

Note: Please note that this index is provided for guidance only and has no binding force. The International Court of Appeal is not bound by its previous decisions.

No.	Date	Appellant (ASN)	Competitor appealing	Sporting discipline	Contested Act(s)	Rules and issues examined	Decision of the Court
ICA-2021-03	16.11.2021	Direct appeal	Yohan Rossel	2021 FIA World Rally Championship (WRC3)	Decision No. 3 dated 12 September 2021 of the Stewards of the EKO Acropolis Rally	<p>Weight of the front subframe above de limits => disqualification</p> <p>Homologation and calibration of scales</p> <p>Applicable law</p> <p>[Article 10.3.3, 11.14.2.b) and 255 A of Appendix J of the 2021 International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>The Appellant's right to be heard commands that the latter be given the opportunity to challenge the course of the post-race scrutineering. The statements made by the Appellant's representatives at the hearing before the Stewards do not impact his right to raise submissions on the reliability of the measurements made during the post-race scrutineering.</p> <p>French law on measuring instruments has a scope of application specifically limited to the French territory and therefore does not apply to measurements made in another country.</p> <p>The Court is comfortably satisfied that the procedure applied during the post-event scrutineering was compliant with the requirements set by the FIA regulations and ensured that the results were accurate.</p> <p>Given the ICA's longstanding jurisprudence, the sanction must be disqualification, unless the Appellant can prove that the breach took place under exceptional circumstances (such as a clerical error or a mistake made in the homologation document), which was not the case.</p>

							<p>The lack of sporting advantage is not relevant when it comes to non-compliance with technical regulations.</p> <p>The appeal is rejected.</p>
ICA-2021-02	12.08.2021	Direct appeal	Aston Martin Cognizant Formula One Team	2021 FIA Formula One World Championship	Decision No. 59 dated 1st August 2021 of the stewards of the Hungarian Grand Prix	<p>Competitors must ensure that a 1.0 litre sample of fuel may be taken from the car at any time during the Event => disqualification</p> <p>[Article 6.2.2 of the 2021 F1 Technical Regulations]</p>	<p>The appeal was withdrawn</p> <p>The appeal is to be returned to Aston Martin, subject to a € 1,500 deduction to cover the costs of the proceedings</p>
ICA-2021-01	19.07.2021	Direct appeal	Mr Luca Corberi	2020 FIA Karting World Championship KZ	Decision IT-2021-01 of 19 April 2021 of the International Tribunal of the FIA	<p>Disciplinary matter: behavior during a competition (throwing spare parts on track towards others competitors / engaging into a brawl in parc fermé)</p> <p>Ne bis in idem principle</p> <p>Nulla poena sine previa lege principle</p> <p>[Article 2.3 of the FIA Status] [Article 5.2 (i) of the JDR] [Articles 12.1.1.c, 12.1.1.d, 12.1.1.h a&nd</p>	<p>The facts, which were of utmost gravity, were not contested</p> <p>The Court finds that the fact that two procedures are being conducted in parallel regarding the same facts, that is to say one before the ACI-Sport jurisdictions and one before the FIA courts, does not violate the principle “ne bis in idem” and this in view of the fact that the competences and attributions of the two jurisdictions are distinct</p> <p>According to French law, under which is the FIA, the nulla poena sine previa lege principle has not been violated in the present case</p> <p>In the present case, the Court decides that there is no reason to reduce the sanction, which is absolutely proportionate to the gravity of the breaches committed by the Appellant</p>

						12.1.1..i of the ISC] [Appendix B to the ISC, Code of Good Conduct] [Article 2 of the FIA Karting World Championship-KZ Sporting Regulations]	The Court confirms the suspension and ban for a period of 15 years during which the Appellant is not allowed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - to take part or exercise any role, directly or indirectly in any competition, event or championship organized directly or indirectly by the FIA or on its behalf, and the same be applicable in respect of competitions and preparatory testing and training organised by the ASNs - to exercise within the FIA any duties whatsoever as an executive officer, a member of a commission, or a president of a commission, or any duties of any nature whatsoever on behalf of the FIA and/or within a body of the FIA
ICA-2020-06	05.02.2021	Direct appeal	Messrs Pierre Furon et Maxime Furon-Castelain	2020 FIA Karting Academy Trophy	Decision CS/9/20 of the Corte Sportiva d'Appello of the Automobile Club d'Italia (ACI-Sport) confirming the decision No. 227 of 4 October 2020 taken by the Stewards of the Event of Lonato (Italy)	Behavior on track [Article 3.6.2.e of the 2020 FIA Code of conduct on Karting circuit]	Even though procedural irregularities can have under certain circumstances such an impact on the case that they can simply not be cured by the devolutive effect of the appeal, in the present case the alleged procedural irregularities (incomplete summons, violation of the right to be heard, wrong information on the appeal procedure, etc.) have been cured by the Appeal before the ICA. Although the national courts of appeal and, ultimately, the ICA can review the case de novo based on the devolutive effect of the appeals, the ICA considers that the national courts of appeal and, ultimately, the ICA must in principle exercise restraint when it comes to the pure assessment of a race incident and of the

							<p>sanction imposed on a competitor by the Stewards</p> <p>The Court concludes that it is, in the present case, actually in a better position to assess the incident than the Stewards, who should have taken additional evidentiary measures after the Race, such as confronting the two drivers, hearing the Judge of Fact or inspecting the two karts in order to get a more complete and precise understanding of the circumstances of the incident instead of simply relying on a video which was again incomplete.</p> <p>The Court thus concludes that this was a pure race incident between two competitors.</p> <p>The appeal is upheld and the disqualification of the appellant is quashed</p>
ICA-2020-05	22.12.2020	Direct appeal	Team MRF TYRES	2020 FIA European Rally Championship (ERC)	Decision No. 1 of 2 October 2020 taken by the Stewards of the Rally Fafe Montelongo counting towards the FIA European Rally Championship (ERC)	<p>Non-compliance of fuel with Regulations => disqualification</p> <p>Method for calculating the tolerance.</p> <p>[Article 62.1.4 of Appendix V1A to the 2020 FIA Regional Rally Sporting Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 252.9.1 of Appendix J to the International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>In applying the calculation method clearly described in the extract from the applicable standard, the ICA finds that the result of the test is just within the tolerance.</p> <p>The Appellant has thus not committed the infringement with which it is charged.</p> <p>The contested decision is quashed</p>

