



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	254/05
2. Advertiser	Samsung Electronics Aust Pty Ltd (LCD TV Screen)
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Other - Social values
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 13 September 2005
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The first scene in this television advertisement depicts a young man acknowledging receipt of a Samsung television on behalf of his neighbour. The voiceover states: *“Imagine you sign for a package for your neighbour. A Samsung 101cm LCD TV. To make sure it’s undamaged you get it out. It’s stunning. You wonder where your neighbour will put it. It looks terrific. Everyone loves your new Samsung TV”*. The man is shown to be watching TV with a large group of friends. The voiceover continues: *“A few days later your neighbour asks you: “Did you sign for a package?”*. You ask yourself: *“Did you sign for a package?”* The voiceover concludes: *“With a Samsung LCD TV, it’s not that hard to imagine”*.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The ad depicts committing a crime... The ad says your neighbour asks whether you signed for a package that they were expecting. The ad says that you decide not to tell your neighbour about the package... because the picture on the TV was so real. The ad is clearly promoting the commission of a crime in order to make a gain or profit.”

“... the type of behaviour advocated by this advertisement is offensive, or indeed dangerous... I would have to submit that this matter is one of public safety as it conveys the impression to more naïve members of the public that property offences are acceptable and that, despite the way the advertisement concludes, somehow it is a victimless crime. In fact, the conclusion of the advertisement does not reconcile the situation in favour of the aggrieved neighbour at all but leaves the scenario unresolved...”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“The advertisement clearly does not portray any discrimination, violence, sex, strong language or dangerous driving to which parts of this section refers. Nor does there appear to be any association between the advertisement and community standards on health or safety. In this context, we do not see that the advertisement is in breach of any of the provisions of Section 2 of the Code or indeed any other provisions of the Code.”

“... The allegation that the advertisement “promotes the commission of a crime in order to make a gain or profit” is unfounded as there is no evidence to support this allegation. Whilst the advertisement raises a moral issue, with the question being posed: “Did I sign for a package?”, no response is given and it is really only the complainant’s assumption that the main character did in fact keep the television that his neighbour paid for.”

“It is also clear from the commencement of the TVC voiceover that the main character is daydreaming; this is reinforced as the commercial ends with the word: “Imagine” displayed on screen for several seconds, thus emphasising the light-hearted aspect of the TVC...”

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 that the final scene in the advertisement did not definitively indicate that the young man had lied to his neighbour and kept the television. The Board considered that the entire advertisement was framed as hypothetical or otherwise as a daydream sequence and noted that (at multiple points) the voiceover stated the word: “imagine”.

The Board considered that in the context of prevailing community standards the majority of people would find this advertisement humorous rather than offensive. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of people (social values).

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