



## **CASE REPORT**

1. Complaint reference number	441/99
2. Advertiser	Icon Clothing Pty Ltd (Lee jeans)
3. Product	Clothing
4. Type of advertisement	Cinema
5. Nature of complaint	Violence Other – section 2.2
6. Date of determination	Tuesday, 8 February 2000
7. DETERMINATION	Upheld – discontinued or modified

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The cinema advertisement commences with a scene of a woman running through a cemetery at night, apparently being pursued. She waves down a man driving a car, gets inside and the two drive off. The car then breaks down and the man gets out to check under the bonnet. As the woman is shown sitting in the front passenger seat, a figure with the appearance of a decomposing corpse grabs at the car window and the woman begins screaming repeatedly. The man rushes into the car and slams the door as several other ‘zombie’ figures encircle the car and climb on its roof. After several attempts, the car drives off sending the figures rolling onto the road. After driving some distance, the car stops and the man and woman smile at each other with relief. At this point, an arm appears from the rear seat, grabbing the man and the woman again begins screaming. The advertisement concludes with the superimposed words ‘Live Life. Lee’.

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*“Horrible and distressing ... I am very disappointed that an advertisement of this sort can be aired before a children’s movie ... my three year old daughter was quite frightened and screamed as did the other children in the cinema.”*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

The Advertising Standards Board (‘the Board’) considered whether this advertisement breached Section 2 of the Advertiser Code of Ethics (‘the Code’).

The Board determined that the advertisement was in breach of the Code in terms of its inappropriate display of violence in the context of its placement before ‘Toy Story 2’, a G rated movie primarily aimed towards a children’s audience. The Board did, however, note the advertiser’s advice that this placement had not been intended and was the result of an error by its media agency. The Board further noted that the advertiser had apologised to the complainant/s and had indicated that action would be taken to remedy the incorrect placement now that the matter had been brought to its attention.