown anywhere, [Cooligan](#) told me that the middleman is also not able to see the amount of BTC that the contract earlier stated and has now disappeared.

Image from the actual contract

I think this is where the confusion is caused.

Admins, to prevent future confusion, would it be beneficial to add the BTC amount behind the \$ value when the contract is made?

123 - November 13, 2020, 8:06 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:01 AM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) ScreemS is posting our findings that concludes what I have posted is correct and that Cooligan should have indeed sent the full amount. We did a little test contract.

Thanks for confirming.

I appreciate your and [SIM-1729678](#) genuine efforts.

Cooligan - November 13, 2020, 8:07 am

[123](#)
I've exported all of our group Convo logs with [noobnoob](#) and I'd like to post them here so that everyone can see the full context behind this deal and the terms within.

However in those logs it shows your paypal.me address so I don't want to post it without your permission.

Would you mind if either I or you post the logs for detail?

Side note: I've already agreed by the way to [SIM-1729678](#) proposition of me sending you \$20 of the interest to make you whole at \$350, and send the remaining interest to [noobnoob](#) and that way everyone is happy and this is resolved. However after you said you'd be okay with that in previous replies, you argued with Screems saying "One of the successful Middleman on-site answered this." and proceeded to link someone else's post.

[SIM-1729678](#) 's reply which offers a very fair solution for both you and noobnoob (which you stated prior that you'd be okay with):

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342153#pid60342153>

Your replies to him:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342165#pid60342165>

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342172#pid60342172>

His replies to you:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342169#pid60342169>

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342176#pid60342176>

123 - November 13, 2020, 8:13 am

[Cooligan](#) I'm happy to share FULL CONVO LOGS but please hide my Paypal Email (I really appreciate of you letting me know this) .

Also, I would like to thank [SIM-1729678](#) for his/her efforts and writing a detailed post confirming the messed up situation along with [Kill Joy](#)

Also, I'm happy to receive \$20 and rest of the funds transferred to noobnoob.

Thanks !!

qq6123783 - November 13, 2020, 8:14 am

Hilarious part is if bitcoin went down in price you bet your ass Cooligan would've sent the amount in satoshis not usd ?

123 - November 13, 2020, 8:16 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:14 AM)RIP KING VON Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) If you want the full amount you're entitled to it.

Let it be a lesson for me as well as others who'll read this thread.

Just want to conclude this asap without creating extra drama.

SIM-1729678 - November 13, 2020, 8:19 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:13 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) [Cooligan](#) I'm happy to share FULL CONVO LOGS but please hide my Paypal Email (I really appreciate of you letting me know this) .

Also, I would like to thank [SIM-1729678](#) for his/her efforts and writing a detailed post confirming the messed up situation along with [Kill Joy](#)

Also, I'm happy to receive \$20 and rest of the funds transferred to noobnoob.

Thanks !!

Happy to hear that you are accepting the deal I proposed.

Let's get this sorted and also let's make sure this confusing case isn't going to replicate itself in the future.

My apologies for any harsh language that I might have used.

-3 removed. :)

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 8:21 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:16 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Let it be a lesson for me as well as others who'll read this thread.

Just want to conclude this asap without creating extra drama.

Fair. At least you were made whole. Hopefully someone benefits from reading how this should be handled correctly.

Xerotic - November 13, 2020, 8:22 am

BTC holding is BTC holding. Not USD holding. It might have a USD-like value but you are holding satoshis, not pennies. You receive X BTC to hold you don't send Y BTC later on. You send X.

Buyer/Seller both take a chance of BTC value changing. The longer the hold duration the more likely the final receiving price varies a bit. But one thing that won't change? The number of satoshis held. X is X and it's not Y.

That's my opinion and I sure as hell would never deal with someone confused about that. Reconsider who you deal with in the future.

123 - November 13, 2020, 8:27 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:22 AM)Xerotic Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) BTC holding is BTC holding. Not USD holding. It might have a USD-like value but you are holding satoshis, not pennies. You receive X BTC to hold you don't send Y BTC later on. You send X.

Buyer/Seller both take a chance of BTC value changing. The longer the hold duration the more likely the final receiving price varies a bit. But one thing that won't change? The number of satoshis held. X is X and it's not Y.

That's my opinion and I sure as hell would never deal with someone confused about that. Reconsider who you deal with in the future.

Thats what I have been claiming since start and I respect your opinion.

Edit : I would like to confirm here [noobnoob](#) has nothing to do with this misunderstanding. He is a genuine buyer and honest member who asked to release funds after deal was completed as promised.

The situation was caused right after receiving funds from Cooligan and confronting with him why he sent low amount. Rest of the story has been mentioned in Thread already.

