

<b>COMPLAINT NUMBER</b>	20/272
<b>ADVERTISER</b>	Vision New Zealand
<b>ADVERTISEMENT</b>	Vision New Zealand, Out of Home
<b>DATE OF MEETING</b>	6 July 2020
<b>OUTCOME</b>	No Grounds to Proceed

**Advertisement:** The Vision NZ signage on the door of the Vision NZ office promotes their candidacy for the Waiariki electorate seat. The signage has the Vision Party logo and the words "Hannah Tamaki Waiariki Electorate Office." There is also a mobile number, email address and web address for Vision NZ.

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

**Complaint:** Hannah Tamaki, leader of the Vision New Zealand Party has opened an office at 1132 Tutanekei Street, Rotorua, New Zealand.

The door on the office advertises the office as "Waiariki Electorate Office". However, as Hannah Tamaki is not the MP for Waiariki, it is incorrect to advertise the office as being the Waiariki Electorate Office, as only the MP for Waiariki could operate a "Waiariki Electorate Office".

This could confuse the public into thinking that Hannah Tamaki is the MP for Waiariki, further confusing people that the services typically offered from within an electorate office could be offered by Tamaki's office.

It would be more accurate for the office door to read "Waiariki Campaign Office".

The ad breaches Principle 2/Rule 2 (b) Truthful presentation: It is clearly designed to mislead the public which could exploit their lack of knowledge. The ad is clearly false representation.

**The relevant provisions were Advertising Standards Code - Principle 2, Rule 2(b);**

**Principle 2: Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must be truthful, balanced and not misleading.

**Rule 2(b) Truthful Presentation:** Advertisements must not mislead or be likely to mislead, deceive or confuse consumers, abuse their trust or exploit their lack of knowledge. This includes by implication, inaccuracy, ambiguity, exaggeration, unrealistic claim, omission, false representation or otherwise. Obvious hyperbole identifiable as such is not considered to be misleading.

**The Chair** noted the Complainant's concern the advertisement was misleading to refer to the "Waiariki Electorate Office" as the Vision New Zealand candidate is not the MP for Waiariki.

The Chair carefully reviewed the signage on the door of the Vision New Zealand Party office.

The Chair noted the term "electorate" referred to a geographical boundary within which constituents are entitled to vote in a General election.

The Chair said Hannah Tamaki, the Vision New Zealand candidate, is standing in the Waiariki electorate and the signage informed people she had established a local office and provided contact details.

The Chair did not consider that the consumer takeout was that Hannah Tamaki is the current elected Member of Parliament.

The Chair ruled the advertisement was not in breach of Principle 2 or Rule 2(b) of the Advertising Standards Code.

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

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

**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.