



## **CASE REPORT**

- |                               |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| 1. Complaint reference number | 8/01  |
| 2. Advertiser                 | Hagemeyer Lifestyle Brands (Aust) Pty Ltd (Polaroid)  |
| 3. Product                    | Health Products   |
| 4. Type of advertisement      | TV  |
| 5. Nature of complaint        | Discrimination or vilification Other – section 2.1<br>Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity – section 2.3 |
| 6. Date of determination      | Tuesday, 13 February 2001   |
| 7. DETERMINATION              | Dismissed   |

## **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

The television advertisement shows footage of what appears to be a cricket match. The background noise and commentary is audible but the visual footage is over-exposed, indistinct and appears to be filmed or viewed as if through a glare of sunlight. Shortly after announcing ‘the last ball before lunch’, the commentator exclaims, ‘..... oh, looks like we’ve got ourselves a stalker and she’s running towards one of the players’, at which point the advertisement shows the still indistinct image of a naked woman running across the cricket pitch. The commentator continues, ‘I’ve never seen anything like this before...she’s not shy is she?’ At the point where the woman (genitals obscured) is being escorted off the field by a police officer, the outline of a pair of sunglasses is superimposed on the visuals. The viewer now sees the footage clearly, minus previous glare. The advertisement draws to a close with the words, ‘Polaroid sunglasses eliminate 100% of the glare and UV rays’, and ‘Wear Polaroid sunglasses and you won’t miss any of the action.’

## **THE COMPLAINT**

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

*‘I don’t think this ad should be on at any time, but the fact that it was on at 9.50 in the morning, when children could be watching (school holiday) is even worse. .... I hate seeing sexual overtones to advertise things ....’*

## **THE DETERMINATION**

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

The Board was of the view that the material within the advertisement did not contravene prevailing community standards in its portrayal of sex, sexuality or nudity; neither did it constitute discrimination or vilification. The Board determined that the advertisement did not breach the Code on these or any other grounds and, accordingly, dismissed the complaint.