THE RULER - November 13, 2020, 8:37 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:27 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Thats what I have been claiming since start and I respect your opinion.

Edit : I would like to confirm here [noobnoob](#) has nothing to do with this misunderstanding. He is a genuine buyer and honest member who asked to release funds after deal was completed as promised.

The situation was caused right after receiving funds from Cooligan and confronting with him why he sent low amount. Rest of the story has been mentioned in Thread already.

There should be a vetting process, at least some form of displaying comprehension of how an escrow/middleman functions before you offer paid services.

Glad there's no enmity between you and the buyer, and I'm sure he'll respect the fact that you gave him some kickback from the transaction.

Have a good one.

spiral - November 13, 2020, 8:53 am

Yeah you are totally in the right here OP, the btc funds should've been released, regardless of the USD value.

As someone else mentioned if btc went down, would Cooligan have paid the extra? No.

123 - November 13, 2020, 9:05 am

(Nov 13, 2020 09:53 AM)spiral Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yeah you are totally in the right here OP, the btc funds

should've been released, regardless of the USD value.

As someone else mentioned if btc went down, would Cooligan have paid the extra? No.
Thanks for your opinion.

I appreciate that !! Just seeing what the community thinks, it completely aligns with what I thought.

Porn - November 13, 2020, 9:11 am

I remember kill joy held \$1k btc for me, and when the deal wasn't successful he sent the btc back with an additional \$50 since the value of btc went up in price. If the value of btc went down in price and I lost \$50 kill joy is not held responsible, I simply have to take a loss of \$50. The full amount of BTC received should be the full amount of BTC released regardless of the current price, you can then tip them 5-10% after a successful deal is complete.

123 - November 13, 2020, 9:17 am

(Nov 13, 2020 10:11 AM)Porn Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I remember kill joy held \$1k btc for me, and when the deal wasn't successful he sent the btc back with an additional \$50 since the value of btc went up in price. If the value of btc went down in price and I lost \$50 kill joy is not held responsible, I simply have to take a loss of \$50. The full amount of BTC received should be the full amount of BTC released regardless of the current price, you can then tip them 5-10% after a successful deal is complete.

I had the same experience with him.

I always choose him as a MM if deal is initiated by me but sometimes Buyer wants to choose a particular MM, I do not deny that since it will make him think why he doesn't wanna use this particular MM and puts a negative impression of me (or) MM.

Money Man - November 13, 2020, 10:32 am

OP, you are completely right.

Cooligan and his little crony butt buddies are just trying to walk away with BTC that is YOURS.

- 1) If the value of the BTC dropped, Cooligan would not reimburse you.. its his job to send the amount of BTC that was middle-manned.
- 2) The value went up, you're entitled to it as ITS YOUR BITCOIN.

Is this rocket science or some shit?

(Nov 13, 2020 08:31 AM)RIP KING VON Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're an actual idiot.

You guys are all grasping at straws because you are legitimately brainless and can't comprehend how an escrow works.

THE MOMENT THE MM TOOK THE \$350 BTC TO HOLD FOR THE SELLER UNTIL THE TASK IS COMPLETED IT BECAME THE AGREED UPON FUNDS. IF IT DEPRECIATED, THE BUYER WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN LIABLE TO PAY IN MORE. SO WHY WOULD THE REVERSE BE FEASIBLE?

This isn't a hard concept to grasp, I understand that it may take you some time to wrap your head around the idea that you are completely 100% wrong.

In any other marketplace with an escrow service that had an inkling of understanding of how the world works (you need this to be professional, morons.) this issue wouldn't occur.

He's just dick riding his boyfriend, let him be. Its a clown in the midst. Hopefully he sorts this BS out for you OP.

And in future use Zexi, he don't pull this BS.

123 - November 13, 2020, 11:30 am

(Nov 13, 2020 11:32 AM)Money Man Wrote: [CITE](#) OP, you are completely right.

Cooligan and his little crony butt buddies are just trying to walk away with BTC that is YOURS.

1) If the value of the BTC dropped, Cooligan would not reimburse you.. its his job to send the amount of BTC that was middle-manned.

2) The value went up, you're entitled to it as ITS YOUR BITCOIN.

Is this rocket science or some shit?

He's just dick riding his boyfriend, let him be. Its a clown in the midst. Hopefully he sorts this BS out for you OP.

And in future use Zexi, he don't pull this BS.

Yeah. I have claimed same thing in my thread.

Yes. My go to guys are Zexi or Kill Joy. But Buyer chose MM himself and I didn't wanted to create negative impression of me (or) him by denying to use him as MM.

