



# The Advertising Standards Council of India

## REPORT OF CONSUMER COMPLAINTS COUNCIL (CCC) COMPLAINTS THAT WERE UPHELD BY THE CCC From April 2006 to March 2007

Sr. No	Advertiser / Agency / Media	Claim / Description of Ad/ TVC	Complaint	ASCI Code/ CCC Decision
--------	-----------------------------	--------------------------------	-----------	-------------------------

# Intra-Industry Complaints \* ASCI Member \$ Complaint received from Consumer Representational Organisation

### Advertisements Modified Appropriately / Withdrawn / Concluded

1.	McDowell & Company Limited(*) (now United Spirits Ltd) (RomanoV)	Ad states - "VonamoR spanking new RomanoV".	(Complaint registered in 3/2006) `RomanoV' appears to be a liquor brand name. `VonamoR' - spelt in reverse, is apparently suggestive of the same brand name.	<u>May 2006</u> Exparte (absence of comments from the Advertiser). Chapters III.6, I.4, III.4.
	Rediffusion DY&R(*)	Visuals depict `admiration for a young man'.	Ad is misleading by ambiguity and is suggestive of a liquor brand.	No supporting data to establish the sustainability of the promotion, provided by the Advertiser.
	Bombay Times(*) (3/2006)	Ad states (in fine print) - `CD Rack'. Visual - "a tall tumbler bearing the brand name - RomanoV".		Ad misleading by ambiguity. Ad appeared to be a surrogate Ad for a liquor product which was considered to be in breach of the law.
				<b><i>Ad campaign suspended temporarily.</i></b>
2.	State Bank of India (SBI Debit Card)	Visuals - Bholu an ex-pickpocket, does manual labour in buildings to transport goods etc, and is harassed by kids, is shouted at in traffic jams, walks with broken slippers with considerable inconvenience, and has dry pieces of bun at the	(Complaint received in 4/2006) Ad promotes pickpocketing than hard work.	<u>May 2006</u> Chapters I.4 and III.1(a). Ad misleading by omission of essential conditions pertaining to the acquisition and regular use of a Debit Card. Ad by implication,
	Mudra Communications(*)			
	HBO channel (3/2006)			

		end of the day with a feeling of sadness on his face. Punch line in the TVC says, "Welcome to State Bank Debit Card, Welcome to a cashless world".		tends to incite people to crime, by conveying that the advantage of being a pickpocket far outweighs the hardships of physical work. <b>TVC discontinued.</b>
3.	Voltas Ltd(*) (Voltas Vertis Gold AC)  Euro RSCG Advertising(*)  Hindustan Times(*) (4/2006)	Claims - "Most ACs make your skin dry. Here's one that keeps it fresh and healthy", "It releases Vitamin C ions that protect your skin from harmful ultraviolet rays".	(Complaint received in 4/2006) Complainant questions how UV rays normally present in the atmosphere outside, can affect skin inside a room (in which ACs are usually functioning), and How Vitamin C ions, even if released in the air, can get absorbed by skin and provide any UV protection.	<u>May 2006</u> Chapter I.1. Supporting technical information provided with the comments, by the Advertiser, were not convincing enough to substantiate the claims.  <b>Ad campaign stopped.</b>
4.	Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) # (Wheel Active Colours)  Lowe(*)  Zee(*), Star Plus(*), Star One(*), Sony TV(*), DD (2/2006)	Claims - Wheel Active is the "World's largest selling detergent" ("Wheel Active, duniya ka sabse zyada biknewala detergent").  Super in the TVC - "Based on tonnage sales of Wheel detergent".	(Complaint received in 5/2006) There is no evidence that the claim can be substantiated. As per the "Published retail share" data that is referred by the industry, total sale of P&G's Tide detergent in the U.S. is 1097 Million kgs; whereas total sale of the Wheel brand in volume terms is 960 Million kgs. As per "Retail Store Audit report" by A.C. Nielsen, annual sale for Nirma detergent in India is 312 Million kgs; whereas that for Wheel Active is only 130 Million kgs. Thus the claim is false and misleading. No qualifier/super can justify Wheel Active to claim the "World's largest selling detergent".	<u>June 2006</u> Chapter I.1. Claim not substantiated. The claim, in the super, referred to Wheel brand of detergent, whilst the promotion referred to Wheel Active, a variant of the brand.  <b>Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the claim.</b>
5.	Samsung India Electronics Pvt Ltd(*) (Samsung LCD TV)  Mumbai Mirror(*) (4/2006)	Ad states - "Crystal vase...Rs.2200. Samsung LCD TV with crystal clear picture ...just Rs.2166. at an EMI of just Rs.2166".	(Complaint received in 5/2006) Ad is incomplete as it does not mention the number of EMIs. The Ad is misleading as it suggests that the cost of the Samsung LCD TV is less than the cost of a Crystal vase.	<u>June 2006</u> Chapter I.4. Ad misleading by omission.  <b>Advertiser assured that the Ad will be modified appropriately prior to releasing it again.</b>

- |    |  |  |  |  |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| 6. | <p>Hindustan Lever Ltd(*)<br/>(Lux Body Wash)</p> <p>Desk Top Calendar -<br/>“**x2006”</p>                                 | <p>Copy lines - “**x Appeal. If you got it, flaunt it”, “Now every girl can be a **x symbol”, “**x in the morning and night makes your skin glow”, “Once a girl has tried **x, she wants it everyday”, “It’s never too early to start your **x education”, “**x in the bathroom can be great fun”, “**x appeal is a girl’s best weapon”, “A loofah is a great **x toy. Goes where no man has gone before”, “There is no such thing as too much **x”, “Girls are trying **x at a very young age”, “Girls just can’t do without **x”, “More and more girls are getting addicted to **x”.</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 5/2006)<br/>This is a cheap and vulgar promotion.</p>  | <p><u>June 2006</u><br/>Chapter II.<br/>Word, “**X”, used repeatedly in the promotion messages appearing in the calendar, was suggestive and indecent, in the absence of any mention that the word “**X”, has been registered for the brand “Lux”.</p> <p><b><i>Distribution of the calendar has been stopped.</i></b></p> |
| 7. | <p>Shaw Wallace Distilleries Ltd<br/>(White Mischief Holidays)</p> <p>Suo motu<br/>Bombay Times(*)<br/>(5/2006)</p>        | <p>Ad states – “I’m in the Mood for Mischief”.</p> <p>Visuals – X-Ray Vision Sunglasses, a man wearing Sunglasses and admiring two scantily clad women on a beach.</p>   | <p>(Complaint registered in 5/2006)<br/>Ad copy read in conjunction with the visual depicted, appears to be indecent.<br/>Ad is misleading and suggestive of a liquor brand – White Mischief.<br/>It is not apparent as to what product or service is being promoted – X-Ray Vision Sunglasses or White Mischief Holidays.</p> | <p><u>June 2006</u><br/>Chapter III.6.<br/>No supporting data to establish the sustainability of the promotion, provided by the Advertiser.<br/>Ad appeared to be a surrogate Ad for a liquor brand – White Mischief.</p> <p><b><i>Ad withdrawn.</i></b></p>   |
| 8. | <p>Lux Hosiery Industries Ltd<br/>(GenX Premium Briefs)</p> <p>Lookad (India) Ltd</p> <p>Mumbai Mirror(*)<br/>(5/2006)</p> | <p>Visuals - “a semi-nude man apparently being molested by a clothed woman”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 6/2006)<br/>Ad is obscene and may hurt a man’s sensibilities.</p>  | <p><u>June 2006</u><br/>Chapter II.<br/>Ad likely to cause grave or widespread offence.</p> <p><b><i>Ad withdrawn.</i></b></p>   |

- |     |  |  |  |  |
|-----|--|--|--|--|
| 9.  | <p>General Motors India Pvt Ltd (Tavera Car)</p> <p>Rediffusion DY&amp;R(*)</p> <p>Sahara One(*) (4/2006)</p>                              | <p>Visuals - "Cricket players playing the game using Tavera cars".</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 4/2006)</p> <p>Ad promotes rash driving which is dangerous.</p>  | <p><u>June 2006</u><br/>Chapter III.3.<br/>Actions portrayed in the visuals depicted in the TVC, show dangerous practices and manifest a disregard for safety without justifiable reason.</p> <p><b><i>TVC modified.</i></b></p>           |
| 10. | <p>Bajaj Auto Ltd (Bajaj Platina Bike)</p> <p>Lowe(*)</p> <p>Ten Sports (6/2006)</p>   | <p>Visuals - "A boy riding a bike and a girl driving a car. The girl keeps flicking her car headlights at the boy who zig-zags all over the road (going into the lane for oncoming traffic). In the end, the boy gets behind the car and starts flicking his bike's headlights at it"</p>                                    | <p>(Complaint received in 6/2006)</p> <p>Ad depicts road safety and traffic rules as something that can be broken or need not be taken seriously.</p>  | <p><u>August 2006</u><br/>Chapter III.3.<br/>Action sequences, depicted in the TVC, show dangerous practices and manifest a disregard for safety without justifiable reason.</p> <p><b><i>TVC discontinued.</i></b></p>                    |
| 11. | <p>Procter &amp; Gamble Home Products Limited(*) (Ariel Sachet for Rs.2/-)</p> <p>Saatchi &amp; Saatchi(*)</p> <p>Sony Max(*) (7/2006)</p> | <p>Visuals - "A boy spraying ink from his pen by shaking it onto the back of another boy's shirt. He then closes the door, opens it and shakes the pen again. Unfortunately it is sprayed onto the front of a teacher's shirt".</p> <p>Voiceover - "as long as Ariel is there for Rs.2/- the shirt can be washed white".</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 7/2006)</p> <p>It is quite objectionable and wrong to put this message across using children.</p> <p>As the Ad shows this act being done by a child, it may prompt and encourage other children to adopt the same antics which are harmful.</p>  | <p><u>August 2006</u><br/>Chapter III.2(b).<br/>TVC featured an act which was likely to encourage minors to emulate such act in a manner which could cause them harm or injury.</p> <p><b><i>TVC discontinued.</i></b></p>                 |
| 12. | <p>"An Appeal to all Terrorists"</p> <p>\$</p> <p>Sunny Advertising</p> <p>Mumbai Mirror(*) (7/2006)</p>                                   | <p>Ad issued in public interest.</p> <p>Statements - "Please do not kill absolutely innocent people"</p> <p>"If you have to fight, fight with those with whom you have a problem".</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 7/2006)</p> <p>Statement is abominable.</p> <p>This is clearly an insidious exhortation to those who believe in their misguided cause. If one considers the very existence of the Indian state a problem, this line suggests that you fight the Indian state.</p> <p>Message conveyed is erroneous and misleading.</p> | <p><u>August 2006</u><br/>Chapter III.1(a).<br/>Ad tends to incite people to crime, promotes disorder, violence and intolerance.</p> <p><b><i>Ad. Agency informed that Ad, a one-time insertion, and no further Ads scheduled.</i></b></p> |