ICA-2020-04 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2020-01, ICA-2020-02 and ICA-2020-03)</i>	09.09.2020	Direct appeal	BWT Racing Point F1 Team and Scuderia Ferrari	2020 FIA Formula 1 Championship	Decision No. 40 dated 30 August 2020 of the stewards concerning Car number 18, driven by Lance Stroll and Car number 11, driven by Sergio Perez, of the BWT Racing Point F1 Team at the Belgian Grand Prix counting towards the 2020 FIA Formula One World Championship	Front and rear brake air ducts based on and near-identical to those that another team used during previous season. [Articles 2.1 and 3.2 and Appendix 6 of the 2020 F1 Sporting regulations]	The appeals were withdrawn The appeals/third-parties fees were returned with various deduction considered the timing of the withdrawal and the work already done by the ICA on the case
ICA-2020-03 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2020-01, ICA-2020-02 and ICA-2020-04)</i>		Direct appeal	Renault DP World F1 Team, BWT Racing Point F1 Team and Scuderia Ferrari		Decision No. 42 dated 16 August 2020 of the stewards concerning Car number 11, driven by Lance Stroll, and Car number 18, driven by Sergio Perez, of the BWT Racing Point F1 Team at the Spanish Grand Prix counting towards the 2020 FIA Formula One World Championship		
ICA-2020-02 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2020-01, ICA-2020-03 and ICA-2020-04)</i>		Direct appeal	Renault DP World F1 Team, BWT Racing Point F1 Team and Scuderia Ferrari		Decision No. 41 dated 9 August 2020 of the stewards concerning Car number 18, driven by Lance Stroll and Car number 27, driven by Niko Hulkenberg of the BWT Racing Point F1 Team at the 70th Anniversary Grand Prix counting		

					towards the 2020 FIA Formula One World Championship		
ICA-2020-01 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2020-02, ICA-2020-03 and ICA-2020-04)</i>		Direct appeal	Renault DP World F1 Team, BWT Racing Point F1 Team and Scuderia Ferrari		Decision No. 4 dated 7 August 2020 of the stewards concerning the Protests filed by Renault DP World F1 Team against Car number 11, driven by Sergio Perez and Car number 18, driven by Lance Stroll of the BWT Racing Point F1 Team at the Styrian Grand Prix and Hungarian Grand Prix and the Protest filed by Renault DP World F1 Team against Car number 18, driven by Lance Stroll of the BWT Racing Point F1 Team at the British Grand Prix counting towards the 2020 FIA Formula One World Championship		
ICA-2019-11	27.02.2020	Polski Związek Motorowy	Inter Europol Competition	2019 European Le Mans Series	Decision dated 28 November 2019 of the National Appeal Tribunal of the Fédération Française du Sport Automobile rejecting the appeal against Decision No. 19 of 27 October 2019 of the Stewards of the 4 hours of Portimão	Penalty of nine laps on Europol's Car No. 13 for failing to respect the minimum driving time of the Driver. Interpretation of Regulations: is a red flag period a driving time?	The FIA is governed by its own regulations, which are silent over the methods of interpretation of the texts. Having its headquarters in France, it is also subject to French law, as an association governed by the law of 1 July 1901. As the regulations in question are of a contractual nature, it is pertinent to refer to the methods of interpretation of contracts as set out in the

					counting towards the "European Le Mans Series 2019"	[Articles 10.10.1.5 b) and 10.10.11.2 of the Sporting Regulations of the "European Le Mans Series 2019"]	French Civil Code. It is pertinent, in a systemic approach, to seek in the Sporting Regulations the provisions which would allow it to give a sense that respects the coherence of the Sporting Regulations as a whole. The Court notes, referring to Article 1188 of the Civil Code, that "a reasonable person placed in the same situation" would clearly not be of the opinion that one can consider as "driving time" a race suspension period during which the cars are in a parc fermé situation and the drivers may leave their cars and remove their helmets and gloves but cannot be replaced. The appeal is rejected
ICA-2019-10 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-09)</i>	14.02.2020	Direct appeal	Vincenzo Sospiri Racing S.r.l.	2019 International GT Open	Decisions Nos. 5/2019 and 5/2019 bis of the "Appeal and Disciplinary Commission" of the Real Federación Española de Automovilismo (RFEdA) dated 5 November 2019 rejecting the appeals against Decisions Nos. 8 and 9 of the Stewards of the Race of Monza counting towards the 2019 International GT Open	Unsporting behavior on track in order to give sporting advantage to another car of the same team competing in another category. [Articles 16.1.f, 19.4 and 19.20 of Sporting Regulations] [Article 9.15.1 of the International Sporting Code and Articles 2b and 2e of Chapter IV of Appendix L to the ISC]	A driver's attitude during the Race leads to the liability of his team irrespective of any instruction the team might have given or not to the driver. In this case the Court is comfortably satisfied that instructions had been given by the team to its driver in order to influence the results of the Race. Given the impact of the breaches on the competition at stake and on the interests of motor sport generally, the Court decides that those breaches must be sanctioned with disqualification of the team from the Race, cumulated with a fine.
ICA-2019-09 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-10)</i>							

							<p>The contested decision is set aside.</p> <p>The team is disqualified and sanctioned with a €50,000 fine.</p>
ICA-2019-08	12.02.2020	Direct appeal	AF Corse	2019-2020 FIA World Endurance Championship (WEC)	<p>Decision No. 29 dated 10 November 2019, taken by the Stewards of the 2019 4 hours of Shanghai (China), counting towards the 2019-2020 FIA World Endurance Championship (WEC)</p>	<p>Non-compliance with Technical Regulations (ground height clearance).</p> <p>[Article 205 of the 2019 WEC Technical Regulations]</p>	<p>The Appellant having chosen and signed a waiver, any further evidence relating to new checks on the Car, carried out after the seals were removed, cannot be brought forward before the Court.</p> <p>According to the ICA's constant jurisprudence, the obligation imposed on competitors to ensure that their cars comply with the relevant technical regulations is an absolute and objective one, and a breach of that obligation does not depend upon a fault being established.</p> <p>When it comes to a breach of technical regulations, the Court's constant jurisprudence is that the breach of technical regulations must lead to disqualification, unless:</p> <p>(a) The competitor has not committed any fault, whether intentionally or through negligence, and</p> <p>(b) The non-compliance of the car is the result of exceptional circumstances (only under very limited criteria, notably a clerical error or a mistake on the official homologation documents).</p> <p>A "purely racing contact" which did not lead to any sanction against the Car's driver, could be an "exceptional circumstance" leading to a mitigation of the sanction imposed on the Appellant if such incident proves to be the cause of the breach reported to the Stewards.</p>

