



2007 SENATE BILL 305

November 2, 2007 – Introduced by LAW REVISION COMMITTEE. Referred to
Committee on Ethics Reform and Government Operations.

1 **AN ACT relating to:** renumbering and amending a provision of the statutes for
2 the purpose of eliminating ambiguities (Revisor's Correction Bill).

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

This revisor's correction bill is explained in the NOTES provided by the revisor
of statutes in the body of the bill. This bill is not intended to make any substantive
changes.

*The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do
enact as follows:*

3 **SECTION 1.** 895.01 (1) (intro.) and (a) to (n) of the statutes are renumbered
4 895.01 (1) (am) (intro.) and 1. to 14.

NOTE: See note following next SECTION.

5 **SECTION 2.** 895.01 (1) (o) of the statutes is renumbered 895.01 (1) (bm) and
6 amended to read:

7 895.01 (1) (bm) Causes of action for wrongful death, ~~which~~ shall survive the
8 death of the wrongdoer whether or not the death of the wrongdoer occurred before
9 or after the death of the injured person.

SENATE BILL 305**SECTION 2**

NOTE: 1999 Wis. Act 85, a revisor’s correction bill, renumbered s. 895.01 (1) into an introduction and 15 paragraphs for the purpose of subdividing a long provision into tabular form consistent with current style. Section 895.01 (1) (intro.) and (a) to (n), as renumbered, had originally been an introductory clause and a list of phrases introduced by that clause that together made up the first sentence of the subsection, while s. 895.01 (1) (o), as renumbered, had originally stood as a separate, second sentence. The comma and “which” that are stricken above were added to s. 895.01 (1) (o) to allow for proper sentence agreement with s. 895.01 (1) (intro.). The Wisconsin supreme court in the case of *Lornson v. Siddiqui*, 2007 WI 92, found that the addition of the comma and “which” rendered the provision ambiguous as to whether a wrongful death claim survived both the death of the wrongdoer and that of the claimant. The court concluded, however, that no substantive change was intended. Consistent with *Lornson* and to confirm that no substantive change was intended by Act 85, this bill removes the comma and the word “which” from s. 895.01 (1) (o) and renumbers s. 895.01 (1) (intro.) and (a) to (o) to organize the material contained in those provisions in the same way it had been organized in the two sentences that existed prior to Act 85.