- |          |   |   |   |  |
|----------|---|---|---|--|
| 13.<br># | <p>Triumphant Institute of Management Education Pvt Ltd (CAT 2005 Results)</p> <p>Tiara Advertising</p> <p>The Times of India(*), Delhi edition (7/2006)</p>  | <p>Ad shows a bar chart. First bar depicts the number of final selections of students of T.I.M.E. appearing for the Common Admission Test 2005, into the IIMs – 1682 (figure purported to be validated by KPMG). Second bar depicts a similar figure for IMS - 828 (not validated by any claimed source). Third bar shows the corresponding figure for PT Education – 521 (source of the information is not mentioned). Finally, the chart mentions CL (Career Launcher India Ltd). There is no figure mentioned for final selections into the IIMs, but shows a question mark (?) above the name `CL`, without any validation.</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)</p> <p>Any commercialization of this is incorrect and grossly unfair to the student community. Ad by the very nature of its ambiguity, unjustifiable use of a competitor's name, attempts to confer an unfair advantage upon itself and attempts to mislead the consumer as a result of the comparison.</p>   | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Chapters I.4 and IV.1(d).</p> <p>Data mentioned in Advertiser's comments, was incomplete and not comparable with the other Institutions mentioned in the Ad. Specific source from which the data was quoted, was not validated. Ad was considered ambivalent. Ad was misleading by ambiguity and was unfair to competition.</p> <p><b><i>Advertiser informed that, Ad appeared in T.O.I. , Delhi, of 7/2006, withdrawn, and Ad campaign suspended temporarily.</i></b></p> |
| 14.<br># | <p>Assotech Supertech (JV)<br/>(The Metropolis – Residential address for corporate citizens of Rudrapur)</p> <p>Percept H Private Limited(*)</p> <p>Economic Times(*), Lucknow edition (8/2006)</p> <p>Economic Times(*), Mumbai edition (8/2006)</p> | <p>Ad carries the image of a letter addressed to "Mr. Bajaj" signed by "Ratan", and the letterhead carries the half-erased name of "R. Ta..." on the right hand top corner.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)</p> <p>From the content of the letter it is quite clear that it is a letter of recommendation eulogising The Metropolis at Rudrapur, an apartment/serviced apartments complex. The name "Ratan" has been mischievously used in the letter (as is the use of Mr. Bajaj's name – another well regarded industrialist), very clearly alluding to Tata Group's Chairman, Mr. Ratan Tata. The half erased name "R Tat...", is only a further allusion to Mr. Ratan Tata.</p> | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Chapter I.4.</p> <p>Ad misleading by implication.</p> <p><b><i>Advertiser informed that Ad had already been withdrawn on receipt of a Notice received from the Complainant's Counsel.</i></b></p>  |
| 15.<br># | <p>Quantum Asset Management Co Pvt Ltd<br/>(Quantum Mutual Fund)</p> <p>Maxigen Communications</p>  | <p>Visual – "picture of a Pizaxx product"</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 9/2006)</p> <p>Quantum Asset Management Co, for their financial Ad, have copied the visual of "Pizaxx – Har Snack ka Big Baap", that Smokin' Joe's are advertising in mass media (since March 2006), as part of the campaign for their new product –</p>  | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Chapter IV.3.</p> <p>Advertiser's Ad was similar to the Complainant's earlier run Ad in visual presentation, so as to suggest plagiarism.</p>  |

India Today  
(7/2006 issue)

Pizaxx, which is a pizza snack.  
The advertiser/agency should not use this picture in any form of communication.

***Ad. Agency informed that they had already stopped using this visual in all their media campaigns after August 06, on receipt of the Complainant's letter to the Advertiser. Ad. Agency also assured that this visual will not be used in any form of communication, in future.***

16.  
Suo  
motu

Cadbury India Ltd(\*)  
(Cadbury Bournvita)  
Ogilvy & Mather(\*)

Headline - "Real Achievers grow up on Bournvita".

(Complaint registered in 9/2006)  
This needs to be substantiated with certificates or testimonials from the persons mentioned in the Ad.

October 2006  
Chapter I.4.  
Ad headline was misleading by gross exaggeration, in the absence of authentic evidence of the prolonged consumption over the growing years, of the individuals cited in the Ad.

The Times of India(\*)  
(8/2006)

Claim - "With Super Chargers".

Claim on the label of the product pack depicted in the Ad, needs clarification as to the nature of ingredients supporting such a claim.

***Ad discontinued.***

17.  
Suo  
motu

McDowell & Company Ltd(\*)  
(now United Spirits Ltd)  
(DSP Black)

Ad states - "Night is Young. Night is Black", "Come Alive", "DSP Black - Black Nights CDs" (in fine print).

(Complaint registered in 9/2006)  
Ad is misleading by its ambiguity, and is suggestive of a liquor brand (appears to be a replica of the label of a branded liquor product).

October 2006  
Chapters I.4, III.4 and III.6(a).  
Mention of "CDs" in an inconspicuous and unreadable manner delinked from any of the pertinent claims or visuals, misleading by its ambiguity.  
Replica of label of a branded liquor product, considered as promoting the sale or consumption of liquor, Ad having appeared in Bombay Times, published in Maharashtra.  
Scale of advertising does not appear to be

Mudra Comms(\*)

Bombay Times(\*)  
(9/2006)

sustainable in respect of the quantity quoted in the agreement provided in support of the business contracted.

***Ad modified.***

18. Shree Baidyanath Ayurved Bhawan P. Ltd. (Baidyanath Sugarfree Chyawanprash Granules, Baidyanath Kesari Kalp) Hindustan Times(\*) (9/2006) Suo motu
- Claims - "Sugarfree Chyawanprash Granules, which for the first time in the world addresses the need of diabetic patients", "anti-diabetic properties", "combat physical fatigue and weakness in diabetic patients". "Kesari Kalp has proved useful in addressing untimely weakness and fatigue", "an energy extending that sustains active and agile life".
- (Complaint registered in 9/2006) Claims need to be substantiated with proof, supporting technical information with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.
- November 2006 Chapter I.1. Claims not substantiated.
- Advertiser informed that Ad has been modified.***
19. Godrej Consumer Products P. Ltd(\*) (Godrej Fair Glow Soap) Quadrant Comm Zee Marathi(\*) (9/2006)
- Visuals - "Parents of the girl are shown as dark skinned, with their names as 'Mr. Kale and Mrs. Kale' and the daughter is shown as fair because she has used the Godrej Fair Glow soap".
- (Complaint received in 9/2006) Ad is offensive.
- November 2006 Chapter II. Visual depicted, was discriminatory in its implication. Ad considered to be repulsive and likely to give rise to widespread offence, particularly amongst women.
- Ad campaign concluded. Advertiser informed that TVC will not be repeated.***
20. Syndicate Bank \$ ETV Kannada (\*) (Sept-Oct 2006)
- Visual - "a fortune teller using a Parakeet to predict the future of a person".
- (Complaint received in 9/2006) The Parakeet used in the Ad is protected under the Wildlife (Protection) Act (WPA) 1972. The trade and trafficking of these birds is banned. Any person who has an animal that is protected under the act should have the permission
- November 2006 Chapter III.4. Visual depicted of a parakeet (bird), emerging from a cage box and performing an act, requires a No Objection Certificate

<p>21. Suo motu</p>	<p>DKT India (XXX Flavoured Dotted Condoms)</p> <p>M:Ideas</p> <p>Sony Max(*) (10/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - “a woman sensually and orally enjoying the flavours of fruits”.</p>	<p>from the Chief Wildlife Warden of the state. Any Ad that uses any kind of animals must have a No Objection Certificate from the prescribed authority i.e. Animal Welfare Board of India, certifying that the Ad has been made in compliance with the Performing Animals (Registration) Rules, 2001, framed under the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960. The Ad is in contravention of the Wildlife Protection Act and as well as the Performing Animals (Registration) Rules, 2001. <b>(One similar complaint received against the same TVC)</b></p> <p>(Complaint registered in 10/2006) Ads are obscene and vulgar because they imply promotion of ‘XXX Flavoured Dotted Condoms’ for oral sex. Running these Ads during cricket matches, which has large proportion of minors and children watching, violates prevailing standards of decency.  <b>(Three similar complaints received against the same TVC)</b></p>	<p>from the prescribed authority. Since the Advertiser has not submitted proof of such certification, the Ad was in breach of the law.  <b><i>TVC withdrawn.</i></b></p> <p><u>November 2006</u> Chapter II. Implications of these acts, when viewed by minors, watching TV commentary on One Day Cricket match, is obscene and is likely to give rise to widespread offence to parents of such minors and to young children not fully aware of the sensuous undertones of this depiction. Ads violate prevailing standards of decency as relevant to this vulnerable age group. The time of airing and the programme during which the Ads were shown, were not suitable for viewing by children and minors. <b><i>TVCs discontinued. Advertiser assured that TVCs will be appropriately modified if they are to be aired during non-adult time bands.</i></b></p>
---------------------	---	--	--	--

22. Suo motu	Vanity Gold (Zodiac Power Rings)  Mumbai Mirror(*) (10/2006)	<p>Claims - "Zodiac Power Rings, made out of Pacnhadhatu, are creating waves the world over with their Unique ability to change the course of people's destiny by making them extra confident, focused, self-willed &amp; more in Touch with themselves".</p> <p>Testimonials - "My Zodiac Power Ring makes me a winner everytime", "My Zodiac Power Ring is behind my new found confidence".</p>	<p>(Complaint registered in 10/2006) Claims need to be substantiated.</p> <p>These statements need to be supported with proof.</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u> Chapter I.5. Claims were so exaggerated as to lead to grave or widespread disappointment in the minds of consumers.</p> <p><b><i>Advertiser expressed intention to withdraw the Ad.</i></b></p>
23.	Heinz India P. Ltd(*) (Complan)  Star Plus(*) (10/2006)	<p>"Complan has 100% milk protein &amp; 23 vital nutrients, which helps children grow by ...."</p> <p>Claim of height increase – "this much" (visually depicted)</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Complainant has been regularly giving his child `Complan` for the last one year, but his height has not increased, to an extent as shown in the commercial.</p> <p>Claim needs to be substantiated.</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u> Chapters I.1 and I.4. Claim, "this much", as visually depicted, which implied 'twice as much increase in height', as a result of daily consumption of Complan in prescribed quantities, was misleading by gross exaggeration. In the absence of valid substantiating data, supported by tests/ trials conducted amongst related subject groups in India, wherein height increase (not general growth) was the focus of such studies, claim not substantiated.</p> <p>Complaint related to the observed lack of perceptible increase in height of an individual boy, in relation to the visually depicted height increase in support of the claim, was Not Upheld, in</p>

the absence of valid supporting data in the complaint.

***TVC modified.***

24. WWW Sky Shop (Roop Amrit Ayurvedic Cream)  
Naveen Advtg.  
Zee TV(\*)
- Claims - "100% Ayurvedic", "Makes face fairer", "No side effects", "Natural fairness", "100% safe product".
- TVC shows various questions being asked to the three experts (referred to as Specialists).  
Girl working in Call Centre says, "Due to the shifts at her work place, she has less hours of sleep, because of which she has started getting dark circles below her eyes",  
Woman asking "whether 'Roop Amrit Ayurvedic cream' can also be used by children",  
Young girl wanting to know the remedy for her dark skin, - each of the experts advises to use "Roop Amrit Ayurvedic Cream".
- Testimonial of a girl who says, "she had dark circles below her eyes, her skin was dark with lot of pimples on her face. After the use of this product, her face has become fair and the dark circles as well as the pimples have disappeared."
- (Complaint received in 8/2006, from individual consumer, but referred by GOI department).  
Claims need to be substantiated with proof, supporting technical/medical information with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.
- November 2006  
Experte (absence of comments from the Advertiser).  
Chapters I.1 and II. Claims not substantiated.  
Ad, discriminatory in its implication.  
Ad considered to be repulsive and likely to give rise to widespread offence, particularly amongst women.
- TVC discontinued.***
25. Goodcare Pharma (Livgood Natural Liver Protector)  
R.K. Swamy BBDO P. Ltd(\*)
- Claims - "Natural Liver Protector", "Partying Frequently? Better be on Livgood".
- (Complaint registered in 10/2006)  
Claims suggestive of remedy for over-indulgence in food and drink, need to be substantiated with supporting technical/medical information.
- December 2006  
Chapters I.1 and I.4. Claim, "Natural Liver Protector", not substantiated.  
Claim, "Partying Frequently? Better be

Mumbai Mirror(\*)  
(10/2006)

on Livgood”,  
ambiguous and could  
be misleading.

***Advertiser informed  
that Ad is being  
withdrawn  
temporarily and will  
be released after  
suitable  
modifications.***

26. Suo  
motu Goodcare Pharma  
(EziSlim Natural  
Slimming Capsules)  
R.K. Swamy BBDO  
P. Ltd(\*)  
Mumbai Mirror(\*)  
(10/2006)

Claims - “An Ezi way to  
Slim”, “Natural Slimming  
Capsules”.

(Complaint registered in 10/2006)  
Claims need to be substantiated  
with proof, supporting technical  
information with details of  
tests/trials reports from an  
independent recognized testing  
institution.