							<p>The Court is comfortably satisfied that this incident was indeed the cause of the breach found on the Car at the end of the Race.</p> <p>In this particular case the non-compliance of the Car is the result of exceptional circumstances, namely a normal racing incident which caused a breach that could not reasonably be detected by the Appellant.</p> <p>The contested decision is set aside.</p>
ICA-2019-07 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-06)</i>	03.10.2019	Direct appeal	Alfa Romeo F1 Team	2019 FIA Formula 1 Championship	Decisions Nos. 56 and 57 dated 28 July 2019, taken by the Stewards of the 2019 German Grand Prix held in Hockenheim, Germany, counting towards the 2019 FIA Formula One World Championship	<p>Non-compliance with Sporting Regulations which specify that “The Driver must drive the car alone and unaided.”</p> <p>10-second stop-and-go penalty, converted into a 30-second time penalty</p> <p>No-appealable character of some penalty.</p> <p>[Article 9 of the 2019 FIA Formula One Technical Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 17.2, 27.1 and 38.3 of the 2019 FIA Formula One Sporting Regulations]</p>	<p>A 10-second stop-and-go penalty converted into a 30-second time is not appealable.</p> <p>The Court confirms that, in any event, it is not bound by previous ICA decisions.</p> <p>The Court is bound by the amendments made by the regulator, namely the 2018 FIA General Assembly, to Article 12.2.4 ISC, which came into force on 1 January 2019 and clearly restrains the ICA’s jurisdiction on certain decisions imposing specific penalties.</p> <p>Articles 12.2.4 ISC and 17.2 of the 2019 F1 SR constitute a clear <i>lex specialis</i> limiting the ICA’s general competence with regard to disputes as foreseen under Article 9.1 JDR.</p> <p>Sporting regulations may be violated concurrently with technical regulations.</p> <p>The appeals are not admissible</p>
ICA-2019-06 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-07)</i>		Direct appeal	Alfa Romeo F1 Team				

						[Article 12.2.4 of the 2019 International Sporting Code]	
ICA-2019-05 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-03 and ICA-2019-04)</i>	24.09.2019	Direct appeal	Comtoyoun Team Audi Sport	2019 FIA World Touring Car Cup (WTCR)	Decision No. 17 dated 6 July 2019, taken by the Stewards of the Race of Portugal counting towards the 2019 FIA World Touring Car Cup (WTCR)	Non-compliance with the Balance of Performance Chart Boost Pressure Monitoring Method	It is the FIA's duty in the present case to prove that the Appellants breached the applicable regulations, and it is undisputed that the standard of proof applicable to this case requires that the Court be "comfortably satisfied" by the proof provided by the party which bears the burden of proof.
ICA-2019-04 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-03 and ICA-2019-05)</i>		Direct appeal	Leopard Racing Team Audi Sport		Decisions Nos. 18 and 39, dated 6 July 2019 and 7 July 2019 respectively, taken by the Stewards of the Race of Portugal counting towards the 2019 FIA World Touring Car Cup (WTCR)	[Article 3.2 of the 2019 WTCR Technical Regulations] [Article 30.1 and 30.2 of the 2019 WTCR Sporting Regulations] [Article 11.9 of the 2019 International Sporting Code]	The Decisions are not based on the breach of the Technical Regulations but on the breach of the Sporting Regulations, more precisely of the BoP Chart.
ICA-2019-03 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2019-04 and ICA-2019-05)</i>		Direct appeal	Leopard Racing Team Audi Sport				

ICA-2019-02	26.07.2019	Direct appeal	Prema Powerteam s.r.l.	2019 Formula Regional European Championship	Decision No. CS 2/19 of the Italian National Court of Appeal rejecting the appeal against Decision No. 3, dated 13 April 2019, of the Stewards of the Le Castellet	<p>Non-conformity with Technical regulations (erroneous mounting of the damper / a front damper had been mounted on the rear suspension of the car) => disqualification</p> <p>Proportionality of the sanction of disqualification</p> <p>Decision <i>ultra petita</i> of the National Court of Appeal</p> <p>[Article 3.1 of the Sporting regulations and Article 2.7.1 of the technical regulations of the 2019 Formula Regional European Championship]</p> <p>[Article 9.15 of the International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>Not only that a car must be compliant throughout the running of an event, but also a car which is found to be non-compliant before an event is simply not admitted to take part in the event => application of the relevant regulations can only lead to the disqualification of any car whose non-compliance is detected during or after an event</p> <p>In “exceptional circumstances”, the objective responsibility of a competitor for a case of non-compliance of its car can lead to a less severe sanction than disqualification => clerical errors or mistakes in the homologation documents can constitute “exceptional circumstances” => in such cases, only where there is a “lack of any intention or negligence on the part of the competitor” (see ICA 2013-03) can the imposition of a less severe sanction than disqualification be envisaged</p> <p>Recalling that Article 1.3.3 of the International Sporting Code expressly provides that “<i>it shall be no defence to claim that no performance advantage was obtained</i>”, the Court stresses that in order to admit the presence of exceptional circumstances and thus envisage a sanction other than disqualification, both of the following conditions must be met:</p> <p>(a) the competitor must not have committed any fault, whether intentionally or through negligence; and</p> <p>(b) the non-compliance of the car must be the result of a clerical error or a mistake in the official homologation documents, or be of a nature such that the impossibility for the</p>
-------------	------------	---------------	------------------------	---	--	---	--

							<p>competitor to detect it was absolute <u>and</u> proven.</p> <p>A national Court of Appeal in charge of a case consisting in the assessment of the consequences of a car's technical non-compliance with the relevant regulations, the NCA is free to judge the validity of the Stewards' Decision and is not limited in its powers by the conclusions of the federal Prosecutor</p> <p>The appeal is rejected</p>
ICA-2019-01	25.07.2019	Direct appeal	Pravia Autocompetición (Carrera-Villaron)	2019 FIA European Historic Sporting Rally Championship	Decision No. 1 dated 23 May 2019, taken by the Stewards of the Rally De Asturias Historic	<p>Non-presentation of the FIA Historical Technical Passport (HTP) => car not allowed to start</p> <p>[article 4.3.1 of Appendix K of the ISC]</p> <p>[Articles 4.3 and 10.1.2 of the Supplementary Regulations for the FIA European Historic Sporting Rally Championship 11 Rally de Asturias Histórico]</p>	<p>A competitor in an Historic Rally race must present a valid HTP to be allowed to start a race</p> <p>The original HTP could not be produced by the Appellant not simply because it was in the hands of the FIA but because of the Appellant's car still not being compliant with the applicable technical requirements</p> <p>The HTP is not just a formal requirement but is mandatory to control the eligibility and conformity of the car and ensure its correct classification in a competition</p> <p>The appeal is rejected</p>
ICA-2018-10	16.11.2018	Direct appeal	Haas	2018 FIA Formula 1 Championship	Decision No. 42 dated 2 September 2018, taken by the Stewards of the 2018 Italian Grand Prix held at Monza	<p>Non-compliance of the Car's reference plane => disqualification</p> <p>What does "each front</p>	<p>A competitor has to accept that if it does not comply with a Technical Directive, the evidence or the submissions it intends to bring as an alternative to those foreseen by that Technical Directive might not satisfy the Technical</p>