PsyDovah - November 13, 2020, 11:35 am

7 pages over this, damn. As others have said if someone is holding a BTC amount, then they should send the same exact BTC amount in satoshis (minus fees).. Don't get why this is so complicated lol, if BTC dropped the MM wouldn't have sent you \$350 but the satoshis he got minus fees.

Glad you came to an agreement with Cooligan though.

Cooligan - November 13, 2020, 12:37 pm

I just got back home so I can now make my official reply to this thread. To start, I don't appreciate some of the things being said on this thread as for one; I've never done anything to those who were saying foolish things, and two; I've ran a very successful MM service here on HF for many years now and have never had any issues MM'ing a very large number of funds over those many years. This is actually the first time my services have been questioned by anyone.

I also don't appreciate the title of this thread as it is completely and utterly inaccurate, especially the part about greediness (seeing my MM service was free for many years), however regardless of it, I'd still like to see this get resolved and everyone happy in the end - which could have been done hours ago if [123](#) had simply agreed then and there to the same exact resolution that we have finally come to now, which was suggested by [SIM-1729678 >HERE<](#) - however at the time of that suggestion, this was the result of it:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342176#pid60342176>

Below is an exported PDF of our full group Convo to show full transparency about how this deal started, the terms involved, and the confusion that eventually led to this point. (123 gave me permission to post this as long as I removed his paypal.me which has been done)

[https://drive\[WARNING POSSIBLY INFECTED\]google.com/file/d/1NhV95nsvZJazdr36TryQ7kLilZczDG24/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1NhV95nsvZJazdr36TryQ7kLilZczDG24/view?usp=sharing)

I would like to first state that at no point during this deal was I ever against sending either [123](#) or

[noobnoob](#) the interest, I just want to make that very clear, (the interest of the BTC I was holding is what's in question here) and the complete and full Convo logs provided above will show that I never "denied" sending it or "said no" as [123](#) claimed I did. In fact, at the end of our conversation I even said to him that I was going to post a thread here in Marketplace Discussions for the community to read and decide what should happen here (as BTC usually doesn't grow by \$1k+ in just a week or so's time) [\[IMAGE\]](#) -- however [123](#) didn't reply and beat me to the punch as we can all see here. Our private conversation just happened very quickly and talks of posting a thread for the community to decide happened rather quickly as well which is why this wasn't eventually resolved in Convo.

I understand how the misunderstanding between me and [123](#) happened due to how the contract terms [\[PUBLIC CONTRACT & TERMS HERE\]](#) were stated both there and in Convo. I was under the impression that I was holding \$350 BTC in dollar amount [\[IMAGE\]](#), and [123](#) was under the impression that I was holding it in satoshi amount, however this was never clarified in the beginning of the deal [\[IMAGE\]](#). Now this poses the question that I've seen multiple times in this thread; "Well what would you have done if it dropped, would you just eat the loss? No you wouldn't." and you would be right about that, however it would never have reached that point as I check BTC multiple times per day everyday and also have notifications setup to where if it ever starts dropping by a significant amount I get notified. If that were to ever happen I would have simply moved the BTC to a stable-coin and paid the fee of swapping it myself as that is a risk I take on as the MM, and it's also something that helps the seller avoid losing any value of their funds should a substantial drop happen, however that very rarely happens as again, BTC doesn't typically grow by \$1k+ within a week or so's time. Usually in all deals that I MM it's requested that it be in the dollar amount and not satoshi amount, and if it were done in any other currency or transferred immediately via the BTC, there would be no interest to worry about to begin with. Now typically, terms like these are set in the beginning to avoid any confusion at the end of the deal. Unfortunately those terms weren't made as clear as everyone would have liked, and that is how we got to this point. (This was also after I had asked the opinions of multiple different users as well to make sure I wasn't basically being a deer in headlights)

The interest that has grown from November 1st (when the contract started) until today has been \$63 to be exact. It was \$367 on November 1st and that includes the 5% fee for the deal, and today it is currently at \$430. Now usually in the majority of deals I MM, I will have the buyer send me the fee as a separate transaction to avoid any confusion, however due to how high BTC fees have been lately it was smartest to just do it all in one deal rather than have anyone pay an absurd amount in fees. I admit that this was a slight oversight on my end and perhaps I should have stated specific terms about it then, especially how volatile BTC has been lately, but I will be updating my TOS as necessary to ensure that no misunderstanding like this ever happens again, as something like this is the last thing that I ever want to happen during a deal that I am responsible for MM'ing.

I hope this all clearly explains how everything got to this point, and that there was never any form of ill intent on either side. I will more than happily send the remaining \$20 to [123](#) (which will be me returning the funds he told me to keep this morning [which I assume was a tip seeing he knew about the 5% fee prior], that way he's made whole at \$350), and the remaining interest amount goes to [noobnoob](#)

Seeing that Convo is currently down, [123](#) if you could please reply here with the BTC address you'd like it sent to, I'd appreciate it.

