

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	17/085
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	G Lacey
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Green Door Real Estate
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Green Door Real Estate Radio
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	20 March 2017
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The radio advertisement for Green Door Real Estate opens with the lines:

“We’ve got more buyers. We’ve got better buyers. We’ve got out-of-town buyers. Hi, Mike Harvey, Green Door, Licensed REAA. Come on, seriously, does anyone actually believe that bollocks?”

**The Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.**

**Complainant, G Lacey, said:**

On my way to work this morning, I was horrified to hear the new advert from Mike Harvey of Green Door Real Estate, Nelson/Marlborough.

The advert was broadcast at approx. 08:45 during the Si and Gary show and contained the word "bollocks" used in a derogatory manner towards their industry competitors.

I was offended at the use of the word, particularly at a time when a large family audience are listening.

**The relevant provisions were Code of Ethics - Basic Principle 4, Rule 4, Rule 5.**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant’s concerns about the use of the word “bollocks”, particularly when a family audience is listening.

The Chair referred to a precedent decision, Complaint 17/035, regarding a complaint about the use of the word “bloody” in a television advertisement. This advertisement received a “G” rating from the Commercial Approval Bureau. The Complaints Board agreed the complaint was Not Upheld. This was because the word “bloody” was used in a non-threatening way, in a humorous context and did not reach the threshold required to cause serious or widespread offence.

The Chair noted the word “bollocks” is further down the list of “Unacceptable Words on Television and Radio” than the word “bloody”.

The Chair said in this case the word “bollocks” has similarly been used in a non-threatening way, in a humorous context and does not reach the threshold required to cause serious or widespread offence.

Therefore, the Chair ruled the advertisement had been prepared with a due sense of social responsibility to consumers and there was no apparent breach of Basic Principle 4 or Rules 4 & 5 of the Code of Ethics. Accordingly, the Chair ruled there were no grounds for the complaint to proceed.

**Chair’s Ruling:** Complaint **No Grounds to Proceed**