						<p>corner” mean under the Technical Regulations (methods of interpretation of regulations)</p> <p>Legal value of Technical directive</p> <p>Legal value of a “period of grace”</p> <p>[Article 2.4 & 3.7.1 (d) of the 2018 FIA Formula One Technical Regulations]</p> <p>[Articles 3.2 and 3.3 of the 2018 Formula One Sporting Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 11.9.1 of the ISC]</p> <p>[Article 10.9 par. 1 and 11.3 of the JDR]</p>	<p>Delegate, the Stewards or, in the present case, the Court.</p> <p>Meeting the requirements set by the applicable technical regulations is an absolute and objective test.</p> <p>The responsibility of the competitors to ensure the technical conformity of their car is absolute and objective. The Appellant does not put forward any extenuating and exceptional circumstances (like a clerical error or a mistake on the official homologation documents that could be considered as a good reason for the application of a less severe sanction than disqualification</p> <p>The appeal is rejected</p> <p>The Court:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - upheld the contested decision - rejects the request made by Renault (third-party) to deduct a further 10 points in relation to another breach committed at the occasion of another GP (lack of jurisdiction)
ICA-2018-09	29.08.2018	Direct appeal	Charouz Racing System	2018 FIA Formula 2 Championship	Decision No 29 dated 29 July 2018 of the Stewards of the Race of Budapest	<p>Failed to serve a time penalty at next pit stop => 3 place grid penalty in the driver’s next race</p> <p>[Art. 38.1 & 38.3(a) of the F2 Sporting Regulations]</p>	<p>The appeal was withdrawn</p> <p>The appeal fee was returned with a deduction of € 3,000 considered the timing of the withdrawal and the work already done by the ICA on the case</p>

ICA-2018-08 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2018-06 and ICA-2018-07)</i>	24.09.2018	Direct appeal	Münnich Motorsport	2018 FIA World Touring Car Cup (WTCR)	Decisions No. 30 of 14 July 2018 taken by the Stewards of the competition "Race of Slovakia"	<p>Non-compliance of the engine speed and boost pressure values with the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>Competency and procedure to establish and to modify the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>[Articles 3.8 & 80 of the 2018 WTCR Sportings Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 3.1 of the 2018 TCR regulations]</p>	<p>It is not only up to the competitors, but also to the Stewards, Scrutineers and any other official or competent committees of the FIA, to strictly meet the standards that apply to them.</p> <p>The decision of the Technical Committee, which adjusts the maximum boost pressure, was taken in an irregular manner, and must therefore be regarded as void, and could thus not form the basis of the contested Decisions through lack of applicability.</p> <p>While the maximum boost pressure had been adjusted by the TC, this was not the case for the maximum engine speed.</p> <p>Münnich's car was only in breach with maximum boost pressure.</p> <p>Decision No. 30 taken against Münnich's car must be quashed in the absence of legal foundation</p>
ICA-2018-07 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2018-06 and ICA-2018-08)</i>		Direct appeal	Boutsen Ginion Racing		Decisions No. 32 of 14 July 2018 taken by the Stewards of the competition "Race of Slovakia"	<p>Non-compliance of the engine speed and boost pressure values with the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>Competency and procedure to establish and to modify the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>[Articles 3.8 & 80 of the</p>	<p>It is not only up to the competitors, but also to the Stewards, Scrutineers and any other official or competent committees of the FIA, to strictly meet the standards that apply to them.</p> <p>The decision of the Technical Committee, which adjusts the maximum boost pressure, was taken in an irregular manner, and must therefore be regarded as void, and could thus not form the basis of the contested Decisions through lack of applicability.</p> <p>While the maximum boost pressure had been</p>

				<p>2018 WTCR Sportings Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 3.1 of the 2018 TCR regulations]</p> <p>[Article 1.1.1 of the International Sportig Code]</p> <p>[Preamble of the JDR]</p>	<p>adjusted by the TC, this was not the case for the maximum engine speed.</p> <p>BGR's car was in breach with maximum boost pressure but also with maximum engine speed.</p> <p>Decision No. 30 taken against BGR's car must be upheld</p> <p>The Court specifies that the disqualification imposed by the Stewards and confirmed by the Court refers to a qualifying session of the Competition and, in pursuance of the principle of sporting fairness, must lead to the disqualification of these same cars from Races 2 and 3 of the Competition</p>
ICA-2018-06 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2018-07 and ICA-2018-08)</i>	Direct appeal	Boutsen Ginion Racing	Decisions No. 31 of 14 July 2018 taken by the Stewards of the competition "Race of Slovakia"	<p>Non-compliance of the engine speed and boost pressure values with the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>Competency and procedure to establish and to modify the "Balance of Performance Chart"</p> <p>[Articles 3.8 & 80 of the 2018 WTCR Sportings Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 3.1 of the 2018 TCR regulations]</p>	<p>It is not only up to the competitors, but also to the Stewards, Scrutineers and any other official or competent committees of the FIA, to strictly meet the standards that apply to them.</p> <p>The decision of the Technical Committee, which adjusts the maximum boost pressure, was taken in an irregular manner, and must therefore be regarded as void, and could thus not form the basis of the contested Decisions through lack of applicability.</p> <p>While the maximum boost pressure had been adjusted by the TC, this was not the case for the maximum engine speed.</p> <p>BGR's car was in breach with maximum boost pressure but also with maximum engine speed.</p>

