

COMPLAINT NUMBER	17/264
COMPLAINANT	L Halpin
ADVERTISER	Brand Developers Ltd
ADVERTISEMENT	Television
DATE OF MEETING	14 August 2017
OUTCOME	No Grounds to Proceed

Advertisement: The television advertisement for the Clever Cane showed various elderly people having difficulty standing up in various situations including getting out of a car and bed. The advertisement showed demonstrations of the Clever Cane as a tool to aide in the transition from sitting to standing and as a safety device featuring a light and an alarm.

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

Complainant, L Halpin, said: “I just feel that their product of 'Clever Cane', a walking stick with attachment to help elderly people get up and walk oversimplifies actual elderly problems of balance, weak knees/legs, mobility by presenting a 'magic' solution of these issues. At almost \$50, it is a very expensive of what look like a cheap product made overseas. I am just concerned because elderly can be very vulnerable to this kind of false marketing.”

The relevant provisions were Basic Principle 4 and Rule 2 of the Code of Ethics and Principle 1 and 2 and Guideline 1(c) of the Therapeutic and Health Advertising Code.

The Chair noted the concerns of the Complainant the advertisement was misleading and preyed on a vulnerable audience by oversimplifying the issues some elderly people can have with balance and mobility.

The Chair said the advertisement was illustrative of the types of problems some people have with mobility and demonstrated how the Clever Cane could assist with stabilisation as well as other safety features. While the Chair appreciated the Complainants concerns, she was of the view the advertisement did not prey on the vulnerability of the elderly but showed how the product could minimise the risk around mobility issues.

The Chair said the advertisement did not present unrealistic outcomes and was unlikely to mislead consumers into thinking the product would fix all mobility problems.

The Chair said the advertisement was not in breach of the Therapeutic and Health Advertising Code and had been prepared with the high standard of social responsibility required. Accordingly, the Chair ruled the complaint had no grounds to proceed.

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