December 2006  
Chapters I.1 and I.4.  
Claim, “An Ezi way  
to Slim”, not  
substantiated  
adequately.  
Claim, “Natural  
Slimming Capsules”,  
ambiguous and could  
be misleading.

***Advertiser informed  
that Ad is being  
withdrawn  
temporarily and will  
be released after  
suitable  
modifications.***

27. # Kyndal India P. Ltd.  
(Absolut Win)  
Mid-Day(\*)  
(8/2006)

Claims - “Absolut with  
its enriching and  
delectable flavour brings  
the Absolut Win offer for  
the people in Mumbai and  
Pune”, “This August  
Absolut Bottles will carry  
a scratch card with  
irresistible prizes listed on  
them”.

Visual: “a bottle labeled  
Absolut Vodka”.

(Complaint received in 9/2006)  
Claims appear to refer to a liquor  
product (Absolut).  
Ad is misleading and suggestive of  
a liquor brand – Absolut, the Ad  
having appeared in Mid-Day,  
published in Maharashtra.

December 2006  
Chapter III.4.  
Advertorial was a  
promotion for  
Absolut Vodka,  
which being a Liquor  
product, is prohibited  
from being  
advertised, in the  
State of Maharashtra,  
under the Bombay  
Prohibition Act,  
1949.

***Advertiser assured  
that such similar  
Advertorial/  
Promotions will not  
be repeated.***

28.	<p>Anchor Electricals P. Ltd. (Ave Weather Proof Switches)</p> <p>Network Advtg P. Ltd(*)</p> <p>CNN-IBN(*), Times Now channel(*) (Sept-Oct 2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - “people throwing and splashing water on their electric sockets to show it is water proof”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Children may try the same actions on non-water proof sockets in their homes and get killed due to shock. Ad is dangerous.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Chapter III.2(b). Visual depiction of, “touching the Switchbox after it has been sprayed with water”, accidentally, in a sequel featuring young children, was a hazardous act, likely to be emulated by minors, in a manner which could cause injury. <b>TVC modified.</b></p>
29.	<p>Bhawani Textiles Ltd. \$ (Dollar Wintercare Undergarments)</p> <p>Satellite Channel</p> <p>Star Plus(*) (10/2006)</p>	<p>Claim (in Hindi) - “Fridge si thandi mein garmahat laye”.</p> <p>Visual - “two young adults entering and remaining for a while however brief, in a large Deep Freezer”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Claim needs to be substantiated.</p> <p>This may influence youngsters to try sitting in a deep freezer, which may prove dangerous.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Chapter III.3. Visual depiction, shows a dangerous practice, which may be emulated by vulnerable youngsters. <b>TVC discontinued. Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the TVC.</b></p>
30.	<p>Suo motu Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) (Surf Excel Automatic Win Whirlpool Washing Machine offer)</p> <p>Lowe (*)</p> <p>Times of India (*) (21/10/2006)</p>	<p>Visual - “A young boy standing inside a washing machine open at the top end”.</p>	<p>(Complaint registered in 11/2006) Ad shows a dangerous act which may influence youngsters to try the same, which may prove dangerous.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Chapter III.3. Visual depiction shows a dangerous act, which manifests a disregard for safety and may encourage negligence on the part of vulnerable youngsters. <b>Ad withdrawn.</b></p>
31.	<p>Eureka Forbes Ltd(*) (E-Boiling Aquaguard)</p> <p>Triton Comms(*)</p> <p>CNBC(*) Star TV(*) (11/2006)</p>	<p>Visual - “Eureka Forbes sales person telling a young boy – “Safe water will make him strong and smart.”</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Claim needs to be substantiated.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Chapter I.1. Claim not substantiated.  <b>TVC suspended. Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the claim.</b></p>

32.	<p>Dr. Batra's Positive Health Clinic P. Ltd.</p> <p>Dattaram Advtg. P. Ltd(*)</p> <p>NDTV (11/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals show testimonials of persons –</p> <p>A man says that his hair grew better (implies he came out of baldness) by going to Dr. Batra's Clinic.</p> <p>A Lady and a girl (implied mother &amp; daughter) says that the girl's health improved after going to Dr. Batra's Clinic.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006)</p> <p>As per accepted health ethics, it is wrong that a company in this field or a Doctor in particular, claiming success, using patients as a medium.</p> <p>Claims are unsubstantiated. This misleading Ad can highly influence a vulnerable person.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u></p> <p>Chapters I.1 and I.4.</p> <p>The implied claim conveyed by the personal testimonial referring to 'relief, immunity improvements and well-being in health', of a young boy, previously suffering from sinus ailment, who was treated at Dr. Batra's clinic, not substantiated with clinical evidence.</p> <p>Testimonial conveyed by the young man implies "feeling good, experiencing definite improvement, and quite satisfied with the treatment taken at Dr. Batra's clinic", not specific and misleading by its ambiguity.</p>
				<p><b><i>TVC withdrawn.</i></b></p>
33. #	<p>Marico Ltd(*) (Sparsh Baby Bathing Bar)</p> <p>McCann-Erickson(*)</p> <p>Zee TV(*), Star Plus(*), DD Sahyadri (8/2006)</p> <p>Promotion message on the pack</p>	<p>Pack claim - "India's first baby bar for No Tears Bath".</p> <p>TVC claim - "India's first No Tears Bath".</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 9/2006)</p> <p>After conducting the analysis as per the standard methodology, on 'Sparsh Baby Bathing Bar', the pH value of the said product was found to be 9.77. With this high pH value this product cannot be claimed to be a product which would not cause irritation and watering of eyes. Such a product cannot be described as a "No Tears" product moreso for babies. This claim is false, deceptive and misleading.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u></p> <p>Chapters I.1 and I.4.</p> <p>Claim not substantiated. Ad misleading by exaggeration.</p> <p><b><i>Advertiser assured that the claim in the TVC, and on the product pack, is being modified.</i></b></p>
34.	<p>Marico Ltd(*) (Hair &amp; Care Hair Oil)</p> <p>DD1 (11/2006)</p>	<p>Claim (in Hindi) – "Baalon ka tootna fifty percent tak kam kare".</p> <p>Super: "Upto 50% less breakage"</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006)</p> <p>Claim amounts to misleading unwary customers into believing that the product has a comparative advantage in preventing hair loss, and that the usage of this product might have the partial advantage as</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u></p> <p>Chapters I.1 and I.4.</p> <p>Claim not substantiated adequately.</p> <p>Ad misleading by ambiguity, in respect</p>

			claimed in the TVC. Claim needs to be substantiated.	of perceptible differentiation between hair breakage and hair fall.
				<b><i>Advertiser assured that the claim in the TVC is being modified.</i></b>
35.	Go Air P. Ltd. (Distribution of 1,00,000 Free Tickets)  Rediffusion DY&R(*)  The Times of India(*) (11/2006)	Ad states - "On the occasion of our 1 <sup>st</sup> Anniversary, we are giving away 1,00,000 free tickets. Across all sectors. Offer valid till 15 <sup>th</sup> November 06. Offer valid for travel till 31 <sup>st</sup> March 07"	(Complaint received in 11/2006) Complainant started to surf the advertiser's site hoping for 4 free tickets, but their server was jammed. He sent an SMS on 13/11/06, which was acknowledged by them on the same day. Advertiser's response (telecon on 14/11/06) - "all free tickets have been sold out and the ticket for Bangalore available then was costing Rs.3400 plus taxes i.e. about Rs.4500 – 5000 per ticket." Such Ads are only just to fool the innocent people.	<u>December 2006</u> Exparte (absence of comments from the Advertiser). Chapter I.5. Considering the Complainant's narration of the individual experience within the stipulated period, and delayed response from the Advertiser, it was concluded that the Advertiser abused the trust of consumers, by mentioning a claim so exaggerated as to lead to widespread disappointment in the minds of consumers.
				<b><i>Advertiser assured that they will take adequate care in ensuring that all commitments being communicated in their promotions are implemented satisfactorily and no incorrect information is being sent out to consumers.</i></b>
36. #	L'Oreal India P. Ltd.(*) (Garnier Light Fairness + dark spots prevention daily moisturizer and	Packs claims – "Proven Results in 4 weeks: Skin is softer, naturally lighter, more even, with reduced spots and illuminated with a healthy fair glow",	(Complaint received in 10/2006) Claims implying this level of efficacy are both misleading and highly exaggerated. Dermatologist conducted clinical studies carried out on Indian	<u>December 2006</u> Chapters I.1 and I.4. Claims made in print Ads, TVC, and on the product packs, not substantiated.

	Garnier Light Anti-marks + fairness concentrate) Publicis(*) Femina(*) (June 06 issue) Hindustan Times(*) (May 06) Sony TV(*), Zee TV(*), Star TV(*) Promotion messages on the product packs	“Proven Results in 4 weeks: Spots are less visible. Complexion is fairer, finer & more luminous”. Print Ad claims – “91% of Indian Women discovered Flawless Fairness in just 4 weeks*”, “Proven results in just 4 weeks: Skin is visibly fairer: 94%*”, “Dark spots reduced: 93%*”. TVC claims - “fair Skin in just 4 weeks – 94%”, “Dark spots reduced - 93%”.	panelists, fail to show any significant efficacy with either product including a variant sold in Thailand. Independent clinical studies conducted by reputed external dermatologists using Garnier’s own skin-scale, show that the results obtained post use of Garnier Light products 2x/day for 4 weeks are significantly inferior compared to the claims made by Garnier. The use of the word “Dark Spots” is misleading in the absence of any further classification. There is thus a deliberate attempt to mislead consumers through the misuse of words like “Proven Results” and “Dermatologically tested” on the back of pack and a lack of clear information on the kind of data being used to substantiate these claims.	Claims misleading by gross exaggeration, in the absence of demonstrable evidence of the efficacy of the products in use.  <b><i>TVC and Print Ads modified. Subsequently, the Advertiser provided excerpts of the relevant clinical study reports in support of the claims made on the product packs.</i></b>
37. #	L’Oreal India P. Ltd(*) (Garnier Pure Pimple Control Pen) Publicis(*) Hindustan Times(*), Femina (*) (4/2006) Sony TV(*), Zee TV(*), Star TV(*) Promotion messages on the pack	Pack claims – “Anti-bacterial”, “Pimple control effectiveness: 92%* (*Percentage of respondents agreeing to the statement “Reduces Pimples”. “Tested on 181 respondents for 3 weeks”), “Works from the 1 <sup>st</sup> application”, “Dermatologically tested” Print Ad claims - “Sudden Pimples? Zap them in just 24 hours”, “India’s first quick-fix Pimple Control Pen”, “Proven in Efficacy: Reduces pimples in 24 hours: 79%* (*Percentage of Indian women claiming effectiveness in a consumer test, tested on 100 women).” TVC claim - “reduces pimples in 24 hours”. Pack claims – “Pure”	(Complaint received in 10/2006) Claims of this level of efficacy in 24 hrs are misleading and highly exaggerated. The word “pimple” over-simplifies the actual aetiological issue. Based on extensive studies carried out globally, clinical and dermatological experts have noted that the average duration of inflammatory papules in young women 17-25 years (based on the model shown in the Ad) is 11.4 days. The process of healing and generation of new skin cells to replace the damaged ones at the site of inflammation takes anywhere from 14-28 days according to all standard dermatological references.	<u>December 2006</u> Chapters I.1 and I.4. Claims made in print Ad, TVC, and on the product pack, not substantiated. Claims misleading by gross exaggeration, in the absence of demonstrable evidence of the efficacy of the product in use.  <b><i>Press Ad, TVC, and promotion messages on the pack, modified.</i></b>
			Needs clarification, without which it appears to be ambiguous without a related context.	