						<p>[Article 1.1.1 of the International Sportig Code]</p> <p>[Preamble of the JDR]</p>	<p>Decision No. 30 taken against BGR's car must be hupheld</p> <p>The Court specifies that the disqualification imposed by the Stewards and confirmed by the Court refers to a qualifying session of the Competition and, in pursuance of the principle of sporting fairness, must lead to the disqualification of these same cars from Races 2 and 3 of the Competition</p>
ICA-2018-05	12.07.2018	Direct appeal	Boccolacci	2018 International Series GP3	Decision No. 18 of the Stewards of the Le Castellet event	ICA jurisdiction	<p>The appeal was withdrawn</p> <p>The appeal fee was fully returned</p>
ICA-2018-04 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2018-03)</i>	18.09.2018	Direct appeal	TDS	2018-2019 FIA World Endurance Championship (WEC)	Decision No. 75 dated 18 June 2018 of the Stewards of the Meeting in Le Mans	<p>Non compliance of the the refuelling assemblies of the Appellants' cars</p> <p>Definition of a "fitting"</p> <p>[Appendix A of the Technical Regulations (2018) for LMP2]</p> <p>[Article 2.1.1 of the Technical Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 12.1.1.c of the International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>It is the duty of each Competitor to satisfy the Scrutineers and the Stewards of the Meeting that his car complies with these regulations in their entirety at all times during an event</p> <p>the Technical Regulations do not allow the competitors to add new elements to the refuelling system, apart from the necessary fittings which should hold those elements together</p> <p>It is not allowable to have a compliant part which is rendered redundant by another part</p> <p>It is appropriate to expect the competitors to make contact with the FIA or other regulating authority before any competition, in order to ensure that specific innovations comply with the applicable regulations</p> <p>It is the established precedent of the Court, that to ensure fairness and sporting equity, to</p>

						<p>impose the sanction of disqualification in situations of non compliance with Technical Regulations (except when the breach was caused by a clerical error or a mistake on the official homologation documents)</p> <p>The responsibility of the competitors to ensure technical conformity of their car is absolute and objective</p> <p>The appeal was rejected</p>
ICA-2018-03 <i>(Joined case with ICA-2018-04)</i>		Direct appeal	G-Drive		<p>Decision No. 74 dated 18 June 2018 of the Stewards of the Meeting in Le Mans</p> <p>Non compliance of the the refuelling assemblies of the Appellants' cars Definition of a "fitting"</p> <p>[Appendix A of the Technical Regulations (2018) for LMP2]</p> <p>[Article 2.1.1 of the Technical Regulations]</p> <p>[Article 12.1.1.c of the International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>It is the duty of each Competitor to satisfy the Scrutineers and the Stewards of the Meeting that his car complies with these regulations in their entirety at all times during an event</p> <p>the Technical Regulations do not allow the competitors to add new elements to the refuelling system, apart from the necessary fittings which should hold those elements together</p> <p>It is not allowable to have a compliant part which is rendered redundant by another part</p> <p>It is appropriate to expect the competitors to make contact with the FIA or other regulating authority before any competition, in order to ensure that specific innovations comply with the applicable regulations.</p> <p>It is the established precedent of the Court, that to ensure fairness and sporting equity, to impose the sanction of disqualification in situations of non compliance with Technical Regulations (except when the breach was</p>

							<p>caused by a clerical error or a mistake on the official homologation documents)</p> <p>The responsibility of the competitors to ensure technical conformity of their car is absolute and objective</p> <p>The appeal was rejected</p>
ICA-2018-02	19.09.2018	MSA	Lennox	2018 CIK-FIA European Junior Championship	Decision n° 68 taken by the Stewards on 16 June 2018 within the context of the competition of Ampfing (Germany)	<p>Disqualification of Qualifying Heat for having caused a collision</p> <p>Unduly benefit from the suspensive effect resulting from the appeal</p> <p>Sporting fairness</p> <p>[Art. 2.24 of the CIK-FIA General Prescriptions]</p> <p>[Art. 1.1.1 of the ISC]</p>	<p>The appeal was withdrawn by the Appellant.</p> <p>On request of the FIA, the ICA decided that the Driver be disqualified from the official classification of the final phase of the competition (it does not increase the penalty imposed by the Stewards with this decision, but simply draws the consequences of the withdrawal of the appeal which leads to the lifting of the suspensive effect of the appeal)</p>
ICA-2018-01	04.05.2018	Direct appeal	M-Sport Ford	2018 World Rally Championship	Decision No.7 dated 11 March 2018 of the Stewards of the Rally Guanajuato Mexico	<p>Driver hit the chicane during Power Stage = 10 second time penalty</p> <p>Binding value of "Guidelines"</p> <p>Equality of treatment</p> <p>Sporting advantage</p> <p>[2018 WRC Sporting</p>	<p>"Guidelines do not form part of the Regulations applicable to the Rally.</p> <p>The Stewards are in the best position with regards to their best knowledge of the relevant facts in a given time and a given place, which the Court cannot obviously have, to assess which particular incident committed by a particular rider has to be sanctioned or not.</p> <p>The purpose of the Decision is to sanction the Appellant's car No. 1 and not to compensate for</p>

						Regulations, art. 13.3.4 and art. 14.2] [FIA Rally Safety Security Guidelines]	any time gained during the incident
ICA-2017-02	27.09.2017	KNAF	Ekris Motorsport	2017 GT4 European Series Southern Cup	Decision of the Tribunal d'Appel National of the Fédération Française du Sport Automobile (FFSA) of 12 July 2017 which confirms decision n°36 of the College of Stewards of the GT4 European Series Southern Cup	Turbo pressure too high = Exclusion of the race [art. 4.4 of the GT4 European Series Regulations]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Appellant.
ICA-2017-01	31.07.2017	JAF	Toyota Gazoo Racing	2017 FIA World Endurance Championship	Stewards' decision No. 19 of the meeting of round 4 of the FIA WEC (6 hours of Nürburgring, 13-16 July 2017)	Cleaning the mirrors during refueling is authorized [art. 10.8.4 of the WEC Sporting Regulations]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Appellant.
ICA-2016-05	03.02.2017	SAMF	Yasir Seaidan	2016 FIA World Cup for Cross-Country Rallies	Decision No. 9 dated 15 December 2016 of the Stewards of the 2016 Morocco Cross-Country Rally (Morocco)	Rear rigid axle, more specifically the housing, did technically not conform to the applicable regulations = exclusion + € 6,000 fine	Subject to very specific cases (burden of proof being on the Appellant), possible procedural mistakes committed by the Stewards are cured by the devolutive effect of the appeal before the Court Lex generalis vs lex specialis
ICA-2016-04	16.09.2016	ACCUS	Dragon Racing	2015-2016 FIA Formula E Championship	Decisions Nos 5 and 10 dated 3 July 2016 of the Stewards of the Competition of London	Maximum energy allowance = drive-through penalty (converted in 50 seconds penalty) Emerging from the pit lane in a potentially dangerous manner (one-second penalty)	The Appellant failed to provide proof that the intention of appeal had been given within one hour. The penalties of driving through and stopping in pit lanes and certain other penalties, including the time penalties, cannot be subject to an appeal.

