**Response Regarding the "Closing" of this Case**

Requests of a response and explanation have been highlighted for an easier reading experience, thank you for taking the time to read this.

Hello, it is good to see you want to close this case to close. However, it is requested that you tie up some loose ends first.  It is believed abruptly shutting the case without any clarity or conclusion is rather unwise. The comments you have made on this account's response post will again be broken down in order.

"I see what your trying to say but u still said false information about people."
After the claims of false information were debunked you still insist false information was present in this account's posts. This account takes misinformation very seriously. Please point out where you believe information is false so it may be corrected. Also, the post you made warning others about this account also possesses a few pieces of misinformation (as pointed out in the response post). It is unwise to accuse another person of false information whilst also spreading false information yourself. Your account as considerably larger, so users will most likely see your post first. It would be appreciative if you simply added a note in the description correcting said false claims. If you call out a user for misinformation it is preferred you hold yourself up to the same standard.

"And by what I'm seeing you WANT people not to trace."
The first point is valid criticism. This account admits that this account originally wanted users to avoid tracing altogether. However this view has very much changed and now this account aims to discourage users to avoid tracing AND claiming it as their own. It is certainly possible that this change in view did not translate properly to the posts. Please forgive this account for the lack of communication,  English is not the first language of this account. Hopefully in future posts this view is presented more clearly.

"Your saying u don't discourage people, then why make a note asking if someone's tracing"

It is assumed that you are referring to the title "is @urfav4rt1st tracing?" This rhetorical question was used because it seemed the most fitting at the time. This account did not want to use words such as "expose" and "tracer" in the title as it came off as rather harsh, and creating a title such as "Is _____ tracing and also claiming it as their own with no credit" seems rather unoptimised. To clear up another misunderstanding, the word "tracing" is utilised as a term referring to the act of tracing AND claiming it as one's own. This is also another valid criticism, and this will be clarified in future posts. If you have better suggestions for titles, that would be appreciated (but not needed if you do not wish to suggest).

"Post drawings and actually post GOOD things about people like @r0_yal is such a artist and not posting IS R0YaL TRaCING"

From the way this is worded, it can be insinuated the you believe the posts this account makes are bad (pardon this account if this is an incorrect assumption). May you please explain what part of calling people out for claiming other people's art as their own as bad? It can be argued that these posts are good in a sense, as it encourages people to hold themselves accountable for their actions and discourages what is essentially art theft.

Now to address points not mentioned in your comments. Since you have decided to not respond to the response made, it is asked that you clarify whether or not you have read the response made, and whether or not you believe the what is being said.

The link you are accusing of being suspicious is in fact not dangerous, and can be easily verified through asking others about the contents of the website. Do you still think the link is dangerous? Also, you claim that "suspicious links" are against the community guidelines, but after reading through them there does not appear to be an sort of mention of them. May you please state where in the community guidelines the section regarding links is? Once you have found the where it states such rules, the link will be removed.

All claims of false information you have stated in your post have been debunked, from the apology to potuc to the numbers of months this account has been active for. Do you still believe your claims, and are there any other instances of false information present in the account's posts?

You claim this account has no evidence to back up the claims of tracing made. However you have commented on a post which contains roughly 2 pages of evidence supporting the tracing claims (please refer to the post: "Is @urfav4rt1st tracing?"), which leads this account to believe you have read (or at least skimmed through all the pages of) this post. Not to mention @potuc has openly acknowledged the research and evidence presented in the now deleted post calling her out for tracing. It is very unclear what lead you to make this claim. Do you believe not enough evidence was presented, or that the evidence presented was false?

If you are so adamant about preventing bullying, then you would understand that out posts are devoid of any person bias and simply bring evidence to light. Under the definition of bullying, the bullying victim has to be constantly harassed, however this account has neither commented anything vile under @urfav4rt1st's posts, spam them to take down their art or advocate for them to get banned. You yourself have stated that this is not "technically" bullying. This account has simply called out a wrongdoing and suggest they fix said error. So tell this account, what is so "mean" about these posts?

Hopefully you read this post and reply to the points brought up in this post. "e" certainly agrees that this should be resolved as quickly as possible. However, simply "closing" such a case with so many misconceptions and miscommunication is definitely a bad idea. Assuming you are going to keep your posts regarding this account up, others will be more likely to read and believe your incorrect claims and may ignore the debunks from this account due to the length of the response. Although spreading misinformation is not against the notability peacemakers rules, surely it goes against what it stand for. "e" patiently waits and hopes for your response.

-e