		“Garnier Skin Naturals products”	Ingredients listed on the pack include a significant number of chemical derived components.	
38.	Godrej & Boyce Mfg. Co. Ltd(*) (Godrej Air Conditioners)	Claim - “i-TREC technology for 50% faster cooling”.	(Complaint received in 11/2006) `i-TREC technology’ is not a common terminology and is an incomplete information intended to mislead the consumers. Claim needs to be substantiated.	<u>December 2006</u> Chapter I.1. Claim not substantiated with quantified data or proven performance tests reports.  <b><i>Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the claim.</i></b>
\$	India Today			
39.	Business Today (India’s No.1 Business Magazine)	Claim - “India’s No.1 Business Magazine”.	(Complaint received in 10/2006) This is a completely untrue claim and actually misleads viewers, to believe that Business Today is the No. 1 Business magazine. The fact is that `Businessworld’ is India’s No.1 Business magazine, as per NRS 2006. `Businessworld’ is also the only ABC certified business magazine for circulation numbers.	<u>December 2006</u> Exparte (absence of comments from the Advertiser). Chapter I.1. Claim not substantiated.  <b><i>Claim modified.</i></b>
#	CNBC TV18(*)			
40.	Dabur India Ltd(*) (Promise Toothpaste)	Claims – “New Promise has clove that fights twice as hard and not only removes germs that cause cavities, but also prevents them from coming again”.	(Complaint received in 11/2006) Claims are grossly misleading. Even a lifetime use of a fluoridated toothpaste cannot guarantee a cavity-free mouth. The results of various clinical trials show that continuous and sustained use of fluoridated toothpaste with either 1000ppm or 1500ppm fluoride can cause a clinically significant caries reduction of around 25-40%, but never 100% reduction.	<u>January 2007</u> Chapters I.1 and I.4. Claim, “New Promise fights the germs that cause cavities and prevents them from coming back, and therefore prevents cavities”, not substantiated adequately. Claim, “prevents cavities”, was an exaggeration which could mislead consumers.  <b><i>TVC suspended.</i></b>
#	ETV(*), Zee TV(*) (Oct-Nov 06)			

41.	<p>Hero Honda Motors Ltd(*) (CBZ X-treme Motorbike)</p> <p>Star Sports(*) (12/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals – “a motorcyclist crossing an unmanned railway crossing just ahead of an on-rushing train while the engine driver of the train waives at him not to do so”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 12/2006) TVC shows an extremely dangerous and hazardous stunt by the motorcyclist.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> Chapter III.3. Visual depictions and the action sequences portrayed, were so vivid as to create the impression that the motorbike is geared to such manoeuvres which can be executed with ease, thereby encouraging a dangerous practice, the emulation of which may be attempted by young persons with lesser skills. <b>TVC modified.</b></p>
42. #	<p>Cadila Health-Care Ltd(*) (Nutralite Premium Table Margarine)</p> <p>Mudra Comm(*)</p> <p>The Times of India(*) (12/2006)</p>	<p>Claims - “Butter is made from Animal Fat”</p> <p>“Butter contains high Cholesterol which increases the risk of Heart Diseases”</p> <p>“Butter increases the risk of Obesity”</p> <p>“Butter contains high Trans-fats and Saturated Fats, which increase the risk of Heart Diseases”.</p> <p>“Nutralite is rich in PUFA, which helps to reduce cholesterol”.</p> <p>“Cholesterol Free”</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 12/2006) Claim is misleading and categorizes Butter as non-vegetarian, which is not true. Butter is made from Milk Fat.</p> <p>There is no conclusive scientific evidence that proves that Cholesterol intake is linked to heart diseases. Claim is misleading.</p> <p>Nutralite Table Margarine contains the same amount of Fat and Calories as in Butter. Nutralite does not reduce the total calorie intake and thus cannot directly help in reducing Obesity.</p> <p>Nutralite does not declare the amount of trans-fat content on pack label.</p> <p>The actual PUFA content in Nutralite is neither mentioned on the pack label nor in the Ad. This claim is ambiguous and unsubstantiated.</p> <p>All table Margarines are made from vegetable oils, which do not contain Cholesterol. This is only stating the obvious and misleading the consumers.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> Chapters I.4 and IV.1(e). Claims were ambiguous and in the absence of relevant quantification as proof, were misleading and unfairly denigratory of a category of products, without justification.  <b>Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the Ad.</b></p>

- |     |   |   |  |  |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 43. | <p>Kellogg India Private Ltd(*)<br/>(Kellogg Real Banana Corn Flakes)</p> <p>J. Walter Thompson(*)</p> <p>Free Press Journal<br/>(12/2006)</p>          | <p>Visual - “a young boy hanging upside down by holding the upper handle, inside a bus”</p>   | <p>(Complaint registered in 1/2007)<br/>Ad shows a dangerous act which is likely to encourage minors to emulate it, in a manner which could cause injury.</p>  | <p><u>February 2007</u><br/>Chapter III.2(b).<br/>Visual depiction shows a dangerous act which is likely to encourage minors to emulate it, in a manner which could cause injury.</p> <p><b><i>Ad discontinued.</i></b></p>  |
| 44. | <p>Hero Honda Motors Ltd(*)<br/>(Hero Honda CBZ X-treme)</p> <p>J. Walter Thompson(*)</p> <p>Star Sports(*)<br/>(1/2007)<br/>Zee TV(*)<br/>(1/2007)</p> | <p>Visuals – “a biker going near the cliff and performing stunts on a single wheel of the motorbike”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 1/2007)<br/>Ad shows a dangerous act which if emulated by inexperienced riders, may cause injury.<br/><b>(1 similar complaint received against the same TVC)</b></p>   | <p><u>February 2007</u><br/>Chapter III.3.<br/>Action as depicted in the TVC, showed a dangerous act which if emulated by inexperienced riders, could cause injury. Such actions show dangerous practices and manifest a disregard for safety without justifiable reason.</p> <p><b><i>TVC modified.</i></b></p> |
| 45. | <p>Pan India Network Infravest Pvt Ltd<br/>(Playwin Lottery)</p> <p>Ambience Advertising Agency(*)</p> <p>DNA<br/>(12/2006)</p>                         | <p>Visual - “an Indian Currency Note shown as a toilet paper roll in a toilet.”</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 1/2007)<br/>This is a blatant disgrace and disrespect to the Indian Currency Note.</p>   | <p><u>February 2007</u><br/>Chapter III.4.<br/>Ad was in breach of the law.</p> <p><b><i>Ad discontinued.</i></b></p>  |
| 46. | <p>Cadbury India Ltd(*)<br/>(Cadbury Fruity Gems)</p> <p>Nick channel<br/>(1/2007)</p>  | <p>Visuals - “a child eating fruits and another child eating Gems of the same flavours. In the end, the child eating fruits is shown eating `Cadbury Fruity Gems’ instead of fruits (because it has many more flavours)”.</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 1/2007)<br/>Ad has influenced the Complainant’s 6 year old daughter so much that she doesn’t want to eat “fruits” and wants to eat only “Cadbury Fruity Gems”.<br/>This Ad is likely to corrupt young minds.</p> | <p><u>February 2007</u><br/>Chapter III.2.<br/>Ad exploits the vulnerability of minors.</p> <p><b><i>Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the TVC.</i></b></p>   |

			Advertiser confirmed that fruit extracts present in the product conform with FDA requirements.	<u>Suo motu complaint on the pack</u> Visual depiction of fruits could be misleading young children. (Not Upheld – March 2007 CCC)
47.	Inox Leisure Ltd (Inox – Live the Movie)  The Metro (a supplement of The Telegraph, Kolkata) (1/2007)	Claim - “Rs.50/- only. Not valid on weekends and holidays”.	(Complaint received in 1/2007) As per the complaint, the Cinema Theatre is charging Rs.80/- for these tickets on Fridays. When reported to the duty Manager of the Theatre, the Complainant was told that they consider Fridays to be a “weekend” and not a “weekday”. Advertiser is cheating the consumers by this Ad.	<u>February 2007</u> Chapter I.4. Claim being interpreted by the Advertiser as inclusive of `Fridays`, could be misleading to an average cinema-goer. Ad misleading by omission of a pertinent clarification. <b>Advertiser assured appropriate modification of the claim in their similar Ads, in future.</b>
48.	Neo Sports Broadcast Pvt Ltd(*) (Neo Sports)  Ogilvy & Mather(*)  Neo Sports channel (1/2007)	Visuals - “West-Indian people in a variety of situations in India being mis-treated by Indian people. The West-Indians are shown miserable and upset because of the treatment they have received from the Indians”.	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Ad is absolutely and undoubtedly racist. It suggests that Indians have a negative prejudice against the black people and that they mistreat black people.	<u>February 2007</u> <b>Not Upheld.</b> TVC showing “a West Indian couple in a boat”, was not so offensive as to give rise to widespread offence.  <b>Upheld.</b> Chapter II. TVC showing “a West Indian eating chilly chutney and many Indians not giving him water to drink”, was likely to give rise to widespread offence. The display of `Intolerance` as portrayed in this TVC was indecent, repulsive and offensive to generally accepted standards of Public Decency.

April 2007

**Decision on Review**  
**Complaint stands**

**Upheld.** Chapter II. CCC members felt that their collective decision to Uphold the complaint, was carefully deliberated and unanimous. The survey (Quantitative research conducted by a recognised independent market research agency) provided by the advertiser, did not change anything and the earlier decision to Uphold the complaint stands.

***TVC withdrawn.***

49. Neo Sports Broadcast Pvt Ltd(\*)  
(Neo Sports)  
Ogilvy & Mather(\*)  
Neo Sports channel  
(1/2007)

Visuals – “a West Indian cricketer eating chilly chutney and many Indians not giving him water to drink”.

(Complaint received in 1/2007)  
Ad is absolutely inhuman and insulting the West Indians.

**(4 similar complaints received against the same TVC)**

February 2007

Chapter II. TVC was likely to give rise to widespread offence. The display of ‘Intolerance’ as portrayed in the TVC was indecent, repulsive and offensive to generally accepted standards of Public Decency.

April 2007

**Decision on Review**  
**Complaint stands**

**Upheld.** Chapter II. CCC members felt that their collective decision to Uphold the complaint, was carefully deliberated and unanimous. The survey (Quantitative research conducted by a recognised independent market research agency) provided by the

advertiser, did not change anything and the earlier decision to Uphold the complaint stands.

***TVC withdrawn.***

50. L.G. Electronics India P. Ltd (LG Intellocool Refrigerators)  
\$  
Lowe(\*)  
Gujarat Samachar (12/2006)
- Claims - "India's No.1 Refrigerator", "...door cooling that re-energise your food and retain its nutrition longer", "Green ion Door Cooling", "Green catechin and ion coated filter removes bacteria, odour", and "...vita plus recharges food".
- (Complaint received in 1/2007)  
Advertiser needs to substantiate these claims with proof, supporting technical information, independent data, with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.
- February 2007  
Chapter I.1.  
Claims not substantiated.  
***Ad withdrawn.***
51. General Motors India P. Ltd (Chevrolet Aveo)  
McCann-Erickson India(\*)  
CNBC Awaaz(\*) (1/2007)
- Visuals - "a well-known celebrity driving the Aveo dangerously, in wrong lane and on wrong side of the road".
- (Complaint received in 1/2007)  
Even if the actions shown in the TVC are performed by professionals, it is illegal to drive dangerously.  
Ad shows a dangerous act which if emulated by inexperienced riders, may cause injury.
- February 2007  
Chapter III.3.  
Actions as depicted in the TVC, showed a dangerous act which if emulated by inexperienced riders, could cause injury.  
Such actions manifest a disregard for safety without justifiable reason.  
***TVC modified.***
52. Neo Sports Broadcast P. Ltd(\*)  
Neo Sports channel (1/2007)
- Visuals - "a young boy aspiring to be a big cricketer wears the cricket gear and taking a shot in the air, later comes back to his original state with a bucket and broom in his hand".
- (Complaint received in 1/2007)  
Ad encourages child labour, which is banned in our country.
- February 2007  
Chapter III.4.  
Ad endorsed and glorified child labour which is against the spirit of the Child Labour (Prohibition & Registration Act) 1986, and the Convention on the Rights of the Child, UNICEF (India being a signatory).  
***TVC withdrawn.***