						<p>Content of the notification of appeal (reasons of the appeal) [Article 10.1.1 of the Judiciary and Disciplinary Rules] Decisions which cannot be subject to an appeal [Article 12.2.4 of the International Sporting Code] [Article 16.3 of the Formula E Championship Sporting Regulations]</p>	<p>The Court stressed that it was not bound by precedents, especially when it came to a legal issue which had been dealt with only once by the ICA.</p> <p>The FIA can freely decide how to organise its internal processes, which are clearly regulated by the ISC and the Regulations.</p> <p>The Court can only check whether the Stewards are competent to impose time penalties, which was indeed so in the present case The appeals were inadmissible</p>
ICA-2016-03	09.06.2016	ACI-CSAI	Honda Racing Team Jas	2016 FIA World Touring Car Championship (WTCC)	Decisions Nos 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 dated 26 May 2016 of the Stewards of the Race of Germany related to the Races of Hungary and Morocco	<p>Compliance of the flat bottom and the rear hatch [Article 263 of the International Sporting Code] Delegation of powers of the stewards [Article 11.9.2.s of the International Sporting Code]</p>	<p>Stewards may only delegate their authority to the Stewards of the subsequent event The Stewards having declared the cars compliant and authorised their start the competitors must be able to rely on the decisions issued by the Stewards in compliance with the principle of legal certainty The modification of a homologated part without explicit permission has to be considered in itself as a breach of the Regulations, even if the modification could have been homologated The performance advantage would never be taken into account to determine the sanction to be imposed (Article 1.3.3 of the ISC) The appeal was partially upheld</p>
ICA-2016-02	13.07.2016	JAF	Toyota Gazoo Racing	2016 World Endurance Championship (WEC)	Decision No. 55 dated 7 May 2016 of the Stewards of the 6 Hours of Spa-Francorchamps	<p>Minimum driving time => time penalty equal to the missing driving time. [Article 10.10.2 of the 2016 WEC Sporting</p>	<p>The notification of appeal did not include the “reasons for bringing the appeal” (Article 10.1.1 of the Judiciary and Disciplinary Rules); The wording of Article 10.1.1 did not provide any margin of appreciation as to whether the lack of any of the listed formal requirements in</p>

						Regulations] Content of the notification of appeal (reasons of the appeal) [Article 10.1.1 of the Judiciary and Disciplinary Rules	the Notification of the appeal was of crucial or clerical nature; The appeal was inadmissible.
ICA-2016-01	27.05.2016	DMSB	X-Raid	2016 Dakar	Decision dated 2 March 2016 of the National Court of Appeal of the Fédération Française du Sport Automobile (FFSA), having ruled on an appeal brought by X-raid Motorsport GmbH against Decision No. 2.14 taken by the Stewards of the Dakar 2016 on 12 January 2016	Refuelling during a Neutralisation section [Dakar 2016 Cars/Trucks Regulations]	The interpretation of the Dakar 2016 Cars/Trucks Regulations on whether refuelling was authorised or not “within the neutralisation of a selective section” is a key argument of this case; This interpretation must be made in compliance with the requirements set out in Articles 1156 et seq. of the French Code Civil; In the present case, it must be concluded that the “Neutralisation section” is a “road section” in which the Regulations authorise refuelling: The appeal must be rejected
ICA-2015-06	18.12.2016	FAMS	Tsunami	2015 Porsche Carrera Cup Italia	Decision No. 9/15 dated 5 November 2015 of the National Tribunal of Appeal of the Automobile Club d'Italia-Commissione Sportiva Automobilistica Italiana (ACI-CSAI) having ruled on an appeal lodged by Antonelli Motorsport against the decision No. 7 dated 17 October 2015 of the Stewards of the Mugello competition (Italy)	Misconduct during the race [Articles 144, 123 ter and 165 lit. A of the National Sporting Regulations]	Both the national and international courts of appeal must exercise restraint when it comes to the pure assessment of a race incident and of the sanction imposed on a competitor by the Stewards In the present case, it did not find decisive elements which would lead it to set aside both Decisions and to change the sanction imposed on the competitor The appeal must be rejected The Court recalled that according to the Regulations the parties must bear their own expenses or legal defense fees; The costs related to the Italian translation (at the request of the parties) are borne equally between them.

ICA-2015-05	18.12.2015	ACI-CSAI	Honda Racing Team Jas	2015 FIA World Touring Car Championship (WTCC)	Decision No. 12 dated 1 November 2015 of the Stewards of the Chang International Circuit (Thailand)	Non-compliance of ground clearance) => exclusion [Articles 5 and 6 of the WTCC Sporting Regulations] [Article 263-205, Appendix J and the International Sporting Code]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Appellant.
ICA-2015-04	18.12.2015	AKK Motorsport	Printsport	2015 FIA World Rally Championship (WRC3/WRC Junior)	Decision No. 12 dated 21 October 2015 of the Stewards of the Tour de Corse	Breach of the WRC Sporting Regulations and the International Sporting Code (non-compliance of the water pump) => 60-minute penalty	The appeal was withdrawn by the Appellant. The Court decided to reconstitute one half of the appeal deposit due to the withdrawal date and the progress that had been made in the proceedings.
ICA-2015-03	28.07.2015	ÖAMTC	Grasser GmbH	Blancpain GT International Series	Decision dated 20 May 2015 of the National Court of Appeal of the Royal Automobile Club of Belgium (RACB) taken on appeal against the decision No. 43 dated 12 April 2015 of the Stewards of the competition of Monza (Italy)	Delegation of power of Scrutineers [Article 11.14 of the 2015 International Sporting Code] Presence of an official representative of the competitor during scrutineering [Article 67 paragraph 3 of the GT3 Regulations]	Scrutineering was not carried out in the conditions set out in the Code, in that it was not carried out at the request of the Clerk of the Course and/or the Stewards The Court declared the appeal to be well-founded and quashed the decision of the RACB Court of Appeal as well as the Stewards' original decision
ICA-2015-02	16.07.2015	ACI-CSAI	Prema Powerteam Srl	Formula 3	Decision No. 45 dated 30 May 2015 of the Stewards of the Monza competition by which the Driver was sanctioned as a result of a collision that occurred during Race No. 2 of the Monza competition with	Power to lodge an appeal [Article 12.1.1 of the 2015 JDR] Consequences of the withdrawal of an appeal [Article 12.2 of the 2015 JDR]	The appellant's ASN alone is competent to notify the appeal on behalf of its licence-holder and it is not up to the Court to take into consideration the internal misunderstandings that may arise between an appellant and its ASN Despite the request to withdraw the appeal, the very particular circumstances of this case made

