

FINAL RULING

**International Timeshare Refund Action
(incorporated in the Seychelles) t/a**

TimeshareRelease.co.uk

PO Box 561

PMB G416

Gibraltar

Case number: A15-297465

Media: Internet (on own site)

Sector: Business

Agency:

Number of complaints : 1

Ad

A website www.timesharerelease.co.uk for a timeshare claims company featured a page titled "Feedback From People We Have Helped" under the section "Testimonials". The page contained text that stated "We've published a selection of past/recent feedback messages below and, since November 2014, we're delighted to have teamed up with FEEFO, the leading customer feedback organisation, to independently validate and manage our customer service feedback." The page featured a number of customer testimonials.

Issue

KwikChex Ltd, as part of the Timeshare Task Force initiative, challenged whether the testimonials by "Kevin & Sue W" and "Mrs Mary W" were genuine, because they understood that the same testimonials appeared on another website for another timeshare claims company under different names.

Response

International Timeshare Refund Action Ltd said that the testimonials were genuine and came from previous clients of theirs. They provided documentation associated with their work on behalf of these clients, which included addresses, further contact details for the client and copies of emails from them that included the wording used in the testimonials.

They said that the fact that the same testimonials has appeared on another site under different names did not mean that the ones that had appeared on theirs were not original and genuine.

Assessment

Not Upheld

The CAP Code requires that advertisers hold documentary evidence that testimonials are genuine and contact details for those giving them. We noted that the advertiser had provided the names, addresses and email addresses of the clients who gave the testimonials, as well as documents relating to the work the advertiser had done on their behalf, which included their names and addresses. We therefore considered that they held documentary evidence to support the testimonials and the contact details of the clients concerned. We also noted that the fact that the same text had appeared on another website did not, in itself, demonstrate that the testimonials on the advertiser's website were not genuine. We concluded that the ad was not misleading.

We investigated the ad under CAP Code (Edition 12) rules 3.1 (Misleading Advertising), 3.7 (Substantiation) and 3.45 (Endorsements and Testimonials) but did not find it in breach.

Action

No further action necessary.

CONFIDENTIAL