53. # Gujarat Co-operative Milk Marketing Federation Ltd(\*) (Amul Lite Bread Spread – Better than Margarine)  
FCB-Ulka Advertising(\*)  
Sunday Times of India(\*) (1/2007)
- Ad states - fat content in Amul Lite is 59g, whereas the product pack states - fat content is 65g.
- On the pack, the AGMARK classifies the product as Grade – Medium Fat, and the Ad claims the product to be “Low Fat”.
- Ad claims - Amul Lite is a “blend of pure milk fat and vegetable oils”, and the pack states - proportion of milk fat is only 10%.
- Ad claims - “Low Cholesterol”
- (Complaint received in 2/2007)  
This means that the calorie count is 585 kcal in Amul Lite and not 531 kcal. This should be clarified.
- Appropriate clarification needs to be given by the advertiser.
- If the proportion of milk is lower than vegetable oils, the product should be called as vegetable oil-based product. Margarine across the world is a vegetable oil based product. Hence Amul Lite is nothing but a form of margarine.
- Ad does not mention the percentage of Cholesterol that Amul Lite contains. Cholesterol content in Amul Lite is 24 mg per 100 gm whereas in margarine it is nil. And when the Ad claims “Low Cholesterol”, with what product is it being compared to? Claims appear to be misleading.
- March 2007  
Chapter I.4.  
Ad claim, “Low Cholesterol”, was misleading in a comparison with Margarine which contains no Cholesterol.
- Ad modified.**
54. Lux Hosiery Industries Ltd (GenX Undergarments)  
Ogilvy & Mather(\*)  
Star News(\*) (2/2007)
- Visuals - “a man in underwear with a towel overwrap answering the door bell. A girl dressed in a mini skirt and low cut blouse says that she is the Dhobi (laundry person), and very suggestively looks at the lower body of the man. Just then the towel drops down revealing the man in his underwear. She says, “Nikaliye Na”. He looks down towards himself and asks “What!”, to which she replies “Kapde”.
- (Complaint received in 2/2007)  
The commercial has statements of double meaning. It projects the girl in a demeaning manner and is not suitable for a medium of television watched by families together with their children and minors.
- (One similar complaint received against the same TVC).**
- March 2007  
Chapter II.  
Visuals depicted and the voice over (in Hindi), “nikaaliye na...kapde”, were suggestive and indecent, and could give rise to widespread offence.
- TVC modified.**

55. Anchor Electricals Pvt Ltd  
(Anchor Gel Neo Natural Toothpaste)
- Quadrant Comm
- NDTV  
(Jan/Feb 07)
- Claim - "Three times better naturally"
- Claims - "Make teeth stronger", "Make gums healthy", "Removes stains from teeth".
- (Complaint received in 2/2007, from a member of dental profession).  
Claim is not only false but also misleading and the same does not have any clinical support. This will also amount to disparaging other Gel toothpastes available in the country.
- Commercial directly attributes specific benefits to Vitamin C, Citric Acid and Calcium. Complainant has not come across any scientific or clinical evidence which attributes the said benefits to these ingredients in the toothpaste.
- March 2007  
Chapter I.1.  
Claims not substantiated with supporting technical/clinical information or proven results, with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.
- Subsequently, the Advertiser has provided technical information which however does not substantiate the claims.
- TVC withdrawn.***
56. United Spirits Ltd(\*)  
(Royal Mist)
- Suo motu
- Rediffusion DY&R(\*)
- The Times of India(\*)  
(2/2007)
- Ad states - "Royal Mist – 100% Premium Grain", "Enchantingly Smooth", "Misty nights" (in fine print).
- (Complaint registered in 2/2007)  
This could mislead consumers regarding the product advertised for sale.  
Visual depiction of brand name is suggestive of a well-known brand of liquor product – Royal Mist.  
In the absence of specific information, the Ad appears to be a surrogate Ad for a liquor brand – Royal Mist.
- March 2007  
Chapter III.6.  
Visuals depicted and the copy mentioned, did not refer specifically to a product or service being promoted.  
Ad appeared to be a surrogate Ad for a liquor brand – Royal Mist.  
Slogan, "Cast a Spell", and the bylines, "100% premium grain", "Enchantingly smooth", refers to features generally associated with a liquor product.
- Ad withdrawn.  
Advertiser assured that Ad will be modified appropriately before it is released again.***



## The Advertising Standards Council of India

### COMPLAINTS THAT WERE NOT UPHELD BY THE CCC

From April 2006 to March 2007

Sr. No.	Advertiser / Agency / Media	Claim / Description of Ad/TVC	Complaint	Comment/ CCC Decision
---------	-----------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------

# Intra-Industry Complaints \* ASCI Member \$ Complaint received from Consumer Representational Organisation

1.	Dabur India Ltd(*) (Dabur Red Tooth Powder)  Bates India(*)  DD1 (2/2006)	Claims - "Daant hai ya juice ki machine", "Daant hai ya rampuri", "Daant hai ya hathoda", "Daant ab solid mazboot, Dabur Lal Dantmanjan ke naye pack se".	(Complaint received in 3/2006, from a member of Dental Profession). The consumer perception is that Dabur Red Toothpowder makes teeth stronger or strengthens teeth. The claims are exaggerated, false and misleading. The ingredients used in Dabur Red Toothpowder may have certain anti-bacterial properties which can protect teeth to a certain extent, but certainly cannot make teeth as strong as hammer, etc, as claimed. These claims need to be substantiated with clinical data.	<u>May 2006</u> Claims were considered to be advertising expressions to gain the attention of the viewers through apparent exaggeration. Claim, "Daant ab solid mazboot", was substantiated with supporting technical information and with tests/trials reports.
2.	Info Edge (India) Pvt Ltd (Naukri.com)  FCB-Ulka Advertising(*)  DD National, Sahara One channel(*) (3/2006)	Visuals - "An employee distorts his boss name "Hari Sadu" by spelling it as H for Hitler, A for arrogant, R for rascal, I for idiot"	(Complaint received in 3/2006) `Hari' is one of the sacred and pious names of Lord Vishnu. The Ad is highly sacrilegious and should be withdrawn.  (Four similar complaints received against the same TVC).	<u>May 2006</u> Portrayal of a fictitious character in the TVC, in a humorous situation, was not likely to give rise to grave or widespread offence.
3.	Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) # (Sunsilk thick & strong shampoo)  Zee TV(*), Star Plus(*), Sony TV(*), DD (1/2006)	Visuals show `several bald heads'.  Claim (in Hindi) as translated in English - "Weak hair becomes so strong that there is no fear of breakage".	(Complaint received in 3/2006) It is a well-known scientific fact that baldness cannot be cured or prevented. A cosmetic shampoo as Sunsilk thick & strong TVC claims, at the most, may only reduce hair fall caused due to hair breakage, which by itself cannot result into baldness.	<u>May 2006</u> Visual depiction in the TVC, was considered to be an apparent exaggeration with a humorous tone, exercising advertising licence.

			This is unmistakably leading consumers to believe that Sunsilk thick & strong can prevent balding, which is grossly misleading.	Claim not false.
4.	Marc Sanitation Pvt Ltd (Sanitary Shapes Series)  Times Life, T.O.I.(*), Hyderabad (1/2006)	Ad states - "Shape up your life"  Visual - "rear picture of a naked woman"	(Complaint received in 3/2006) Visual depicted has no relevance to the product promoted – Sanitary Shapes Series. The Ad is indecent.  (One similar complaint received against the same Ad)	<u>May 2006</u> Ad was not so indecent, as to give rise to grave or widespread offence.
5.	Triumph International (India) Pvt Ltd (Maximizer)  The Hindu(*) (3/2006)	Ad states - "Dangerous! Curves, Minimum Coverage, Maximum Exposure"  Visual - "scantly clad woman".	(Complaint received in 4/2006) Ad copy, read in conjunction with the visual depiction, appears to be indecent, and would be considered objectionable to women. The Ad is vulgar. (One similar complaint received against the same Ad)	<u>May 2006</u> Ad was not so indecent or vulgar, as to give rise to grave or widespread offence, having regard to the product promoted in the Ad.
6.	Tata Motors Ltd(*) (Tata 207 DI EX)  Rediffusion DY&R(*)  On various channels (3/2006)	Visuals - "a youngster driving the car recklessly on and off the road risking the lives of other road users, while his father is sleeping alongside in the passenger seat".	(Complaint received in 4/2006) This commercial is poisoning the minds of small children of impressionable age by showing that it is very adventurous to drive recklessly without any regard to the traffic rules and the safety of self and others on the road.	<u>May 2006</u> Actions portrayed in the visuals depicted in the TVC, were not dangerous, having regard to the settings shown. However, the Advertiser has been advised that the 'disclaimer' shown in the TVC, should be readable to the average viewers of the TVC, whilst being aired under normal circumstances.
7.	Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) (Kwality Walls Pleasure Up Ice cream)  McCann-Erickson(*)  NDTV (4/2006)	Visuals - "a boy getting tempted and licking his lips as he sees a girl licking the Walls ice cream, and another woman taking it as his sexual advances, and pulls him inside her cabin".	(Complaint received in 5/2006) The commercial has sexual overtones and has suggestive gestures.	<u>May 2006</u> Ad was not so sensuous or explicit, as to give rise to grave or widespread offence.

- |         |  |   |  |   |
|---------|--|---|--|---|
| 8.<br># | Nirulas Corner House Private Limited (“Nirula’s Maha Treat @ Rs.60 per head”)<br><br>Jabro Advertising & Marketing<br><br>Delhi Times, T.O.I.(*)<br>(4/2006) | Similarity in the Ads of the Complainant (Nirulas) and the Advertiser (Pizza Hut)   | (Complaint received in 4/2006)<br>Areas of similarity are – Pizza Hut logo unit reads, “Treat @ Rs.75 per head. Unbelievable!”. Nirula’s logo unit reads, “Maha Treat @ Rs.60 per head. Believe it!” The fonts used in the Logo unit are similar.<br>The treatment of the meal bundles is also similar. The entire look and feel of the “Nirula’s Maha Treat” Ad resembles the “Pizza Hut Treat” Ad. | June 2006<br>Advertiser’s Ad was not so similar to that of the Complainant’s Ad, as to suggest plagiarism.            |
| 9.      | Coca-Cola India Inc(*)<br>(Cricket Jiyo Thanda Piyo)<br><br>McCann Erickson India(*)<br><br>Sahara channel(*)<br>(3/2006)                                    | Animated Ad<br>Visuals - “due to some event in the cricket field, a man comes out of a closet in the bedroom of a couple. The apparent husband and this man are first shown uneasy to be present in the same bedroom, but then are shown hugging each other”. | (Complaint received in 3/2006)<br>This is highly offending and seen as glorification of extramarital relations.  | June 2006<br>Sequel under complaint, as depicted in the TVC in a humorous manner, was not considered to be offensive. |
| 10.     | Pepsi Foods Private Limited(*)<br>(Mirinda)<br><br>J. Walter Thompson(*)<br><br>Sahara One(*)<br>(4/2006)  | Visuals - “a film personality blowing the skirt of a model walking on the ramp, using his lips and the voice over saying, “mouth ka karo good use”.   | (Complaint received in 5/2006)<br>The commercial is in bad taste.<br><br><b>(2 similar complaints received against the same TVC).</b>  | June 2006<br>Visual under complaint, as depicted in the TVC, not considered, to be indecent or in bad taste.          |
| 11.     | Coca Cola India Inc(*)<br>(Coca Cola – Thande ka Tadka)<br><br>McCann Erickson(*)<br><br>On various channels<br>(4/2006)                                     | Visuals - “some boys passing comments on Aishwarya Rai and other girls, saying, “Kamar hai ya Coca Cola ki bottle”, and whistling at the girls”.  | (Complaint received in 5/2006)<br>This commercial is in bad taste. It is also encouraging eve teasing which is a serious social problem.<br><br><b>(1 similar complaint received against the same TVC).</b>  | June 2006<br>Ad not derogatory of women nor provocative.  |

