



On the other hand, the following should **not** be rejected:

4. My address is 0x81A1DE9646D11147ca8Fa71a44F61Bf43F91e494!

Should be accepted since in this case **the extra text on the sign does not cause any confusion AND there is no rule against displaying other text alongside the address.** It could be argued that this would make OCR (automated character recognition) on the address slightly more difficult but it is not Kleros' role to decide what use cases should be optimized for and how, but the contract writer's.

5. 0x81A1DE9646D11147ca8Fa71a44F61Bf43F91e494x

Should be accepted for the same reasons as 4.: **the extra 'x' does not cause any confusion AND there is no rule against displaying other text alongside the address.**

This last sign's text is of course the same as the one displayed in the case at hand. Since 'x' is not a hexadecimal character (0-9, a-f), **it cannot cause any confusion.**

In conclusion, this profile conforms to both the spirit *and* the letter of the rules, and there is therefore no basis for rejecting it. For the jury to do so would be for it to overstep its purpose, which is to enforce contracts as they are written, applying common sense when necessary, but no more than that.