



CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	385/08
2. Advertiser	TrueLocal
3. Product	Housegoods/services
4. Type of advertisement	Print
5. Nature of complaint	Discrimination or vilification Gender - section 2.1
6. Date of determination	Wednesday, 8 October 2008
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This print advertisement portrays a young woman asking "You need a plumber do you?" and continues with her detailing her recent experience with a blocked drain at the same time as she was "a bit clogged up myself."

THE COMPLAINT

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

The woman is deliberately depicted as overweight, stupid, and highly unattractive - i.e. she is depicted as a reverse sex object that no real bloke would want to touch. She also bears a noticeable resemblance to photos of Diane Brimble.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

Truelocal.com.au is an online business directory that connects business with consumers through ratings and reviews of local businesses, by like minded individuals – it's a fast reliable way to search for great local businesses recommended by others without having to ask all of your neighbours.

Local knowledge is a truly valuable thing. But there can be a high price to pay in acquiring it. The essence of this ad is the humorous highlighting of local information that's flawed - in its content and delivery - in contrast to quality information from truelocal.com.au.

The perfect execution lies in striking a balance between the comic exaggeration and the uncomfortable familiarity of each character as they ramble away on unhelpful tangents.

The complainant seems to have made his or her own judgements of the attractiveness of the female character. Nothing in the ad asserts that she is unattractive. Nothing in the ad is derogatory of her or women in general. There is absolutely no discrimination and no vilification of anyone based on sex.

In fact the ad shows a high calibre obviously comedic performance.

As for the reference to our character resembling Dianne Brimble, this again is a totally subjective comment on the complainant's behalf. This clearly was not our intention in casting this actor to play the character.

The ad does not include any inappropriate language.

Accordingly we respectfully submit that the Advertising Standards Board should conclude that the commercial does not breach Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics.

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 application of Section 2.1, relating to discrimination and vilification. The Board considered that most reasonable people would not interpret the advertisement as derogatory to the female character or women generally, or find the advertisement to be offensive. The Board considered there was no sexual discrimination or vilification depicted in the advertisement and no discrimination against any section of the community.

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