



**ADVERTISING
STANDARDS
BUREAU**

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612
Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833
www.adstandards.com.au

Case Report

1	Case Number	0105/11
2	Advertiser	Lifestyle Changes Centre
3	Product	Professional services
4	Type of Advertisement / media	Print
5	Date of Determination	11/05/2011
6	DETERMINATION	Dismissed

ISSUES RAISED

2.3 - Sex/sexuality/nudity Treat with sensitivity to relevant audience

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

Image of an apparently naked woman reclining on a chair. Her legs are apart and there is a large, hairy cat sat between her legs. The text reads, "It's more obvious than you think..... IPL hair removal."

THE COMPLAINT

A sample of comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

It is sexually suggestive - having her legs apart with a cat in between (suggestive). It is offensive and disturbing for everyone to see. Unrestricted viewing for all age groups as it is in the paper. I think it is inappropriate.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

The Advertiser has not provided a response.

THE DETERMINATION

The Advertising Standards Board (“Board”) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the “Code”).

The Board noted the complainant’s concerns that the advertisement features an inappropriate image of a woman.

The Board viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser’s response.

The Board considered whether the advertisement was in breach of Section 2.3 of the Code. Section 2.3 of the Code states: “Advertising or Marketing Communications shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and, where appropriate, the relevant programme time zone”.

The Board noted that the advertisement features an image of a woman with a cat placed in her lap covering her genital region.

The Board considered that the pose of the model was sexualized but there is no discernable nudity, and that the nudity (underneath the cat) is inferred.

The Board noted that the placement of the image in a general newspaper meant that the relevant audience could include children but it was unlikely to be a significant part of the readership and, in the Board’s view, the sexual implications of the advertisement would not be understood by children.

The Board considered that the placement of the cat in this instance adds an element of humour and ridiculousness. On the basis of this, the Board considered that most members of the community would not find the imagery offensive.

The Board determined that the advertisement did treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience and that it did not breach section 2.3 of the Code.

Finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.