

Level 2, 97 Northbourne Avenue, Turner ACT 2612 Ph: (02) 6262 9822 | Fax: (02) 6262 9833

# CASE REPORT

- 1. Complaint reference number
- 87/06 2. Advertiser David Booth Real Estate Pty Ltd 3. Product **Real Estate** 4. Type of advertisement TV 5. Nature of complaint Portrayal of sex/sexuality/nudity - section 2.3
- 6. Date of determination Tuesday, 14 March 2006
- 7. DETERMINATION Dismissed

#### **DESCRIPTION OF THE ADVERTISEMENT**

This television advertisement for "Evolution on Gardiner" features film of a luxury apartment block of units for sale. Interior and exterior shots are depicted including the kitchen area, a young woman in a bikini relaxing by the pool, a couple sitting on a couch in the living area and outside on a balcony. Male voiceover announces "Beautiful spacious three bedroom designer homes in a landmark central city high rise. People will call this the finest address in Darwin . You'll call it home".

## THE COMPLAINT

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

... a bikini clad female is lying on her back and raises one side of her body to eventually be on her side. A lot of emphasis seems to have been put on her leg movements as she is doing this, drawing attention to the space between her legs. I find this offensive .... and don't like to see that same space that I keep hidden from the public aired on TV in an insidious manner. I don't even think we saw her face.

## THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

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

There is no overt attention given to her legs; and the shot is a full body shot including the model's face. It is a very straightforward real estate commercial.

The lifestyle component is significant. There is a 1200 square metre recreational podium deck with a very large resort style lagoon pool....hence the girl in the bikini is relevant to the product.

#### 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 that advertisement and did not agree that there was any emphasis placed in the advertisement on a woman' legs, let alone on her genital region.

The Board did not consider that there was any sexual connotation in this advertisement and that it did not breach clause 2.3 of the Code.

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