



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 267/04 |
| 2. Advertiser | Liposuction Australia |
| 3. Product | Professional Services |
| 4. Type of advertisement | Print |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Tuesday, 12 October 2004 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

The advertisement is a print advertisement which features before and after photographs of liposuction patients. One of the patients lower torso is photographed and she is wearing black underwear with white elastic.

THE COMPLAINT

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

“The photo of the overweight woman is one which gives the initial impression that the woman is naked and that she has a substantial amount of very dark pubic hair. It would be reasonable to state that this is an image which is inappropriate and immediately offends the reader. Only upon very close examination does the photo reveal that the overweight woman is in fact wearing a dark coloured bikini brief with string type sides.”

THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

“I fail to see how could possibly mistake the briefs that the patient is wearing in the advertisement as pubic hair. It is very obvious that this patient is wearing briefs so I am at a loss to understand issue.”

THE DETERMINATION

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

The Board found that the depiction did not contravene the provisions of the Code relating to the portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity.

The Board were of the view that it was clear in the photograph that the patient was wearing a dark coloured bikini brief.

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