I'm sorry this misunderstanding happened, however things do happen sometimes I suppose. I'm just happy we were able to get this all resolved in the end. :)

?roye - November 13, 2020, 1:03 pm

(Nov 13, 2020 01:37 PM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I just got back home so I can now make my official

reply to this thread. To start, I don't appreciate some of the things being said on this thread as for one; I've never done anything to those who were saying foolish things, and two; I've ran a very successful MM service here on HF for many years now and have never had any issues MM'ing a very large number of funds over those many years. This is actually the first time my services have been questioned by anyone.

I also don't appreciate the title of this thread as it is completely and utterly inaccurate, especially the part about greediness (seeing my MM service was free for many years), however regardless of it, I'd still like to see this get resolved and everyone happy in the end - which could have been done hours ago if [123](#) had simply agreed then and there to the same exact resolution that we have finally come to now, which was suggested by [SIM-1729678 >HERE<](#) - however at the time of that suggestion, this was the result of it:

<https://hackforums.net/showthread.php?tid=6121274&pid=60342176#pid60342176>

Below is an exported PDF of our full group Convo to show full transparency about how this deal started, the terms involved, and the confusion that eventually led to this point. (123 gave me permission to post this as long as I removed his paypal.me which has been done)

[https://drive\[WARNING POSSIBLY INFECTED\]google.com/file/d/1NhV95nsvZJazdr36TryQ7kLilZczDG24/view?usp=sharing](https://drive[WARNING POSSIBLY INFECTED]google.com/file/d/1NhV95nsvZJazdr36TryQ7kLilZczDG24/view?usp=sharing)

I would like to first state that at no point during this deal was I ever against sending either [123](#) or [noobnoob](#) the interest, I just want to make that very clear, (the interest of the BTC I was holding is what's in question here) and the complete and full Convo logs provided above will show that I never "denied" sending it or "said no" as [123](#) claimed I did. In fact, at the end of our conversation I even said to him that I was going to post a thread here in Marketplace Discussions for the community to read and decide what should happen here (as BTC usually doesn't grow by \$1k+ in just a week or so's time) [\[IMAGE\]](#) -- however [123](#) didn't reply and beat me to the punch as we can all see here. Our private conversation just happened very quickly and talks of posting a thread for the community to decide happened rather quickly as well which is why this wasn't eventually resolved in Convo.

I understand how the misunderstanding between me and [123](#) happened due to how the contract terms [\[PUBLIC CONTRACT & TERMS HERE\]](#) were stated both there and in Convo. I was under the impression that I was holding \$350 BTC in dollar amount [\[IMAGE\]](#), and [123](#) was under the impression that I was holding it in satoshi amount, however this was never clarified in the beginning of the deal [\[IMAGE\]](#). Now this poses the question that I've seen multiple times in this thread; "Well what would you have done if it dropped, would you just eat the loss? No you wouldn't." and you would be right about that, however it would never have reached that point as I check BTC multiple times per day everyday and also have notifications setup to where if it ever starts dropping by a significant amount I get notified. If that were to ever happen I would have simply moved the BTC to a stable-coin and paid the fee of swapping it myself as that is a risk I take on as the MM, and it's also something that helps the seller avoid losing any value of their funds should a substantial drop happen, however that very rarely happens as again, BTC doesn't typically grow by \$1k+ within a week or so's time. Usually in all deals that I MM it's requested that it be in the dollar amount and not satoshi amount, and if it were done in any other currency or transferred immediately via the BTC, there would be no interest to worry about to begin with. Now typically, terms like these are set in the beginning to avoid any confusion at the end of the deal. Unfortunately those terms weren't made as clear as everyone would have liked, and that is how we got to this point. (This was also after I had asked the opinions of multiple different users as well to make sure I wasn't basically being a deer in headlights)

The interest that has grown from November 1st (when the contract started) until today has been \$63 to be exact. It was \$367 on November 1st and that includes the 5% fee for the deal, and today it is currently at \$430. Now usually in the majority of deals I MM, I will have the buyer send me the fee

as a separate transaction to avoid any confusion, however due to how high BTC fees have been lately it was smartest to just do it all in one deal rather than have anyone pay an absurd amount in fees. I admit that this was a slight oversight on my end and perhaps I should have stated specific terms about it then, especially how volatile BTC has been lately, but I will be updating my TOS as necessary to ensure that no misunderstanding like this ever happens again, as something like this is the last thing that I ever want to happen during a deal that I am responsible for MM'ing.