- |     |   |   |  |  |
|-----|---|---|--|--|
| 12. | <p>The Mathrubhumi Printing &amp; Publishing Co Ltd(*)<br/>(The Mathrubhumi – 10 Lakh Celebration)</p> <p>Maitri Advertising</p> <p>The Hindu(*)<br/>(4/2006)</p> | <p>Ad states- “Mathrubhumi Daily is celebrating the victory of credibility by crossing the 1 million mark. With a growth of 58,134 new copies, Mathrubhumi now has a total circulation of 10,40,183 copies and a readership of 80.42 lakhs”.</p> <p>Source: ABC July-Dec’05, Jan-June’05. IRS’05 R2</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 5/2006)</p> <p>This is a deliberate attempt to mislead the readers by omitting facts. The latest round of IRS, i.e., IRS 2006 round I is available and according to that, Mathrubhumi had a drop of 3.95 lakhs readers, and their current readership is 76.47 lakhs.</p> | <p><u>June 2006</u></p> <p>Ad not misleading by omission.</p> <p>Advertiser assured that ‘IRS 2005 R2 readership’ will not be mentioned in their future Ads.</p> |
| 13. | <p>Sara Lee Apparel India Pvt Ltd(*)<br/>(Hanes Innerwear)</p> <p>McCann Erickson(*)</p> <p>ESPN<br/>(3/2006)</p>   | <p>Visual - “a bridegroom cuts the ‘itchy’ label of his innerwear”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 5/2006)</p> <p>Visual is portrayed in a vulgar manner.</p> <p>This indecent Ad is being aired during sports event which most families watch with their younger ones.</p>   | <p><u>June 2006</u></p> <p>Ad not indecent.</p>  |
| 14. | <p>Hindustan Lever Ltd(*)<br/>(Liril Soap)</p> <p>Lowe(*)</p> <p>NDTV 24x7<br/>(5/2006)</p>   | <p>Visuals - “a lady coming out of bathroom with water dripping from her body. A man, presumably her husband, sips dripping water from her body”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 5/2006)</p> <p>Ad is not in good taste.</p> <p>(One similar complaint received against the same TVC).</p>  | <p><u>June 2006</u></p> <p>Ad not indecent.</p>  |
| 15. | <p>GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare Ltd(*)<br/>(Chocolate Horlicks)</p> <p>J. Walter Thompson(*)</p> <p>TV Network channels<br/>(5/2006)</p>                   | <p>Visuals - “Kids robbing milk from the temple and then using it to have Horlicks”.</p>  | <p>(Complaint received in 6/2006)</p> <p>Visual depicted, is a heinous act violating the sanctity of the temple and its deity. This depiction is highly objectionable and can form wrong impression regarding robbery or stealing in young and impressionable minds.</p>                           | <p><u>August 2006</u></p> <p>Depiction of a humorous situation in the TVC, not objectionable.</p> <p><b><i>TVC discontinued.</i></b></p>                         |

- |     |  |   |   |   |
|-----|--|---|---|---|
| 16. | <p>Jet Airways (India) Pvt Ltd(*)<br/>(Superfare Returns)</p> <p>Network Advertising(*)</p> <p>The Times of India(*), Mumbai (7/2006)</p>  | <p>Ad headline states – “Superfare Returns”.</p> <p>Ad (in fine print) states - “*Special fares are applicable for a one-way journey. PSF (Rs.225) will be additional to the above fares. Fuel surcharge extra. Taxes as applicable. Conditions apply”.</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 7/2006)</p> <p>The use of the word “Returns” as a pun is misleading, making the consumer believe that these are return fares. Actually, the offer at most of the sectors is for single journey with an asterix saying, these are basic fares, and there are PSF, fuel charges (not quantified) which will be additional (in small print). Ad is misleading.</p>                                 | <p><u>August 2006</u></p> <p>Mention of “conditions apply” refers to a table which clarifies the fares applicable. Ad misleading.</p>   |
| 17. | <p>HDFC Bank Ltd</p> <p>Hoarding in Kolhapur (observed in 6/2006)</p>  | <p>Message on the Hoarding - “Loans for (1) Son’s Education (2) Daughter’s Marriage”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 6/2006)</p> <p>Ad makes discrimination among the girls and boys, and is objectionable.</p>  | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Message on the Hoarding, as mentioned in the complaint, not considered to be discriminatory.</p> <p><i>Advertiser confirmed that Hoarding is no longer on display, and also assured of appropriate modification of the Ad in future, to avoid any discrimination.</i></p> |
| 18. | <p>Motorola India Private Limited (Motorazr V3i Mobile)</p> <p>Ogilvy &amp; Mather(*)</p> <p>CNBC Awaaz(*) (4/2006)</p>  | <p>Visual - “A girl wearing her jeans in full view of the camera”.</p>  | <p>(Complaint received in 4/2006)</p> <p>Complainant objects to this visual depicted, which according to him, is offensive.</p>   | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Ad not offensive.</p>   |
| 19. | <p>Kitchen Appliances India Limited (Sansui Television – 1500 Watts Hardrock)</p> <p>Ambience Publicis(*)</p> <p>ETV(*), C channel, and other national channels (probably in 7/2006)</p> | <p>Visuals - “A boy listening to a TV in the background of ‘Statue of Liberty’, enjoying the music, and suddenly a glass tumbler breaks”.</p> <p>Claim - Sansui Hardrock - “1500 Watts PMPO”.</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 7/2006)</p> <p>Complainant has seen other products of the same brand with lower sound specifications which are emitting more sound, and hence doubts the claim that this Hardrock model is emitting 1500 Watts PMPO. Claim needs to be substantiated with proof, supporting technical information, with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.</p> | <p><u>September 2006</u></p> <p>Complaint not specific to enable any valid comparison of “PMPO” (Peak Measure Power Output).</p>  |

- |  |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>20. Cadbury India Limited(*)<br/>(Cadbury Chocolates)</p> <p>Various channels<br/>(8/2006)</p>                                  | <p>Visuals - "A sister is sulking because her brother has come to her on the 'Rakhi Day' without any gift. The sister ties the Rakhi tightly on her brother's wrist in rage. Then the brother gives the Cadbury chocolates as a gift to his sister which makes her happy."</p>  | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006, through a Government department)<br/>Visual depiction of the "sister tying a 'Rakhi' while she is full of rage", militates against the basic root of this very sacred Raksha Bandhan Parva. The commercial makes a mockery of this Parva by conveying the message that sisters only look out for gifts on this day.</p> | <p><u>September 2006</u><br/>TVC depicted a humorous situation which was not offensive.</p>   |
| <p>21. TTK-LIG Ltd<br/>(Durex Sensation Condoms)</p> <p>McCann Erickson India(*)</p> <p>Radio City,<br/>Bangalore<br/>(8/2006)</p> | <p>Voice over - "More the dots more the love. Touch her where she has not been touched before".</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)<br/>Ad sounds vulgar. The Ad does not convey the right message as why one should use condoms.</p>   | <p><u>September 2006</u><br/>Claims conveyed in the Ad were not vulgar, having regard to the product promoted.</p>  |
| <p>22. Wrigley India Private Limited<br/>(Orbit Chewing Gum)</p> <p>Grey Worldwide(*)</p> <p>ESPN<br/>(8/2006)</p>                 | <p>Visuals - "A girl wearing a low neck dress. Some boys are seated nearby eyeing her through a camera phone".</p>  | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)<br/>TVC is degrading women, and shows eve teasing.<br/>It also shows anti-social behaviour of boys with camera phone. This would encourage young boys to indulge in such activities in public.</p> <p>(3 similar complaints received against the same TVC).</p>   | <p><u>September 2006</u><br/>Ad not offensive.</p>  |
| <p>23. Tata Sky Limited(*)<br/>(Tata Sky Satellite Services)</p> <p>Star Plus(*)<br/>(9/2006)</p>                                  | <p>Visuals - "A sweeper on an empty street, sweeping up hordes of spectacles and TV equipment that Tata Sky TV has (presumably) rendered obsolete. Even as he sweeps, things thrown out of windows keep dropping by. The only thing that hits the sweeper is a light pair of spectacles". Then it shows "people from buildings throwing out similar equipment from their windows in a lackadaisical manner.</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 9/2006)<br/>Throwing things out of the window is one of the most dangerous of civic faults. This habit is highly dangerous and despicable.</p> <p>(One similar complaint received against the same TVC)</p>   | <p><u>September 2006</u><br/>TVC used gross exaggeration and humour, and was considered as creative licence to convey the idea of obsolescence.</p> <p><i>Advertiser informed that this Ad campaign was replaced in outdoor media with a new creative, and a new campaign was being launched on Television.</i></p> |

- |     |  |   |   |  |
|-----|--|---|---|--|
| 24. | <p>Viva Infomedia<br/>(Bangalore IT<br/>Companies<br/>Directory)</p> <p>Website<br/>(7/2006)</p>   | <p>Ad states - "Database of 3,400 Bangalore based IT companies", "Database contains: Company Name, Type, Address, Phone, Fax, Email, Website, Entity, Segment, Estd. Quality Certificate, Products, Total Employees, Membership, Specialization, Contact Person, Designation, etc".</p> | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)<br/>On viewing the contents of the CD, the Complainant was shocked to find that the list of Companies contained IT and Non-IT as well. Also, the contact persons specified against the Companies names were wrong. The list was not updated. Ad is misleading.</p>  | <p><u>October 2006</u><br/>Ad not misleading.</p>  |
| 25. | <p>The Institute of<br/>Computer<br/>Accountants<br/>(Industrial<br/>Accountant Plus)</p> <p>DNA, Mumbai<br/>(8/2006)</p>  | <p>Ad states - "Now I can marry off my sister".</p>   | <p>(Complaint received in 8/2006)<br/>According to the Complainant, in these days of women attaining education, social status and financial independence, the last thing we need is Ads that are 18<sup>th</sup> century.</p>   | <p><u>October 2006</u><br/>Ad not discriminatory or derogatory of women.</p>   |
| 26. | <p>Wipro Ltd.<br/>(Sanjeevani Lemon<br/>Honey and<br/>Sanjeevani Ginger<br/>Honey)</p> <p>Suo<br/>motu</p> <p>FCB-Ulka Advtg(*)</p> <p>Zee Marathi(*)<br/>(8/2006)</p> | <p>Visuals - Bottles of Sanjeevani Honey claiming that they are with a new taste viz. Lemon and Ginger. The labels show that they are Lemon Honey and Ginger Honey.</p>   | <p>(Complaint registered in 8/2006)<br/>In reality, they are with added flavours of lemon and ginger respectively.<br/>As per the PFA Act 1954 and Rules 1955 PART VIII - Prohibition And Regulations of Sales 45, the label and the Ad should clearly mention that it is a 'flavoured honey only'.<br/>Ad is misleading the consumers.</p> | <p><u>October 2006</u><br/>Visual depiction of the "spread of 'Lemon Honey' or 'Ginger Honey' on slices of bread, and the implied taste appeal", was not misleading, since it represented natural Honey with natural extracts of lemon or ginger.<br/>The label declaration - 'Lemon Honey' or 'Ginger Honey', 'Proprietary Ayurvedic Medicine' and carrying a manufacturing license number, places it outside the consideration of the PFA Act.</p> |

