

PolicyFix Complete Pre-Appeal Audit

Example case: Northstar Home Services (fictional)

Stated suspension reason: Unacceptable Business Practices / Misrepresentation

Illustrative website: northstarhomeservices.example (reserved fictional domain; no live customer site was reviewed)

Appeal history: One rejected appeal submitted before material remediation

Important: This document demonstrates the structure and level of specificity of a PolicyFix audit. It is not a real customer case, does not represent a reinstatement success rate, and does not predict Google's enforcement decision.

What this audit is designed to answer

- Which current policy is most relevant to the stated suspension?
- Which public-site or evidence gaps appear material enough to fix before another appeal?
- What should be remediated first, and what evidence should be retained?
- Is the case ready for another appeal, or should the advertiser wait?

1. Executive finding

READINESS: NOT READY TO
RE-APPEAL

The fictional case shows a legitimate home-services business with a plausible path to remediation, but the public presentation is not yet strong enough for a second appeal. The main issue is not the ad copy itself; it is the consistency and verifiability of the business identity and offer across the destination.

The previous appeal was also submitted before the business corrected the material website gaps. Repeating the same explanation without new evidence would not demonstrate a meaningful change.

Material findings

Severity	Finding	Why it matters
High	Operator identity is not clearly tied to the trading name	A reviewer needs a clear, truthful picture of who provides the service.
High	Third-party certification/logo relationship is unclear	Unclear affiliations can create a misrepresentation risk if users could infer endorsement.
Medium	Pricing and call-out fee are not explained before lead submission	Material commercial information should not be hidden from the customer journey.
Medium	Cancellation/refund terms are absent	The offer lacks a clear statement of what happens if service is cancelled or cannot be delivered.
Medium	Service-area claims are broad and unsupported	Claims should be accurate and supportable, especially where they affect user expectations.

Decision: fix the two High findings and the commercial-transparency gaps first; assemble supporting evidence; then reassess appeal readiness.

2. Stated policy mapping

The fictional suspension reason maps most directly to Google Ads Misrepresentation / Unacceptable Business Practices guidance. Google's current policy materials emphasize clear, honest business representation and note that the review can consider information from ads, websites, accounts and third-party sources.

PolicyFix does not infer that every missing page or unclear statement caused the suspension. The purpose of mapping is to distinguish *official policy requirements* from *audit hypotheses*.

Source	What the official guidance establishes	Audit implication
Unacceptable business practices	Misrepresenting business, products/services, qualifications or affiliations is not allowed; truthful business description and clear partnerships are emphasized.	Identity, affiliation and deliverability claims deserve first-order review.
Misrepresentation	Ads and destinations should provide information users need to make informed decisions.	Material offer/pricing/customer-journey information should be easy to understand.
Suspension / appeal guidance	Advertisers should appeal after appropriate changes and provide accurate information; repeated appeals without material changes are discouraged.	Document changes before re-appealing rather than resubmitting the same narrative.

Official references used for this illustrative sample:

<https://support.google.com/adspolicy/answer/15938071>

<https://support.google.com/adspolicy/answer/6020955>

<https://support.google.com/google-ads/answer/13704200>

3. Public website audit

The observations below are fictional but show how PolicyFix separates a specific observation from the reason it may matter.

HIGH - Business identity

Observation: Header says “Northstar Home Services”; footer contains no legal/entity name; About page describes “our technicians” but does not identify the operating entity.

Recommended remediation: Make the operator identity explicit and consistent on About, footer, contact and transaction surfaces. Do not invent an entity relationship.

HIGH - Third-party affiliation

Observation: A “Certified Partner” badge appears without naming the issuing organization or linking to a verifiable authorization.

Recommended remediation: Remove the badge unless the relationship is real and supportable, or label the relationship precisely with evidence.

MEDIUM - Pricing transparency

Observation: Lead form says “book today” but does not disclose a diagnostic/call-out fee mentioned later in the fictional customer intake.

Recommended remediation: State the fee or explain the pricing mechanism before the user submits the lead.

MEDIUM - Cancellation/refund

Observation: No cancellation, refund or no-show terms are visible for prepaid service bookings.

Recommended remediation: Publish concise terms that match actual operations.

LOW - Contact consistency

Observation: Phone number appears in the header; street address is missing even though the fictional intake says the business has a fixed office.

Recommended remediation: If an address is legitimately part of the business identity, publish it consistently or explain the service-area model accurately.