I hope this all clearly explains how everything got to this point, and that there was never any form of ill intent on either side. I will more than happily send the remaining \$20 to [123](#) (which will be me returning the funds he told me to keep this morning [which I assume was a tip seeing he knew about the 5% fee prior], that way he's made whole at \$350), and the remaining interest amount goes to [noobnoob](#)

Seeing that Convo is currently down, [123](#) if you could please reply here with the BTC address you'd like it sent to, I'd appreciate it.

I'm sorry this misunderstanding happened, however things do happen sometimes I suppose. I'm just happy we were able to get this all resolved in the end. :)

See, no one got hurt. Just a misunderstanding <3 <3 <3 Well done, Mr. Cooligan.

Dorrance - November 15, 2020, 5:15 pm

(Nov 13, 2020 07:08 AM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) My opinions:

1. Cooligan knew what he was doing and takes advantage of the price difference. Very unethical and not very surprising he has done this. He should send the rest of the money back. Even if you want to get technically correct, you are ethically incorrect.

2. The user you dealt with message me but HF was going through some attacks and I was worried something would go wrong if he chose someone else.

[123](#) You should just deal with me directly every transaction.

I charge zero fees and never have. I currently have over \$20,000 in escrow for 2 members on here and never had any issues.

I would also like to add, most middleman don't take advantage of the dollar difference. They send the whole thing because it's implied and an honest/respectful exchange.

And this is why your a mentor dawg respect.

123 - November 15, 2020, 7:45 pm

(Nov 13, 2020 01:37 PM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I would like to first state that at no point during this deal was I ever against sending either [123](#) or [noobnoob](#) the interest, I just want to make that very clear, (the interest of the BTC I was holding is what's in question here) and the complete and full Convo logs provided above will show that I never "denied" sending it or "said no" as [123](#) claimed I did.

Since you have replied with your complete side here, I would like to address one thing.

You claimed "this would have been resolved long before" and that is actually correct, I would say this thread wouldn't have been created at first place if you weren't behaving Unprofessional, unethical and greedy. Since you have exported the chat, everyone can see , I asked you in clear terms " So you won't send the remaining amount to me or noobnoob" and your answer was " that's not how MM Deal works".

One more instance in that convo where I asked simple question. I asked " So the remaining money you're keeping to yourself or returning to noobnoob" , to which you replied " There is no remaining money lol". I think everyone knows " THERE IS DEFINITELY A REMAINING MONEY" which you completely ignored until I asked about in our convo.

These two instances implies " YOU WERE DEFINITELY AGAINST SENDING THE MONEY EITHER TO ME OR NOOBNOOB " and keeping it to yourself , so please you can't deny that.

Also, when I asked if the BTC value drop \$1k overnight and you're sleeping how would you change it to Stable coin. Your answer to this question was "I keep track of these things man.. I check BTC value multiple times per day man.. Hold on"

I asked you a simple question of what you'll do if BTC value drops OVERNIGHT and you answered I keep track of these things and you check multiple times per DAY. Any person having some intellect would agree this answer don't make any sense. How would you change it to STABLECOIN while you're sleeping ?

After this answer of yours, I was more than sure it's best to ask community and tell them my experience. So I opened the Market Discussion and started creating this thread. From that point onwards I was creating this thread.

SIM-4831178 - November 15, 2020, 7:50 pm

I'm just wondering what would happen if we had a let's say 20% dump or even more. You would give him 0.05 btc for example from your pocket as you claim that you converted that btc to a stable coin? That's the part that Cooligan seem sketchy. On the other hand CLEARLY it says 350\$ so he might thought that he'll have to send that amount of \$. I can't know and noone can prove it. As he wants to resolve this I think that it's very good for him, also as of now he hasn't show any bad sign except of this so don't judge with words like "unethical" etc, it's not right.

hell-o-world - November 15, 2020, 8:17 pm

(Nov 13, 2020 08:03 AM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You're post way too soon before even reading any of the replies. You're a dog yourself.
Hate people like this

?ytes - November 15, 2020, 8:40 pm

I've somewhat different point of view on this, which I think is more accurate and may help the problem getting sorted out.

1. Scenario 1: I plan to purchase some item from an online shopping site, which costed me 1 BTC and at the time of checkout I had to pay exactly 1 BTC (value at the time of checkout = \$15K). But after couple of days, even before I get the product delivered/shipped, I found that BTC price jumped up to \$16K. So here, neither the Seller (BTC receiver refunds me the increased value nor I have any right to ask for it).

So in the above case, the "Seller (BTC receiver) is 100% beneficiary.