27.	<p>Castrol India Ltd(*) (Castrol Engine Oils)</p> <p>Ogilvy &amp; Mather(*)</p> <p>Headline News (9/2006)</p>	<p>Claim - "Castrol Engine Oil - not just an oil but liquid engineering".</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 9/2006)</p> <p>Major auto manufacturers evaluate oils from various oil majors and approve the products. Ad misleads users who do not know the technical aspects of oils, and they will be misled by such words as "liquid engineering".</p>	<p><u>October 2006</u></p> <p>Sign off line, "Castrol - It's liquid engineering", was globally trademarked, and was not misleading.</p>
28.	<p>Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) (Pepsodent Complete Germicheck)</p> <p>Lowe(*)</p> <p>Times of India(*) (9/2006)</p>	<p>Claims - "Fights Germs upto 12 Hours after brushing", "Removes Stains", "Maintains Healthy Gums", "Fights Tooth Decay", "Maintains Natural White Teeth", "Helps prevent Gum problems caused by Germs", "Gives Fresh Breath", "Removes Yellow Film (Plaque)", "Gives Stronger Teeth", "Helps protect teeth from acids formed by sweet food and germs".</p>	<p>(Complaint registered in 9/2006)</p> <p>Claims need to be substantiated with proof, supporting technical information with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.</p>	<p><u>October 2006</u></p> <p>Claims substantiated. Visual was not considered to be an inducement to over-indulgence, but seemed to present an appealing choice, as displayed in the shop window.</p>
		<p>Visual - Entire cakes in complete presentation</p>	<p>Appear to be an inducement to a young child to consume high fat sugar calorie foods which due to over-indulgence could result in obesity, diabetes and related conditions</p>	
29.	<p>Johnson &amp; Johnson Ltd(*) (Stayfree Dry Max Ultra Thins)</p> <p>McCann-Erickson(*)</p> <p>Sale Material (POSM)</p> <p>Zee TV(*) ETV Marathi(*) Sony(*) DD National (9/2006)</p>	<p>Claims - "It's the best", "tumhare best Ultra se much drier" (much drier than your best Ultra), "Aaj ke leading Ultra se teen guna zyada dryness" (gives 3 times dryness than today's leading Ultra) with supers - *In the center of the pad. *Under Standard Rewet Test Conditions. *Creative representation of the re-wet test.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 9/2006)</p> <p>The leading Ultra napkin being implied here is 'Whisper Ultra' as it is an undisputed category leader in this segment.</p> <p>As per "Product performance tests" carried out by an independent laboratory in September 2006, Whisper Ultra is significantly better than Stayfree Dry Max on dryness aspect.</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u></p> <p>Claims substantiated.</p>
		<p>Visual - "One Stayfree Dry Max pad miraculously absorbs all the fluid that spills from a half filled glass."</p>	<p>This exaggerated visual is bound to mislead consumers about absorbent capacity of the product. This, followed by further elaboration of pad surface being three times drier than the leading ultra product is a clear distortion of facts.</p>	

- |     |   |  |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|--|
| 30. | Rajasthan Patrika P. Ltd.(*)<br>(Promotion Contest)<br><br>Rajasthan Patrika(*)<br>(10/2006)                                  | Use of the ABC Certificate, and use of competition figures of `Dainik Bhaskar`, as a contest point of reference.   | (Complaint received in 10/2006)<br>Advertiser is not authorized to use the ABC Certificate as that is a copyright of Dainik Bhaskar. The Ad makes unjust use of another firm's name and reference. It is an unfair practice as the figures are not to be used for any comparison or reference.   | <u>November 2006</u><br>Complaint not valid, since the Media are well aware that the Code of the ABC permits of audit certified circulation figures to be quoted.  |
| 31. | Perfetti Van Melle India P. Ltd.<br>(Big Babol)<br><br>McCann-Erickson(*)<br><br>Pogo channel,<br>Cartoon Network<br>(9/2006) | Visuals - a mother sparrow accidentally hatching a tortoise's egg along with her own eggs. She rears the tortoise kid along with her own siblings. Seeing the bird's kids flying around, the tortoise kid takes a plunge into a deep gorge/valley thinking that perhaps he can fly too. When he starts falling in the gorge headlong that he pops a Big Babol bubble that surprisingly acts as a parachute and saves his life. | (Complaint received in 9/2006)<br>Ad is dangerous and misleading and can prompt some innocent kids to jump from a hill or building thinking that Big Babol's big bubble would save their life as it did in the case of baby tortoise.<br><br>(One similar complaint received against the same TVC)   | <u>November 2006</u><br>Visual depictions cited in the complaint were considered as advertising licence for gaining the attention and interest of the target group of children, and were not likely to lead to acts endangering lives. |
| 32. | Colgate Palmolive (India) Ltd.(*)<br>(Colgate Dental Cream)<br><br>Promotion messages on the pack                             | Claims - "Calcium + Minerals", "Colgate has the power of Calcium enriched with Minerals", "Its advanced Super Shakti formula is clinically proven to make your teeth stronger than ever before".<br><br>Visual - stream of calcium and minerals going into the tooth.  | (Complaint received in 10/2006)<br>There is no evidence to prove that calcium or minerals can be absorbed by the teeth making them stronger. The visual shown is not true and intended to deceive the consumer. Calcium Carbonate here only acts as a filler and gentle abrasive. There is no way the tooth can fix the calcium carbonate. The other minerals referred to, are not specified explicitly nor implicitly in the list of key ingredients. Probably no other minerals are added and if they are, they would not be absorbed/fixated by the tooth with the exception of Sodium Fluoride. The claims are misleading. | <u>November 2006</u><br>Claims were not false or misleading. Advertiser has provided adequate technical information in support of these claims.  |

<p>33. Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) (Close Up Toothpaste)</p> <p>Promotion message on the pack</p>	<p>Claim - "Vitamin Flouride System gives Stronger Teeth".</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) There is no evidence to prove that Vitamin E can be absorbed by the teeth making them stronger. Vitamin E has no role in brushing, only the Fluoride in the toothpaste reacts with the enamel strengthening it. Claim is misleading.</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u> Claim was in reference to the total action of the product, Vitamin Fluoride System, and not specific to any individual ingredient. Claim not false or misleading.</p>
<p>34. Bank of India Ogilvy &amp; Mather(*)</p> <p>Various channels (Sept-Oct 2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - a child going a long distance across open fields, all by himself, to the Bank without adult supervision.</p> <p>He crosses a railway track and a train passes by after a while.</p> <p>He then gets into a boat all by himself.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) A trend that could be adopted by other little children.</p> <p>This is a dangerous portrayal, sending wrong signals to small children telling them that crossing tracks by themselves is acceptable by adults.</p> <p>This could encourage children to take lifts and rides with strangers, which is dangerous. (One similar complaint received against the same TVC)</p>	<p><u>November 2006</u> Visuals were not indicative of risk taking actions by children in the related age group, whereas the follow through observance by the grand father of the boy and the friendliness of the adults known to the boy in the local settings, were indicative of care and concern rather than exposure to dangerous situations.</p>
<p>35. Tata Tea Ltd(*) (Tata Tea Gold)</p> <p>Lowe(*)</p> <p>National channels (Sept-Oct 2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - a senior Army officer has called his junior officers home to hand out postings. One of the officer refuses to have tea and is supposedly caught looking at the senior officer's wife. He is given a posting to Ladakh while others are given posting to Goa.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Postings are not given at the whims and fancy of senior officers. Ad shows the Indian army in a very bad light.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Ad did not show the Indian Army (as mentioned in the disclaimer in the TVC) or any private security personnel, in poor light. The situation portrayed was a light -hearted humorous one.</p>
<p>36. Wrigley India P. Ltd. (Orbit Chewing Gum)</p> <p>Grey Worldwide India(*)</p> <p>On various channels</p>	<p>Claims - "Helps keep teeth white", "Helps prevent tooth decay"</p> <p>Visuals - a Veterinarian feeding chewing gum to a cow and justifying the same in broken English, resulting in shiny white teeth of the cow.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Ad appears to be derogatory to Veterinarians and portraying them in very poor light.</p> <p>Advertiser has not carried out any scientific study on the effects of chewing gum on animals, and portraying such crude activities, can misguide the illiterate animal owners which can cause harm to their animals.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Claims are with reference to human subjects, for which substantiation has been provided by the Advertiser. Portrayal of a "self-proclaimed animal specialist", offering the product to a cow, was considered as an apparent instance of exaggerated humour, to generate viewer interest.</p>

37.	<p>Kinetic Engineering Ltd. (Kinetic Blaze)</p> <p>Grey Worldwide India(*)</p> <p>Zee TV(*), AXN(*), Sony(*), CNBC(*) (10/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - “a young boy driving and jumping along with `Kinetic Blaze’ from the top of a building just to impress the young girls”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 10/2006) Such stunts encourage young teenagers to go beyond the realistic point.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Ad showed a disclaimer and cautionary message which appeared on screen during the sequel depicting the pre-arranged stunt performance as part of an event conducted before a gathering of sports-minded young persons. Actions shown were not likely to manifest a disregard for safety or to encourage negligence.</p>
38.	<p>Wrigley India P. Ltd. (Orbit Chewing Gum)</p> <p>Grey Worldwide India(*)</p> <p>Star Plus(*) (10/2006)</p>	<p>Claims - Orbit Chewing Gum “helps keep your teeth white, prevents tooth decay”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Claims need to be substantiated with proof, supporting technical information, with details of tests/trials reports from an independent recognised testing institution.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Claims substantiated.</p>
39.	<p>Hidesign (Bags)</p> <p>Buzz magazine, Mumbai Mirror(*) (11/2006)</p>	<p>Visual – “a couple in intimacy, with a `Hidesign bag’ covering the upper part of the body”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Visual has no relation to the product advertised – Hidesign bag, and is simply erotic.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Visual depicted was not so objectionable as to give rise to grave or widespread offence.</p>
40.	<p>Entertainment Network India Ltd. (Mirchi Hotties)</p> <p>McCann-Erickson(*)</p> <p>The Hindu(*) (11/2006)</p>	<p>Visual - a part of the woman’s body</p> <p>Copy - “Mirchi Hotties. Catch the hottest actresses only on Radio Mirchi”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Copy read in conjunction with the visual depicted, appears to be obscene and vulgar, and has no relation to the product/service advertised.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Experte (absence of comments from the Advertiser). Ad not objectionable.</p>
41.	<p>Heinz India P. Ltd(*) (Complan)</p> <p>Leo Burnett(*)</p> <p>Hindustan Times(*) (10/2006)</p>	<p>Claim - “2 spoons of Complan ~ a glass of milk with 23 vital nutrients”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) In the absence of a notation in the Ad on the source supporting this claim, the advertiser is required to substantiate this claim, which appears to be gross exaggeration of facts.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Claim was factual and not an exaggeration.</p>

42. Suo motu	<p>Infomedia (Yellow Pages)</p> <p>Ambience Publicis Advtg(*)</p> <p>Hindustan Times(*) (11/2006)</p>	<p>Ad states - "Book your Ad before November 30<sup>th</sup> and save 15%".</p> <p>Visual resembles currency note with alteration.</p>	<p>(Complaint registered in 11/2006) Ad could be misleading to readers. Apparent defacing or disfiguring currency, may be considered violation of the Law, 'Disrespect to National Emblems' Etc.</p>	<p><u>December 2006</u> Comments provided in support of the visual depiction, has provided a justification for the depiction of 'mock currency' in the Ad, which takes the complaint outside the provision in the referred law.</p>
43	<p>Coca-Cola India(*) ("Coca-Cola is absolutely safe")</p> <p>Hoarding (put up at Noida Link Road, New Delhi)</p>	<p>Visual – "A well-known celebrity displaying a Coca-Cola bottle and assuring that it is 100% safe".</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Complaint refers to several other factors related to Coca Cola, such as source material process, and end product marketed to consumers. "Coca-Cola follows very hygienic production process and material", "Coca-Cola never says that the pesticide contents are within the permissible limit", "It is according to international standards".</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> Upheld. Chapter I.1. Claims, "100% safe", "it is according to International standards", and "all the ingredients meet regulations in India", not substantiated.</p>
			<p>A verification of the copy appearing on the hoarding, confirms that none of the above factors as mentioned in the complaint, is featured on the Hoarding. The Hoarding under complaint carries only one claim, "I have 100% confidence that Coca-Cola is absolutely safe".</p>	<p><u>April 2007</u> <u>Decision on Review</u> Not Upheld. CCC considered that Advertiser's recent submission that the Hoarding under complaint carries only one claim, "I have 100% confidence that Coca- Cola is absolutely safe", the other claims cited in the complaint being apparently the subjective allegations of the Complainant.</p>
				<p>Claim of "Coca Cola is absolutely safe", was substantiated. Earlier CCC decision Upholding the original complaint stands reversed.</p>

