

1997 original texts	2007 proposed Law 75 (for publication)
<p data-bbox="197 323 853 352">[Proposed deletions highlighted in yellow]</p> <p data-bbox="188 646 443 675">Law 75 footnote:</p> <p data-bbox="188 700 1084 914">Two examples may clarify responsibilities of the players (and the Director) after a misleading explanation has been given to the opponents. 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 data-bbox="188 940 703 968">Example 1 – Mistaken Explanation</p> <p data-bbox="188 994 1084 1335">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 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</p>	<p data-bbox="1137 323 1989 352">[Proposed additions and changes highlighted in yellow]</p> <p data-bbox="1128 378 1628 406">LAW 75 - PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENTS</p> <p data-bbox="1128 432 1753 461">(All content transferred to other laws)</p> <p data-bbox="1128 486 2045 563">Reminder: when we decide what to do about this proposal we must remember that we have placed a cross-reference to Law 75 in Law 20F5.</p> <p data-bbox="1128 588 1545 617">Possible replacement with:</p> <p data-bbox="1128 643 1868 671">LAW 75 - MISTAKEN EXPLANATION OR MISTAKEN CALL</p> <p data-bbox="1128 697 2011 780">After a misleading explanation has been given to opponents the responsibilities of the players (and the Director) are as illustrated by the following examples:</p> <p data-bbox="1128 940 1500 968">A. Mistaken Explanation</p> <p data-bbox="1128 994 2029 1045"><i>[place here either the example from the 1997 footnote or a more up-to-date example if one is found.]</i></p>

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.

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.

B. Mistaken Bid

[place here either the example from the 1997 footnote or a more up-to-date example if one is found]