

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	19/378
<b>COMPLAINANT</b>	J Harper
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Waikato Health Clinic
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Waikato Health Clinic website
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	25 February 2020
<b>OUTCOME</b>	Settled

**Advertisement:** The website advertisement for Waikato Health Clinic BDORT is a non-conventional, bio-energetic test method. The technique involves a patient opposing their thumbs and fourth finger (Bi Digital) into an “O Ring”. The patient can then be challenged or “tested” against a wide variety of things. These can range from foods preservatives, infective organisms, drugs and standardized vials covering a wide range of components.

**The Chair ruled the complaint was Settled.**

**Complainant, J Harper, said:** Ricky Gorringe BDORT (Bi-Digital O-Ring testing)...

On his website, he describes his procedure as follows:

The technique involves a patient opposing their thumb and fourth finger (Bi-Digital into an O-Ring configuration, with the tips of the fourth finger and thumb touching. The Tester then grasps each side of the Bi-Digital O-Ring formed and teaches the patient to apply a specified, constant degree of pressure, between the thumb and fourth finger, when asked. Once the skill has been learned, the patient can then be challenged, or tested against a wide variety of things. These can range from foods, preservatives, infective organisms, chemicals, drugs and standardized vials covering a very wide range of components, to determine whether these:-

- (1) are compatible/incompatible/intolerant or allergic/non-allergic to the patient; or
- (2) produce a response that can help gain a working diagnosis, on which to base a logical treatment protocol.

This is a breach of principal 2 of the therapeutic code in that he is unlikely to be able to produce evidence that this diagnosis can reliably discern what specific substance one of his clients is allergic to. This is also a breach of principle 1, as to offer such a diagnosis, as the medical tribunal put it so eloquently, is grossly irresponsible and unconscionable.

**The relevant provisions were Therapeutic and Health Advertising Code - Principle 1, Principle 2, Rule 2(a)**

**The Chair** noted the Complainant’s concerns the website advertisement was making unsubstantiated claims.

The Chair acknowledged the Advertiser had taken down the website, after receiving the complaint. The Chair noted the intention of the Advertiser to seek TAPS approval (see: <https://www.anza.co.nz/taps>) for any future advertisements, before doing any further advertising.

Given the Advertiser’s co-operative engagement with the process and the self-regulatory action taken in amending the advertisement, the Chair said that it would serve no further purpose to place the matter before the Complaints Board.

The Chair ruled that the matter was Settled.

**Chair's Ruling:** Complaint **Settled**

**APPEAL INFORMATION**

According to the procedures of the Advertising Standards Complaints Board, all decisions are able to be appealed by any party to the complaint. Information on our Appeal process is on our website [www.asa.co.nz](http://www.asa.co.nz). Appeals must be made in writing via email or letter within 14 calendar days of receipt of this decision.