44.	<p>Sony Ericsson Mobile Communications (Sony Ericsson Z 550i Mobile)</p> <p>Sony Max(*), Sab TV (10/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals – “a young couple who meet multiple partners”</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 11/2006) Ad is unethical and glamorises / glorifies partners.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> Exparte (absence of comments from the Advertiser). Ad not objectionable.</p>
45.	<p>Hindustan Lever Ltd(*) (Pure-it)</p> <p>Lowe(*)</p> <p>Sun TV (11/2006)</p>	<p>Visuals - “two young boys discussing on drinking boiled/unboiled water. The boy drinks unboiled water (supposedly processed by Pure-it) conveying that it is safe and healthy”.</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 12/2006) Prevalence of water borne diseases is high. In a country where majority of the population lacks access to safe, potable water, this Ad can be misinterpreted.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> Ad was not likely to be misinterpreted, nor was it considered to be misleading.</p>
46.	<p>Citibank N.A.(*) (Citigold)</p> <p>Rediffusion DY&amp;R(*)</p> <p>On English News channels (probably 12/2006)</p>	<p>TVC talks about the “Citigold Relationship Manager and how he/she is passionate about the success of their respective clients.”</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 12/2006) According to the Complainant’s personal experience, this claim is misleading. He, being a Citigold customer, has had number of problems and has yet to see the face of a “Relationship Manager”, to help sort out his problems. Since his problems were not attended to, he has e-mailed the Country Manager of Citibank, and has received no response.</p>	<p><u>January 2007</u> The lapse, if any, on the part of the Advertiser in fulfilling the expectations of the Complainant in respect of the Customer service quality as promised in the Ad, could be an one-off case, which they are prepared to resolve provided the Complainant contacts their customer relations unit and specifies the issues which have not received the anticipated attention, in keeping with the promise set out in the Ad.</p>
47.	<p>Reckitt Benckiser (I) Ltd(*) # (Harpic Toilet Cleaner)</p> <p>J. Walter Thompson(*)</p>	<p>Claims - “Harpic cleaner completely cleans toilet by removing both stains and germs” (“Puri safai daag aur kitanu ki”).</p> <p>“Harpic cleans deep</p>	<p>(Complaint received in 12/2006) Comparison of TVC and Harpic pack claims are contradictory. TVC claims, “Kills all germs”, whereas on the pack “99.9% germ kill” is declared. The super in the TVC says, “apply</p>	<p><u>February 2007</u> Claims made in the TVC, and cited in the complaint, were substantiated, and were not misleading.</p>

	Sahara One(*), Sony TV(*), Star Plus(*) (9/2006)	inside and every corner of toilet, by killing all the germs” (“Andar tak jakar sare kitanu ko mare, kare kona kona saaf”).  TVC shows a visual of “a clean toilet”.	Harpic on the toilet bowl and leave it for 60 minutes”. This message is not reflected on the back of pack of any Harpic product, which only mentions “Leave for 20 minutes, brush and then flush”.  These claims are misleading, false and unsubstantiated.	
48.	GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Healthcare Ltd(*) (Boost)  Cartoon Network (12/2006)	Visuals – “Kid’s lip movements clearly suggest him using ‘swearing’ words”.	(Complaint received in 12/2006) Ad gives the message to Kids that in order to win in life, they should be aggressive by pushing, hitting and expressing their anger/aggression against their competitors. Such Ads should be clearly prohibited.	<u>February 2007</u> TVC not offensive.
49.	Kopran Pharmaceuticals Ltd (Smyle Cough Syrup)  Zee Marathi(*) (12/2006)	Visuals – “Lakshman has severe cough so Hanuman flies and brings Smyle Cough Syrup from some mountain and gives it to Ram who makes Lakshman well again”.	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Ad is showing Hindu Gods to sell its product, which is not acceptable. It is highly degrading and hurting the religious feelings of Hindus.  (One similar complaint received against the same TVC)	<u>February 2007</u> TVC not offensive.
50.	Hutchison Essar Ltd(*) (Hutch)  Ogilvy & Mather(*)  NDTV News, Star TV(*) (12/2006)	Visuals - “a Chinese Bulldog following a child everywhere, running behind him”.  (identified by the Advertiser as Indian Pug)	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Ads that use animals must take permission from the Animal Welfare Board of India. Hutch has not taken any such permission.	<u>February 2007</u> Advertiser had obtained permission from the Animal Welfare Board of India, prior to shooting the said TVC. Complaint was not valid.
51.	Zapak Digital Entertainment Ltd (Zapak.com)  Marching Ants Pvt Ltd  Nickelodeon channel (12/2006)	Visual - “two men touching themselves”  As per Advertiser’s comments and on verification of TVC, no such action was portrayed.	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Ad is disgusting as it is telecast in the middle of a children’s show.	<u>February 2007</u> TVC not offensive.

52.	India Today (India Today Grand Prize Draw)	Ad - Promotion mailer is a letter addressed by Prize Draw Manager of India Today, which states, "This is your chance to win Rs. 15,00,000/-.", "You have just reached the final stage of winning Rs. 15 lakh!", "I am pleased to inform you that you are one of the privileged few who have been chosen to participate in India Today's Grand Prize Draw and win Rs. 15,00,000 in cash."	(Complaint received in 1/2007) This Promotion mailer was sent to the Complainant in December 06 (vide India Today's e-mail ). Ad-promotion mailer trumpets about the grand prize suppressing the fact till last 6 <sup>th</sup> stage that one has to subscribe to be eligible to participate in the draw.	<u>February 2007</u> Offer of choice to participate in the prize draw, and to subscribe for the magazine, was referred to in the Ad (Rules & Regulations of the prize draw).
	Ad – promotional mailer		<b>(One similar complaint received against the same Ad – Promotion mailer)</b>	
53.	Amrutanjan Ltd (Amrutanjan Pain Balm)  Denstu Comm P. Ltd  Maa TV (1/2007)	Visuals - "children playing very noisy tunes which creates headache in their tutors, which is cured by Amrutanjan Pain Balm".  (As per Advertiser's comments and on verification of the TVC, no such unusually loud sound was evident)	(Complaint received in 1/2007) The audio of the violins playing is very disturbing and since the volume level of the Ads is not regulated by the channel, it is very discomfoting to watch the Ad.	<u>February 2007</u> TVC not objectionable.
54.	Neo Sports Broadcast Pvt Ltd(*) (Neo Sports)  Ogilvy & Mather(*)  MTV (1/2007)	Visuals - "a person is racist enough towards the West Indian couple to jump out of the boat. The person removes all his clothes and makes gestures, as if about to sexually assault the lady sitting in the boat".	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Racism towards the West Indians with indication of sexual assault is highly objectionable. TVC is highly offensive.	<u>February 2007</u> Ad not so offensive as to give rise to widespread offence.
			<b>(One similar complaint received against the same TVC)</b>	
55.	Dr. Shah's Jai Vimal Health Clinic # (Hair Loss – Dr. Shah's Advance Speciality Treatment)  Sandhyanand (10/2006)	Visuals – Logo, pilman on the logo, colour and the pattern of the Ad	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Is misleading to the consumer, since it appears similar to the Ad of "Dr. Batra's Positive Health Clinic".	<u>February 2007</u> Complaint was not valid since the Complainant's legal Suit filed against the Advertiser, on the same complaint, in the Court of V Additional District Judge, Pune, was disposed off in favour of the Advertiser. Complainant's Ad was not so similar to the Advertiser's Ad as to mislead the consumers.

		Claims - "Gives us total restoration of new hair growth by using naturally prepared homeopathic medicine preserved in advance blister packing".	Such a claim cannot be made as per The Drugs And Magic Remedies (Objectionable Advertisements) Act, 1954.	Complaint was not valid, since the complaint did not mention specific provisions of the said Act which the Ad has contravened.
56.	Tata Sky Ltd(*) (Tata Sky Satellite Television)  Rediffusion DY&R(*)  Hindustan Times(*) (12/2006) Dainik Jagran (1/2007) DNA (1/2007) and The Telegraph (1/2007)	Claims – "Full suite of 6 new-age interactive services", "7-day listing of all programmes on TV", "Watch cricket matches through multiple camera angles", "Control what your children watch", "Daily astrology predictions by Bejan Daruwalla's team", "Order latest ad-free movies on your TV", "Take your set-top-box anywhere in the country", "Professional installation directly by company engineers", "Replacement box in case of any problem", "24x7 help available in 11 languages"	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Claims and comparisons made in the Ad are blatantly wrong and incorrect and the potential consumers/general public is being misled by Tata Sky by presenting distorted facts and deliberately portraying the CAS service and cable STBs in poor light so as to wrongfully lure the customers to opt for DTH services of Tata Sky.	<u>February 2007</u> Claims made in the Ad and cited in the complaint, were not false or misleading or denigratory of a group of other products.
57.	Anand Rathi Securities Ltd (Stock Broking and Financial Services)  Meridian Comm  NDTV (1/2007)	Tag line/slogan - "Behind every successful investor"	(Complaint received in 1/2007) Advertiser needs to provide documentary evidence that all their investors and traders are successful, also a certified data from any credit rating agency to prove that none of the investor has lost his money. The tag line/slogan is misleading.	<u>February 2007</u> Tag line/slogan was considered to be an advertising licence and was not misleading.
58.	Parle Products P. Ltd(*) (Milano Biscuits)  Everest Brand Solutions(*)  Cartoon Network, Pogo channel (Dec 06 / Jan 07)	Visuals – "a woman enters the bakery at night, blindfolding a man (a well-known celebrity), and suggestively proposing to teach him how to bake, which begins with the sexual gameplay of grazing their bodies, hands, face in the	(Complaint received in 2/2007) Ad bombards images of sexual nature on to the innocent young, impressionable minds of the children.	<u>February 2007</u> Ad was not so offensive as to give rise to grave offence, or to give rise to moral harm to children.

introduction of the ingredients like flour, butter and chocolate which gets rubbed off onto the girls lips”.

59. Suo motu	Cadbury India Ltd(*) (Cadbury Fruity Gems)  Promotion message on the product pack	Visual depiction of `fruits` on the product pack	(Complaint registered in 2/2007) This could be misleading young children to believe that the Gems contain fruit portions or extracts, which may lead to their preference for `Fruity Gems` over `real fruits`.	<u>March 2007</u> Visual depiction of `fruits` on the pack, was not misleading.
60.	Perfetti Van Melle India Pvt Ltd (Center Fresh Chewing gum)  Ogilvy & Mather(*)  Neo Sports channel(*), Doordarshan (2/2007)	Visuals - “4 goats offloading a sack from a car and throwing it from a bridge. A shepherd catches them red handed; but when they are ready to dump him in another sack, he pretends to be dumb”.	(Complaint received in 3/2007) Ad clearly shows criminal intents.	<u>March 2007</u> TVC portrayed a humorous situation and was not indicative of criminal intents.
61. #	Henkel India Ltd(*) (Pril – Challenge Campaign)  National TV channels	Visuals - “a model apparently carries a pack in her hands denoting representing company, enters the house of a consumer and asserts that `Pril` completely cleans plate by removing both grease burn marks and smelling great, a close to freshness”.	(Complaint received in 2/2007) TVC is using general layout, slogan, sound effect based on the goodwill of original prior published TVC of `Vim`.	<u>March 2007</u> No advertising property was established in respect of features claimed or depicted in the Advertiser’s TVC under complaint as compared with the Complainant’s TVC.  <u>Suo motu complaint</u> The Advertiser in each case should substantiate their claim, of “one drop” of the dishwasher liquid could produce the cleaning effect as visually depicted and claimed in the voice over of each TVC under reference.

62. Ford India Private  
Ltd(\*)  
(Ford Fiesta)  
  
NDTV Profit channel  
(2/2007)
- Visuals - “a boy driving  
the car rashly through  
normal traffic roads, and  
looses control of the car  
and stops just before a  
flowing river”.
- (Complaint received in 3/2007)  
Such Ads should not be shown as  
immature young people get a  
wrong idea and then they tend to  
drive rashly.
- March 2007  
Actions shown in the  
TVC were not likely  
to induce rash driving  
under normal  
circumstances.