



## **CASE REPORT**

|                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 17/06   |
| 2. Advertiser                 | SC Johnson & Son Pty Ltd (Baygon DIY Outdoor spray) |
| 3. Product                    | Housegoods/services                                 |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV  |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Health and safety – section 2.6                     |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 14 February 2006                           |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed   |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement features a man spraying the product around the exterior of his home and around the patio. The man is wearing shorts and a shirt. A view through his son's window shows a jar containing a distressed-looking animated spider watching the man. The mother calls to the son to "Get rid of that spider". The son tries to empty the spider from the jar out of the bedroom window, however the spider braces its eight legs against the jar trying not to fall out and calling "NOOOOO... I'll be Baygoned!!!".

## **THE COMPLAINT**

Comments which the complainant/s made regarding this advertisement included the following:

*In the ad the person is not wearing any sort of protective clothing. It is not obvious whether he has on a mask, but he is definitely not wearing any sort of gloves....could be misconstrued that the product is more harmless than is actually the case.*

## **THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE**

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complaint/s regarding this advertisement included the following:

One of the selling points we have...is that gloves and a mask are not required...we can claim this via approval from the appropriate regulatory authorities.

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board ("Board") considered whether this advertisement breaches section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (the "Code").

The Board considered the complaint regarding the clothing of the person using the product advertised. The Board noted the advertiser's response that the product clearly indicates that protective clothing is not required in order to use the advertised product. The Board did not consider that the advertisement depicts material contrary to prevailing community standards on health and safety.

Further finding that the advertisement did not breach the Code on any other grounds, the Board dismissed the complaint.