

Case Report

Case number: 0064-26
Advertiser: Dolce & Gabbana
Medium: TV - On Demand
Decision date: 25-Mar-2026
Decision: No breach

ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY PANEL

- AANA Code of Ethics - 2.4 Sex/sexuality/nudity - no breach

AD DESCRIPTION

This On-Demand ad depicts a woman and two different men who appear separately in different scenes embracing, laying on a bed, and sharing dinner. In one scene, the woman puts on hosiery while one man watches. In another scene, the woman lies on a bed with one man. She is wearing a negligee, and he is wearing pants and a vest. Other scenes include all of them sharing a meal.



SUMMARY

Complain

A complaint was received on the grounds that the ad glorified threesomes, and depicts the woman wearing a negligee, touching two men and lying down with at least one.

Advertiser response

The advertiser did not submit a response.

Decisions

The Panel found that the ad did not breach section 2.4 of the AANA Code of Ethics, as the ad treated issues around sex, sexuality and nudity with appropriate respect to the relevant audience.

ASSESSMENT AND DECISIONS

Section 2.4 (AANA Code of Ethics): Advertising shall treat sex, sexuality and nudity with sensitivity to the relevant audience.

The Practice Note defines 'sex', 'sexuality' and 'nudity' as follows:

Sex: Sexual intercourse; person or persons engaged in sexually stimulating behaviour.

Sexuality: The capacity to experience and express sexual desire; the recognition or emphasis of sexual matters.

Nudity: The depiction of a person without clothing or covering; partial or suggested nudity may also be considered nudity.

Panel assessment

The Panel considered that the ad featured brief scenes of the woman and one man in embrace on a bed. The Panel noted that, while the woman appears to be wearing a negligee of sorts, both characters are clothed. The Panel further considered that the characters were shown kissing for less than a second, but that nothing in the ad suggested that they were engaged in sexual intercourse or sexually stimulating behaviour that would constitute 'sex' as defined in the code.

The Panel considered that the characters appeared to be in a relationship of sorts, and that there was an assumption that the more intimate scenes of the couple in embrace and kissing on a bed constituted a consensual expression of sexual desire. The Panel, therefore, acknowledged that the ad depicted sexuality.

Finally, the Panel noted that the ad opened with a scene in which one of the men was not wearing a shirt at the dinner table, and that the brief scenes on the bed suggested that the characters were in a partial state of undress. The Panel, therefore, considered that the ad featured partial nudity, albeit that there was no suggestion of full nudity.

The Panel considered that the code does not prescribe to advertisers how they are meant to depict people's sexual preferences. The Panel further considered that the ad was broadcast to an On-Demand audience, which likely meant that it was targeted at adults, and not at young children or children's programming.

The Panel considered that the intimacy shown did not feature overt or inappropriately sexual scenes. While the Panel accepts that there would be members of the community who do not condone such open displays of intimacy or a suggestion that one person can have more than one intimate partner, it does not believe that, on a balance of probabilities, the content would be considered inappropriate by prevailing community standards.

The Panel considered the scenes to be sufficiently brief and mild in content, and that the ad treated issues around sex, sexuality and nudity with appropriate sensitivity to the relevant audience.

Panel decision

Accordingly, the Panel found that the ad did not breach section 2.4 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

The Panel found that the ad did not breach any other section of the advertising codes.