NOTE: Case OLG Celle, the Higher Regional Court Decision 8.6.2017, 13 U 53/17 re the use of \#ad

In this case, a well-known Influencer with more than 1 million followers published a post on Instagram for the drugstore chain Rossmann, for which he was paid:

The Post
"To all savers/ smart spenders: Note/ Listen up ONLY tomorrow there will be a 40\% discount on eye make-up in all branches of \#rossmann \& on the online shop! Have fun shopping! @mein_r. Eyes: RdeL Y. Mascara \& M.N. Y. The Rock Nudes Eye Shadow Palette. \#b. \#ad \#eyes \#shopping \#discount \#40\%"

- The Court ruled it infringed s. 5a (6) UWG; in this case, the use of \#ad was not sufficient to identify the commercial purpose of the post, stating that that must be apparent and recognisable at first glance / sight (auf den ersten Blick hervortreten - see Para 9 of the judgement (DE), so that there can be no doubt to the average member of the respective consumer group
- In the case above, commercial purpose is not apparent because \#ad is used at the end of the post, 2nd in a line of 6 hashtags, effectively hiding the \#ad. In addition, it was not clear from the context that it was advertising; there was no difference in presentation compared to noncommercial posts from other Rossman Influencers; emojis were used, which suggested private versus commercial use, impeding identification of the post's advertising nature 'at first glance'
- The Court left open the question as to whether the use of hashtags "\#ad", as formerly recommended by State Media Authorities ALM, is in principle suitable to identify as advertising a post on social media
- ALM, in its 'Answers to social media questions', now recommends commercial posts are labelled with \#advertising (\#werbung) or \#promotion (\#anzeige), and that they should not be placed at the end of the post or in a link, but at the front of the post. The use of identifiers like \#ad, \#sponsored by, or \#powered by are not recommended; see the final section of the document (EN) under Example 5