2. Scenario 2: Involving a MM deal :

Buyer "B" and Seller "S" agrees to use a Middleman "M" for a 1 BTC deal (BTC value at the time of deal was \$15K)

MM Fees is 5% and product/service value is estimated in USD, so \$15K.

"B" pays "M" 1BTC + 5% MM Fees + Extra BTC to cover the BTC TX fees. So lets say "B" paid "M" 1.1 BTC, and from which 0.05 BTC was MM's fees.

After couple of days BTC price goes up to \$16K USD.

Now in this case,

1. Middleman is entitled to gain the BTC value over his 0.05BTC. He should keep 0.05 BTC regardless of its value at that time, and send the rest to the Bitcoin receiver (excluding the BTC fees, MM shouldn't pay the BTC TX Fees from his pocket).

2. Seller "S" (BTC receiver is also entitled to his 1.05 BTC, but he pays the BTC TX fees from this amount).

Hope it clears up everything.

123 - November 15, 2020, 9:21 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 09:40 PM)?ytes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 1. Middleman is entitled to gain the BTC value over his 0.05BTC. He should keep 0.05 BTC regardless of its value at that time, and send the rest to the Bitcoin receiver (excluding the BTC fees, MM shouldn't pay the BTC TX Fees from his pocket).

2. Seller "S" (BTC receiver is also entitled to his 1.05 BTC, but he pays the BTC TX fees from this amount).

Hope it clears up everything.

Yup. Thats why I asked him to keep his 0.0011 BTC (not 17.5\$) in our convo.

So basically, he was entitled to get the raise of BTC value over his BTC fees which is absolutely correct and completely makes sense.

But here, he wanted to keep his BTC fees + whole value gained.

The example you gave above if implied to this deal.

MM wanted to keep 0.05 BTC (that is his fees) + 0.05 BTC that should have been transferred to the other party (that is me who is a BTC receiver here).

?ytes - November 15, 2020, 9:27 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 10:21 PM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Yup. Thats why I asked him to keep his 0.0011 BTC (not 17.5\$) in our convo.

So basically, he was entitled to get the raise of BTC value over his BTC fees which is absolutely correct and completely makes sense.

But here, he wanted to keep his BTC fees + whole value gained.

The example you gave above if implied to this deal.

MM wanted to keep 0.05 BTC (that is his fees) + 0.05 BTC that should have been transferred to the other party (that is me who is a BTC receiver here).

Cooligan is a good guy, what I see is clearly a misunderstanding between you guys, you should try and sort this out in private.

123 - November 15, 2020, 9:53 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 10:27 PM)?ytes Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Cooligan is a good guy, what I see is clearly a misunderstanding between you guys, you should try and sort this out in private.

I tried clearing it out prior to opening this discussion thread to share my experience and seek Community advice. You can see the convo he uploaded in Gdrive.

In his recent long post, he claimed he never denied paying out remaining amount to either me or the other party. But that's utterly false.

How can I clear it in private if he doesn't accept straight up facts.

SIM-1729678 - November 15, 2020, 10:46 pm

I am unsure why we are restarting discussions we already had? ??

123 - November 15, 2020, 10:51 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 11:46 PM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I am unsure why we are restarting discussions we already had? ??

He claimed that I was lying (apparently I wasn't).

Should I stay quiet ?

SIM-1729678 - November 15, 2020, 10:54 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 11:51 PM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He claimed that I was lying (apparently I wasn't).

Should I stay quiet ?

Did [Cooligan](#) send you that \$20 yet?

123 - November 15, 2020, 10:56 pm

(Nov 15, 2020 11:54 PM)Screems Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Did [Cooligan](#) send you that \$20 yet?

He hasn't sent me anything at all other than \$330.96.

Gary Oak - November 15, 2020, 11:33 pm

I have to ask very honestly if there are any middlemen who read part of or whole of this discussion, have you ever escrowed a deal, where the currency was BTC, and you dealt in dollar amounts?

I'm not nitpicking at anyone here, but I have to say although I'm not well regarded on HF, I've done my fair amount of deals off-site as well, and never have I met an escrow, neither professional nor grey-hat based, that have held BTC in a 'dollar' value.

Basically, my opinion is that, whether or not this could have been resolved, I have no doubt, but in the first place, would it be fair to assume that any BTC ever to be traded would never ever be considered a dollar value? When dealing with the dollar you do not correct the amount based on inflation, but neither should be done with BTC, because BITCOIN is in a very pure manner, the same as the dollar, a value that never changes? If we looked at a dollar, the value of a dollar obviously changes, but I've never seen this be the reasoning for requiring more or receiving less?

Hope this will soon be resolved in the manner which all parts already agreed upon.

