

Case Report

1. Case Number :	0099-24
2. Advertiser :	Metroll Darwin
3. Product :	Retail
4. Type of Advertisement/Media :	TV - Free to Air
5. Date of Decision:	17-Apr-2024
6. Decision:	Upheld – Not Modified or Discontinued

ISSUES RAISED

AANA Code of Ethics\2.3 Violence

DESCRIPTION OF ADVERTISEMENT

This television advertisement features a cartoon of two men walking through a swamp having a conversation:

Man 1: "Tom, how did you go with the new extension?"

Tom: "Great! Metroll were very helpful. Great price and service"

Man 1: "Did you get everything?"

Tom: "Yes. They do roofing, flashings, gutter, stud, plate and noggin, even purlins. Makes it easy when you get a great service and price"

Man 1 see's a bird in the trees

Man 1: "oh there's some" *shoots his gun*.

Tom: "Jerry, it's Magpie Geese season, not cocky season"

*cuts to voice over

Voice over: "for all your roofing needs, Darwin Metroll. Marjorie Street, Pinelands"



THE COMPLAINT

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

Cartoon about 2 hunters in which one shoots a cockatoo which is a protected species. It's portrait to be funny, but is actually illegal

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE

Comments which the advertiser made in response to the complainant/s regarding this advertisement include the following:

Advertiser did not provide a response.

THE DECISION

The Ad Standards Community Panel (the Panel) considered whether this advertisement breaches Section 2 of the AANA Code of Ethics (the Code).

The Panel noted the complainant's concern that the advertisement depicts someone shooting a protected species.

The Panel viewed the advertisement and noted the advertiser had not provided a response.

Section 2.3: Advertising shall not present or portray violence unless it is justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised.

The Panel noted the Practice Note for this section of the Code which states

"Although the depiction of violence in an advertisement may be relevant to the story being told in the advertisement, any violence must also be justifiable in the context of the product being advertised, or else will be in breach of this section of the Code... Violence against animals is caught by this section."

Does the advertisement contain violence?

The Panel noted that while the advertisement is a cartoon it does depict a person shooting an animal and this constitutes violence.

Is the violence portrayed justifiable in the context of the product or service advertised?

The Panel noted that the advertised product is roofing and considered that the depiction of characters shooting at an animal was not related to the promotion of the product.

The Panel acknowledged that the advertisement was a cartoon, and no actual birds were harmed in the production of the ad. However, the Panel considered that many people would still consider the depiction of shooting protected species to be violent and not justifiable in the context of promoting roofing products.

Section 2.3 Conclusion

The Panel found that the advertisement did breach Section 2.3 of the Code.

Conclusion

Finding that the advertisement did breach Section 2.3 of the Code, the Panel upheld the complaint.

THE ADVERTISER'S RESPONSE TO DECISION

The advertiser has not provided a response to the decision. Ad Standards has notified FreeTV of the breach of the Code.