4. Evidence gaps

A strong appeal should be grounded in facts the advertiser can support. For this fictional case, the following evidence would make the remediation story more credible.

Priority	Evidence	Purpose
1	Business registration / entity record that matches the actual operator	Supports the identity statement used on the site and in the appeal.
2	Proof of the claimed certification or written authorization from the third party	Supports or corrects the affiliation claim.
3	Before/after screenshots or archived copies of the corrected identity, pricing and policy pages	Shows what materially changed after the suspension.
4	Internal pricing/call-out-fee policy consistent with the website disclosure	Supports that the customer-facing commercial terms are accurate.
5	Short factual explanation of the prior appeal and why it was premature	Prevents the second appeal from repeating an unsupported narrative.

Do not create evidence after the fact that did not exist. If a certification or partnership cannot be substantiated, the correct remediation is to remove or correct the claim, not manufacture support for it.

5. Prioritized remediation plan

- 1 Resolve the operator identity**
Choose the truthful business/entity description and make it consistent across the footer, About, Contact and purchase/lead surfaces.
- 2 Correct the affiliation claim**
Verify the certification relationship. If it cannot be proven, remove the badge and any wording that could imply endorsement.
- 3 Expose material commercial terms**
Explain call-out/diagnostic fees and the basic cancellation/refund rules before the customer commits.
- 4 Capture proof of changes**
Save dated screenshots/exports of the corrected pages and the supporting business documents.
- 5 Re-check the live destination**
Confirm all ad landing URLs resolve to the corrected pages with no unexpected redirects or inconsistent branding.
- 6 Only then draft the appeal**
Describe the business, acknowledge the concrete issues that were corrected, state exactly what changed, and reference only evidence that exists.

Stop condition

If the business cannot substantiate its identity, claimed affiliation or ability to deliver the advertised service, do not submit another appeal built around those claims. Correct the underlying representation first.

6. Appeal readiness

Area	Current status	Ready when...
Business identity	Not ready	Operator is explicit and consistent with supportable records.
Affiliation / certification	Not ready	Claim is either verified and accurately described or removed.
Commercial transparency	Partly ready	Fees and cancellation/refund expectations are visible and accurate.
Evidence pack	Not ready	Supporting documents and before/after change evidence are assembled.
Appeal narrative	Do not draft yet	Narrative can describe completed changes rather than promised future fixes.

CURRENT VERDICT: WAIT

The fictional advertiser should not submit the second appeal until the High findings are resolved and evidence of the changes is retained. This is a readiness judgment, not a prediction of reinstatement.

7. Factual appeal structure - example only

This section is intentionally a structure, not a generic copy-and-paste template. A real appeal should only describe facts that are true for the advertiser and changes that have actually been completed.

1. Identify the business

State the legal/trading identity, what the business actually sells, and who operates the website.

2. State the suspension reason received

Use the category shown in the account/email without inventing a different cause.

3. Explain the specific corrections completed

Example structure: "After the suspension we reviewed the destination and corrected [identity disclosure], [affiliation wording] and [pricing/cancellation disclosure]."

4. Reference truthful supporting evidence

List only documents, public pages or authorizations that genuinely exist and are relevant.

5. Ask for review

Request a re-review after the completed remediation. Do not claim entitlement to reinstatement or misstate the policy.

PolicyFix boundary: We will not fill an appeal with unsupported explanations to make it sound stronger. If the evidence does not support a claim, it should not be included.

8. Pre-submission checklist

- The business/operator identity on the site is truthful and consistent.
- Any claimed affiliation, certification or authorization can be proven.
- Material pricing, fees and customer terms are visible and accurate.
- The destination resolves correctly without unexplained redirects or inconsistent branding.
- All remediation described in the appeal has already been completed.
- Supporting evidence is real, relevant and available if requested.
- The appeal explains what changed rather than merely asserting compliance.
- No replacement account or enforcement-bypass strategy is being used.
- The advertiser is submitting one accurate appeal rather than repeated unchanged appeals.

About PolicyFix

PolicyFix is an independent pre-appeal audit service for legitimate business advertisers. It is not affiliated with, endorsed by, or a partner of Google. Google controls enforcement and reinstatement decisions. PolicyFix does not guarantee reinstatement, advise on replacement accounts, or fabricate evidence.

Founding audit: US\$49 · **Website:** <https://www.getpolicyfix.com/> · **Support:** support@getpolicyfix.com