



CASE REPORT

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 509/08 |
| 2. Advertiser | Hair Free Centre |
| 3. Product | Other |
| 4. Type of advertisement | TV |
| 5. Nature of complaint | Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination | Wednesday, 10 December 2008 |
| 7. DETERMINATION | Dismissed |

DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT

A lady with blonde hair walks into the bedroom wearing a silk robe where a male is sitting upright in bed. The ladies robe falls to the ground and the guys eye are focused at the ladies groin region with his mouth open. A sign comes onto the screen saying Square Pulsed Light Brazilian Treatment from \$99.00.

THE COMPLAINT

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

I strongly object to this ad for a number of reasons. Firstly, the portrayal of nudity is inappropriate especially for children. Whilst my son is too young to understand the ad I have fifteen nephews and one niece under the age of sixteen that do not need to be exposed to suggestive ads like this one. I have seen this ad at 8:30am in the morning and 8:30pm at night and so it appears that there is no restriction on when this ad is shown. It is definitely shown at times when children will see the ad and undermines my efforts at teaching my son, nephews and niece good strong moral values. This ad is just another way sexually explicit material is promoted in the media.

The advertisement was shown in a time slot and during a program where young adults would be watching. I believe the content to be of an adult nature and not appropriate during this time slot as it is suggestive of sexual behaviour . The way the women was presented and the manner in which the male responded was also indicating this.

The implied nudity. The coarseness of the ad. The implied sex.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

We did not show nudity. The advertisement was subtle and was never intended to portray sex or to be offensive. It was intended to show surprise and be memorable. The ad was rated by CAD PG and was shown in appropriate time slots.

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 2.3 of the Code, relating to sex, sexuality and nudity.

The Board noted the advertisement had a “PG” classification and that no nudity was depicted. The Board considered the references to sex, sexuality and nudity were very mild and appropriate to a PG classification. The Board therefore considered the advertisement treated sex, sexuality and nudity sensitively to the relevant audience and found no breach of Section 2.3 of the Code.

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