

1997 original texts	2007 Law 75 (Final Version)
<p>[Deletions highlighted in yellow]</p> <p>Law 75 footnote:</p> <p>Two examples may clarify responsibilities of the players (and the Director) after a misleading explanation has been given to the opponents.</p> <p>In both examples following, North has opened 1NT and South, who holds a weak hand with long diamonds, has bid 2•, intending to sign off; North explains, however, in answer to West's inquiry, that South's bid is strong and artificial, asking for major suits.</p> <p>In both examples, South, having heard North's explanation, knows that his own 2• bid has been misinterpreted. This knowledge is "unauthorised information" (see Law 16A), so South must be careful not to base subsequent actions on this information (if he does, the Director shall award an adjusted score). For instance, if North rebids two no trump, South has the unauthorised information that this bid merely denies a four-card holding in either major suit; but South's responsibility is to act as though North had made a strong game try opposite a weak response, showing maximum values.</p> <p>Example 1 – Mistaken Explanation</p> <p>The actual partnership agreement is that 2• is a natural signoff; the mistake was in North's explanation. This explanation is an infraction of Law, since East-West are entitled to an accurate description of the North-South agreement (when this infraction results in damage to</p>	<p>[Additions and changes highlighted in yellow]</p> <p>LAW 75 - MISTAKEN EXPLANATION OR MISTAKEN CALL</p> <p>After a misleading explanation has been given to opponents the responsibilities of the players (and the Director) are as illustrated by the consequences of this following example:</p> <p>North has opened 1NT and South, who holds a weak hand with long diamonds, has bid 2•, intending to sign off; North explains, however, in answer to West's inquiry, that South's bid is strong and artificial, asking for major suits.</p> <p>A. Mistake Causing Unauthorized Information</p> <p>Whether or not North's explanation is a correct statement of partnership agreement, South, having heard North's explanation, knows that his own 2• bid has been misinterpreted. This knowledge is "unauthorised information" (see Law 16A), so South must be careful to avoid taking any advantage from that unauthorized information (see Law 73C). (If he does, the Director shall award an adjusted score.) For instance, if North rebids two no trump, South has the unauthorised information that this bid merely denies a four-card holding in either major suit; but South's responsibility is to act as though North had made a strong game try opposite a weak response, showing maximum values.</p> <p>B. Mistaken Explanation</p> <p>The actual partnership agreement is that 2• is a natural signoff; the mistake was in North's explanation. This explanation is an infraction of Law, since East-West are entitled to an accurate description of the North-South agreement (when this infraction results in damage to</p>

East-West, the Director shall award an adjusted score). If North subsequently becomes aware of his mistake, he must immediately notify the Director. South must do nothing to correct the mistaken explanation while the auction continues; after the final pass, South, if he is to be declarer or dummy, should call the Director and must volunteer a correction of the explanation. If South becomes a defender, he calls the Director and corrects the explanation when play ends.

Example 2 – Mistaken **Bid**

The partnership agreement is as explained – 2• is strong and artificial; the mistake was in South's **bid**. Here there is no infraction of Law, since East-West did receive an accurate description of the North-South agreement; they have no claim to an accurate description of the North-South hands. (Regardless of damage, the Director shall allow the result to stand; but the Director is to presume Mistaken Explanation, rather than Mistaken **Bid**, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.) South must not correct North's explanation (or notify the Director) immediately, and he has no responsibility to do so subsequently.

East-West, the Director shall award an adjusted score). If North subsequently becomes aware of his mistake, he must immediately notify the Director. South must do nothing to correct the mistaken explanation while the auction continues; after the final pass, South, if he is to be declarer or dummy, should call the Director and must volunteer a correction of the explanation. If South becomes a defender, he calls the Director and corrects the explanation when play ends.

C. Mistaken **Call**

The partnership agreement is as explained – 2• is strong and artificial; the mistake was in South's **call**. Here there is no infraction of Law, since East-West did receive an accurate description of the North-South agreement; they have no claim to an accurate description of the North-South hands. (Regardless of damage, the Director shall allow the result to stand; but the Director is to presume Mistaken Explanation, rather than Mistaken **Call**, in the absence of evidence to the contrary.) South must not correct North's explanation (or notify the Director) immediately, and he has no responsibility to do so subsequently.