Case Report

Case number:	0068-26
Advertiser:	Flightrisk
Medium:	Instagram
Decision date:	25-Mar-2026
Decision:	Breach
Action:	Ad not modified or removed

ISSUES CONSIDERED BY THE COMMUNITY PANEL

- AANA Code of Ethics - 2.6 Health and Safety - breach

AD DESCRIPTION

These Instagram ads promote the advertisers e-bikes, and feature scenes with people riding e-bikes.

SUMMARY

Complaint

A complaint was received on the grounds that these posts feature people riding e-bikes without helmets, which is not only illegal, but also unsafe.

Advertiser response

The advertiser submitted that some of the scenes were filmed on private property, while others were static images, not video clips. In relation to the post by Josh Addo Carr, it submitted that this was not created or posted by it, so it cannot remove this post.

Decisions

The Panel considered the posts separately, and found as follows:

Section 2.6 (AANA Code of Ethics): Advertising shall not depict material contrary to Prevailing Community Standards on health and safety.

The Practice Note states:

> Section 2.6 requires that advertising must not depict content that would encourage or condone unhealthy or unsafe behaviour having regard to Prevailing Community Standards.
>
> UNSAFE PRACTICES Images of unsafe driving, bike riding without helmets or not wearing a seatbelt while driving a motor vehicle are likely to be contrary to prevailing community standards relating to health and safety irrespective of whether such depictions are for the product/service being advertised or are incidental to the product.

Ad 1:

Panel assessment

The Panel noted that this post shows Chris Hemsworth sitting on a stationary bike, while the advertiser's Abraham Mikhail rolls his bike around to park next to him. The Panel considered that the actions take place in a private driveway, and that the bike was not being driven inasmuch as it was being moved.

The Panel considered that this post featured some still images of people posing on the bikes and considered that the bike was being moved into position, rather than being driven in the conventional sense.

The Panel concluded that such actions did not depict unsafe behaviour and would not likely be seen as being contrary to community standards on health and safety.

Panel decision

As such, the Panel concluded that this ad did not breach section 2.6 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

Ad 2:

Panel assessment

The Panel noted that this post was flagged as a collaboration between @joshaddocarr, @flightrisk_co and @letstrotco.

The Panel considered that the advertiser, therefore, appears to have a reasonable sense of control over the post and that the post draws attention to the advertiser in a manner calculated to promote its product.

The Panel considered that the post featured more than one scene where Josh Addo Carr appears to be riding his e-bike while not wearing a helmet, and that these scenes also appeared to show him filming while riding. The Panel considered that community concerns around e-bike safety have increased dramatically in recent years, and that the depicted behaviour would likely be considered to be unsafe by community standards.

Panel decision

As such, the Panel concluded that this ad depicted unsafe behaviour that would be contrary to prevailing community standards, and therefore breached section 2.6 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

Ad 3:

Panel assessment

The Panel considered that the ad featured still images, and that two of these appeared to be photos taken while riding an e-bike in a road. The Panel considered that the overall impression is that the e-bike was being driven.

The Panel considered that riding an e-bike without a helmet is generally considered to be unsafe, and contrary to prevailing community standards. The Panel, therefore, concluded that the ad depicted content that would be considered contrary to community standards on health and safety.

Panel decision

As such, the Panel concluded that this ad breached section 2.6 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

Ad 4:

Panel assessment

The Panel considered that the ad featured two men riding an e-bike while singing along to a song. The Panel considered that neither of the men were wearing helmets. The Panel acknowledged the advertiser's submissions that this was filmed on private property but considered that the question here is whether the ad depicted unsafe behaviour, and that this technical distinction would not alter the Panel's consideration.

The Panel considered that riding an e-bike without a helmet is generally considered to be unsafe, and contrary to prevailing community standards. The Panel, therefore, concluded that the ad depicted content that would be considered contrary to community standards on health and safety.

Panel decision

As such, the Panel concluded that this ad breached section 2.6 of the AANA Code of Ethics.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

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

ACTION

The advertiser has not provided a response to the breach decision. The ads remain visible on the platform and have been referred to Meta.