123 - November 16, 2020, 1:16 am

(Nov 16, 2020 12:33 AM)Gary Oak Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) I have to ask very honestly if there are any middlemen who read part of or whole of this discussion, have you ever escrowed a deal, where the currency was BTC, and you dealt in dollar amounts?

There are two successful MM of HackForums who confirmed on this thread. "BTC Amount" is what

MM holds and not "BTC Value".

Blogger - November 16, 2020, 1:58 am

(Nov 13, 2020 07:10 AM)Ivan+ Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, based on this events, my contracts from now on will be stated in satoshis lol
lol Right! That's what I'm taking away from all of this.

Cooligan - November 16, 2020, 8:44 am

(Nov 15, 2020 08:45 PM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Since you have replied with your complete side here, I would like to address one thing.

You claimed "this would have been resolved long before" and that is actually correct, I would say this thread wouldn't have been created at first place if you weren't behaving Unprofessional, unethical and greedy. Since you have exported the chat, everyone can see , I asked you in clear terms " So you won't send the remaining amount to me or noobnoob" and your answer was " that's not how MM Deal works".

One more instance in that convo where I asked simple question. I asked " So the remaining money you're keeping to yourself or returning to noobnoob" , to which you replied " There is no remaining money lol". I think everyone knows " THERE IS DEFINITELY A REMAINING MONEY" which you completely ignored until I asked about in our convo.

These two instances implies " YOU WERE DEFINITELY AGAINST SENDING THE MONEY EITHER TO ME OR NOOBNOOB " and keeping it to yourself , so please you can't deny that.

Also, when I asked if the BTC value drop \$1k overnight and you're sleeping how would you change it to Stable coin. Your answer to this question was "I keep track of these things man.. I check BTC value multiple times per day man.. Hold on"

I asked you a simple question of what you'll do if BTC value drops OVERNIGHT and you answered I keep track of these things and you check multiple times per DAY. Any person having some intellect would agree this answer don't make any sense. How would you change it to STABLECOIN while you're sleeping ?

After this answer of yours, I was more than sure it's best to ask community and tell them my experience. So I opened the Market Discussion and started creating this thread. From that point onwards I was creating this thread.

(Nov 15, 2020 11:56 PM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) He hasn't sent me anything at all other than \$330.96. It seems like you're more interested in arguing at this point.

I told you to reply here with your BTC address two full days ago yet all you've done is try to extend this further, cause more drama, and try to turn what is simply a misunderstanding into a problem. ?

Still waiting...

123 - November 16, 2020, 10:08 am

(Nov 16, 2020 09:44 AM)Cooligan Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It seems like you're more interested in arguing at this point.

I told you to reply here with your BTC address two full days ago yet all you've done is try to extend this further, cause more drama, and try to turn what is simply a misunderstanding into a problem. ?

Still waiting...

Well, I'm more interested in clearing my side when you say I lied about particular thing.

My BTC address is same to which you sent \$330.

3CjbbEi7hMVURgreA9QUt3iaaCQisuvvm1v

DamienVC - November 18, 2020, 12:22 pm

Went through the thread. Can't say anything except that KJ is correct.

0.0265197 BTC was transferred as a part of the deal including the 5% fee.

We could use an arithmetic expression here

$105x = 0.0265197 \text{ BTC}$

Cooligan has to send $100x = (0.0265197 * 100/105) = 0.02525685$

As you can see he transferred 0.02033863, he still owes 0.00491822 (which is around \$86 at present values).

Unless explicitly stated otherwise in his MM thread, a hold of cryptocurrency is a hold of the cryptocurrency amount and not fiat value. If it was that case, it should have been highlighted clearly, if not it was an action made in bad faith.

(Nov 13, 2020 07:08 AM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) My opinions:

1. Cooligan knew what he was doing and takes advantage of the price difference. Very unethical and not very surprising he has done this. He should send the rest of the money back. Even if you want to get technically correct, you are ethically incorrect.

2. The user you dealt with message me but HF was going through some attacks and I was worried something would go wrong if he chose someone else.

[123](#) You should just deal with me directly every transaction.

I charge zero fees and never have. I currently have over \$20,000 in escrow for 2 members on here and never had any issues.

I would also like to add, most middleman don't take advantage of the dollar difference. They send the whole thing because it's implied and an honest/respectful exchange.

Last line says everything.

Marketplace - November 18, 2020, 12:33 pm

(Nov 16, 2020 11:08 AM)123 Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Well, I'm more interested in clearing my side when you say I lied about particular thing.

My BTC address is same to which you sent \$330.

3CjbbEi7hMVURgreA9QUt3iaaCQisuvvm1v

Did you receive your BTC yet bro?

Net - November 18, 2020, 12:35 pm

Holy shit this thread blew up.