					the obligation to start from the pit lane for the next race the Driver will participate		it necessary to hold a hearing to examine whether or not the appeal, which allowed the appellant to benefit from the suspensive effect of the appeal, was of a frivolous nature The Court concluded that the appeal was inadmissible for not having included, within the appeal deadline, all the elements foreseen by Article 12.1.1 of the JDR The Court then referred to the general principle of economy of procedure and to the need to adopt a utilitarian approach to its mission to conclude that, in the particular circumstances of this case, it would be unwise not to resolve the fundamental question immediately. The Court decided to replace the Stewards' decision (starting from the back of the grid) with exclusion from the race in which the competitor took part normally
ICA-2015-01	5.06.2015		Mr Nasser Al Attiyah	World Cup for Cross Country Rallies	Decision n°3 dated 2 April 2015 of the Stewards under which the car driven by the Appellant had failed to meet the measurements required of its vertical suspension travel	Power to lodge an appeal [Article 12.1.1 of the 2015 JDR]	An appeal before the ICA must be notified by the ASN of the competitor, whereas in this case the appeal was lodged directly by a representative of the competitor There is nothing in the JDR or in the Code that authorises the Stewards, or holds out that the Stewards as having the right, to give instructions to the competitors with respect to the appeal procedure The appeal is inadmissible
ICA-2014-04.2	5.12.2014		Abu Dhabi Racing Team	Request for review	ICA-2014-04	Conditions of a request for reviewing a previous case [Article 18.3 of the 2014 JDR]	A request for review can be examined only if new evidence is discovered which was unknown at the outset of the case before the ICA The request is dismissed

ICA-2014-04	4.12.2014	QMMF	Nasser Al-Attayah Team	Middle East Rally Championship	Decision n°1 dated 29 November 2014 of the Stewards under which the Appellant's protest against Team Abu Dhabi Racing's car numbered 2 was rejected	De novo power of the Court [Article 17.9 2014 JDR] [Article 40.6.2 of the FIA Middle East Rally Championship Sporting Regulations which are part of the FIA Regional Rally Regulations (the "FIA RRR"), under part "V3" (FIA RRR Appendix V3)] [Article 18.2 2014 JDR]	<p>The Court has thus full authority to substitute the Stewards decision under appeal by its own decision in its full scope</p> <p>The Court finds that ensuring during a rally that all competitors follow the same itinerary is a specific sporting objective and that this objective is essential in order to ensure the fairness of the competition, besides the impact on the safety of the spectators.</p> <p>The Court stresses that according to article 18.2 JDR, the expenses or legal defence fees of the parties are not part of the costs awarded by the Court</p> <p>The contested decision is set aside</p>
ICA-2014-03	26.09.2014	RFEdA	Campos Racing	World Touring Car Championship	Decision n°5 dated 3 August 2014 of the Stewards of the Argentinian competition in Thermas de Rio Hondo	<p>Rights of defense [Article 12.3.4 of the 2014 ISC]</p> <p>De novo power of the Court [Article 17.9 2014 JDR]</p> <p>Non conformity of the ground clearance of the front splitter [Articles 5 and 6 of the FIA 2014 World Touring Car Championship Sporting Regulations / Article 263.902 of Appendix J of the 2014 ISC]</p>	<p>Even if there was a breach of rights of defense by the stewards, such breach has been cured by the devolutive effect of this appeal before the Court. The same applies to the allegedly insufficient grounds of the Decision</p> <p>The administrative typewriting error made by the Stewards in their Decision did not mislead the Appellant</p> <p>The Court emphasises that the obligation imposed on competitors to ensure that their cars comply with the relevant regulations is an absolute and objective one and that the breach of that obligation does not depend upon a fault being established</p> <p>The Court refers to previous decisions where the ICA stressed that exceptional circumstances in relation with technical irregularities are</p>

							admitted only under very limited criteria but in the present case the Court comes to the conclusion that the circumstances put forward by the Appellant do not meet the strict and clear criteria to constitute an exceptional circumstance The Court upholds the contested decision
ICA-2014-02	17.10.2014	HKAA	Team Craft Bamboo AMR	GT Asia Series	Decision handed down by the national court of appeal of the Japan Automobile Federation (JAF) having ruled on an appeal against Decision n°15 dated 1 June 2014 taken by the Stewards of the competition at Autopolis (Japan)	Jurisdiction of the different national appeal bodies [Article 14.1.4 and 14.3.1 of the 2014 ISC]	The Court considers that the devolutive effect of the appeals brought before it does not, in legal terms, allow it to examine in depth appeals that were inadmissible before the national court, given that they had been brought in the first instance before an incompetent court The Courts finds that the appeal initially brought before the court of appeal of the JAF was inadmissible. The contested Stewards' Decision must consequently be regarded as definitive, notwithstanding the incorrect formal execution of procedures that the Court notes in this case In view of the circumstances of the case, the Court decides that the costs must be shared equally between the Appellant and the JAF
ICA-2014-01	14.04.2014	ÖAMTC- OSK	Infiniti Red Bull Racing	F1	Decision dated 16th March 2014 of the Race Stewards of the 2014 Australian Grand Prix by which car No. 3 (Driver Daniel Ricciardo) was found to be not in compliance with the Technical Regulations and therefore excluded from the results of the race	Duty to comply with the regulations [Article 5.1.4 of the FIA 2014 Formula One Technical Regulations] Fuel flow meter sensor Duty to comply with the regulations at any time of the event [Article 2.7 TR] Legal value of the FIA	The Court finds that (i) the TD are not legally binding per se but (ii) if a competitor decides not to follow the TD, he has to accept the risk that the evidence he intends to bring as an alternative to that foreseen by the TD will not satisfy the Technical Delegate In the present case, the appellant failed to convince the Court that its car complied with Article 5.1.4 TR at all times during the event The Court confirms the contested decision

