

## CASE REPORT

1. Complaint reference number	4/06
2. Advertiser	Johnson & Johnson Pacific Pty Ltd (Stayfree Freestyle)
3. Product	Toiletries
4. Type of advertisement	TV
5. Nature of complaint	Violence Hooliganism/vandalism/graffiti – section 2.2
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 14 February 2006
7. DETERMINATION	Dismissed

## DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a young woman on a Vespa motor scooter passing a park where young people appear to be playing on swings but the swings themselves are not visible. The woman then passes a cocktail bar where women are sitting on invisible chairs enjoying a drink and a hair salon where a woman sitting on an invisible chair is having her hair styled. The rider then passes a wall mural which features “Amelie” the iconic Stayfree character, coming to life and blowing a Freestyle pad to the woman on the scooter, who handles the pad to demonstrate its unique properties.

## THE COMPLAINT

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

*Graffiti is used as background settings. By incorporating it into advertising gives the perception that it is acceptable.*

## THE ADVERTISER’S RESPONSE

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

*Because we show a backdrop with graffiti we are not encouraging the practice of illegal graffiti. Furthermore, I don’t believe that this commercial will result in any increase in the amount of graffiti.*

*We ensured that our animated character did not stretch beyond her original confines. Thus while she exists on the wall, she does not develop or do any “damage” beyond her space.*

*The scene was designed to represent a modern city streetscape, which happened to have graffiti.*

## 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 graffiti can be legal. The Board did not consider that the advertisement encouraged or portrayed behaviour that would be considered undesirable or in contravention of community standards of behaviour or violence.

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