Mark Ronson - November 18, 2020, 12:40 pm

I think the issue is pretty simple, had BTC gone down would Cooligan have paid the difference from his pocket? I highly doubt, so I think he should've sent the BTC value.

account_ - November 18, 2020, 12:41 pm

Dont think he as time at the moment is father was involved in a accident.

Marketplace - November 18, 2020, 12:48 pm

He even offered to send you the remaining \$20 for free, while he's clearly not obligated to.

My advice is to close the thread imho

Kill Joy - November 18, 2020, 12:50 pm

123 was paid by Cooligan and the thread is done with.

SIM-2273342 - November 18, 2020, 12:51 pm

(Nov 18, 2020 01:50 PM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) 123 was paid by Cooligan and the thread is done with.

It's inappropriate, as I am sure you would agree, for OP to keep this thread open and continue to attempt to tarnish the name of Cooligan.

As someone with no horse in this race, the arguments have been presented from both sides. This will do nothing but stir-up/continue drama.

Kill Joy - November 18, 2020, 12:55 pm

(Nov 18, 2020 01:51 PM)Romania Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's inappropriate, as I am sure you would agree, for OP to keep this thread open and continue to attempt to tarnish the name of Cooligan.

You'd be a fool if you think Cooligan's name isn't already tarnished. This isn't the first issue he has been involved with regarding money.

SIM-2273342 - November 18, 2020, 12:56 pm

(Nov 18, 2020 01:55 PM)Kill Joy Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) You'd be a fool if you think Cooligan's name isn't already tarnished. This isn't the first issue he has been involved with regarding money.

That's not my place to judge. Regardless of external opinions on the individuals involved, this thread remaining open just leaves for back-and-forth, banter and drama. For the sake of OP and Cooligan, I hope it gets closed.

DamienVC - November 18, 2020, 1:20 pm

(Nov 18, 2020 01:51 PM)Romania Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) It's inappropriate, as I am sure you would agree, for OP to keep this thread open and continue to attempt to tarnish the name of Cooligan.

As someone with no horse in this race, the arguments have been presented from both sides. This will do nothing but stir-up/continue drama.

Cooligan already expressed no intention to give the full BTC amount in his chats. So I think this thread was necessary yeah. He also said that he'd ask opinions in a similar thread.

Its resolved by now as I see.

SIM-2273342 - November 18, 2020, 2:11 pm

(Nov 18, 2020 02:20 PM)DamienVC Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) Cooligan already expressed no intention to give the full BTC amount in his chats. So I think this thread was necessary yeah. He also said that he'd ask opinions in a similar thread.

Its resolved by now as I see.

I agree that the thread itself was necessary; just saying it can be closed now.

THE RULER - November 19, 2020, 11:07 am

Nah, this should be left open. Cooligan's gang of retards he was in voice chat with flamed OP and talked mad shit even though he was clearly in the right.

Cooligan doesn't know how an escrow or middleman functions, in this case he literally took money from the OPs pockets. He literally tried to dictate who receives someone else's assets because they appreciate in value while in his care.

Too brain dead to be trusted with any sizable amount of money. He's lucky OP isn't a dick and took a resolution that benefited both him and the buyer.

Guede - November 19, 2020, 11:25 am

(Nov 13, 2020 06:33 AM)James Wrote: [\[CITE\]](#) The contract was for Cooligan to hold and send you a dollar value after the work had been completed, not a bitcoin value. You have no right to any extra \$ because the price changed, in fact, if there was no middle man used you would not have received any extra \$ as it would have been sent after the work was done.

You are being a self-entitled little bitch.

If you wanted it to be based on BTC amount and the \$ amount at completion, you should have based your contract around that. If anyone were to get the extra \$, it would be noobnoob as the contract was for you to receive the \$ amount after the work was done, not receive the \$ amount early and let the value increased.

Shut up.

Lots of middlemen pay \$ amount out when it's based on the \$ amount in an agreement and the value went up, but if the value goes down send the btc amount regardless. So ur being a bit of a dum dum.No Lol. If you're dealing in BTC and you send a certain amount of BTC, you expect that certain amount of BTC not the dollar value. They are dealing in BTC not dollars, so why the fuck would you view it the other way? Otherwise opposed to a fair trade, the MM gets to keep some money because BTC went up??? Makes no sense.

Personally this is the reason why I think contracts should be done via the amount of BTC not by dollars so that people don't get confused and their greedy tendencies don't take over. Say you're a MM who's holding money, and BTC goes up, you are not entitled to that bonus, you owe the person the exact amount of BTC that was sent.

Eagle 95 - November 19, 2020, 11:37 am

There's no reason to continue this drama.