						technical directions	
ICA-2013-06	20.12.2013	ACI-CSAI	Tony Kart Racing Team	CIK-FIA KF Junior World Championship	Decision of the Stewards of the Meeting of the Bahrain event dated 23 November 2013 under which the Stewards decided to sanction Tony Kart Racing Team's driver Nikita Mazepin (RUS) with a 10-second time penalty	Violation of the sporting regulations [Article 2.14.B of the CIK General prescriptions / Article 2.c of the Code of Driving Conduct on Karting Circuits] To leave the track and to gain an advantage	The Court confirms the contested decision
ICA-2013-05	10.01.2014	ACI-CSAI	Romeo Ferraris srl	Superstars International Series	Decision of the Motor Sports Council National Court of the Motor Sports Association (MSA) dated 15 October 2013, whereby the two Romeo Ferraris srl's cars were excluded for the Donington Park event	Duty to comply with the regulations [Articles 13.3.2 b3 and 13.6 of the Technical Regulations of the International Series] Conformity of the car's bonnets and flat bottom Jurisdiction of the national tribunal [ISC, art. 182] Impossibility of increasing the sanction or disproportionate nature of the sanction [ISC, art. 189 / Article 17.9 JDR]	The Court: 1) Sets aside the Decision of the Motor Sports Council National Court of the Motor Sports Association (MSA) for lack of jurisdiction; 2) Confirms the contested decision n° 5 dated 27 September 2013 with respect to the finding that cars n° 3 and n° 15 of Romeo Ferraris Srl did not comply with the Technical Regulations
ICA-2013-04		ACCUS	Devlin De Francesco	Karting (Canadian Karting Championship)	Decision dated 29 September of the National Court of ASN Canada FIA, wherein it was decided to penalize Devlin De Francesco by a loss of one	Gain of position from contact [Standard karting penalties 1-15]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant

					position as a result of an appeal lodged against a decision taken by the Stewards of the final race of the 2013 Canadian Karting Championship		
ICA-2013-03	10.09.2013	RAF	G-Drive Racing	WEC	Decision n°36 of the Race Stewards of the Meeting in Le Mans counting towards the 2013 FIA World Endurance Championship (WEC), under which the Stewards decided to exclude G-Drive Racing's LMP2 car n°26 from the Le Mans 24 Hours event 2013	Duty to comply with the regulations [2013 WEC Regulations, art. 6 / 2013 International Sporting Code, art. 123] Severity of a sanction of exclusion for breaching the duty to comply	The responsibility of the competitors to ensure technical conformity of their car is absolute and objective This does not mean the responsibility is without any limits, as there could potentially occur very rare and exceptional situation, where highly exceptional circumstances may be a reason for application of a less severe sanction than exclusion (not in the present case) The Court confirmed the Contested Decision on the basis that no exceptional circumstances existed in this case
ICA-2013-02	28.02.2013	RACB	Marc VDS racing team (Belgian Racing s.a.)	Blancpain Endurance	Decision n°3/2012 of the National Appeal and Disciplinary Tribunal of the Spanish Royal Automobile Federation, under which the National Tribunal decided to dismiss the appeal filed by the Marc VDS racing team against Decision n°13 taken by the Stewards on 14 October 2012 concerning the Blancpain Endurance Racing Event held in Navarra (Spain) on	Power of the NCA and of the ICA to review facts and legal grounds not mentioned in the Protest Infringement to the refuelling procedure [2012, Blancpain Endurance Series Sporting Regulations, art. 91 & 92]	The Court: 1) declares void Decision n°3/2012 of the National Appeal and Disciplinary Court of the Spanish Royal Automobile Federation and Decision n°13 taken by the Stewards on 14 October 2012 2) imposes a fine of 10,000 euros on the Belgian Audi Club Team WRT

					13 and 14 October 2012 and counting towards the Blancpain Endurance Series 2012		
ICA-2013-01	15.02.2013	CBA	Sergio Santos Sette Câmara Filho	Karting IAME	Decision of the National Court of Appeal of the Fédération Française du Sport Automobile (FFSA) of 4 December 2012 to quash Decision N°41 taken by the Panel of Stewards of the Meeting on 21 October 2012 concerning the IAME International Final – Category X30 Junior event that took place at Saint-Laurent de Mure	Time limit to notify an appeal [JDR, art. 17.3] 30-day time limit for a national court of appeal to issue a decision [ISC, art. 182] Respect of adversarial principle and the rights of the defense by a national court of appeal-Notion of "party concerned" [ISC, art. 182, par. 3] Notion of "loss of control" [2012 General Prescriptions applicable to International Karting Events and CIK-FIA Championships, Cups and Trophies, art. 2.24]	The Court quashes the Contested Ruling returned by the FFSA National Court of Appeal on 4 December 2012 and confirms Decision n°41 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 21 October 2012
ICA-1/2012	20.11.2012	FFSA	Larbre Competition	WEC	Decision n° 25 of the Race Stewards of the meeting in São Paulo on 15 September 2012 – Event counting towards the 2012 FIA World Endurance Championship (WEC)	Exclusion from the Race for a ride height infringement [article 10.1.1 of the LM GTE Technical regulations for Grand Touring Car 2012]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

ICA-2/2011	27.10.2011	ACI-CSAI	Chiesa Corse s.a.s.	Karting KF1	Decision n°46 taken by the Stewards of the Meeting on 3 September 2011 concerning Race 2 of the event run at Genk (Belgium) counting towards the 2011 CIK-FIA KF1 World Karting Championship	Causing an incident [2011 CIK-FIA World Karting Championship Regulations, General Prescriptions, art. 2.24] Prohibited manoeuvres liable to hinder other drivers [Code of Driving Conduct on Karting Circuits, art. 2-(b)]	The Court confirms decision of the Panel of Stewards with regard to the responsibility of the incident but annuls the sanction of exclusion and substitutes it with a penalty of 10 sec.
ICA-1/2011	4.11.2011	ACCUS	Tanner Foust	Rallycross European Championship	Decision N°1 taken by the Stewards of the Meeting on 14 August 2011 against Mr Tanner Foust on the occasion of the event run at Valkenswaard (Netherlands) and counting towards the 2011 FIA European Championship for Rallycross Drivers – SuperCars Decision handed down by the Court of Appeal of the KNAC Nationale Autosport Federatie (KNAF) on 26 August 2011	Time-limit for paying national appeal fee [2011 International Sporting Code, Art. 182 and 183] Black flag; right of appeal [2011 International Sporting Code, Art. 152, fifth paragraph] Breach of overtaking rules [2011 International Sporting Code, Code of Driving Conduct on Circuits (art. 2-b), Chapter IV of Appendix L] Use of black flag [2011 International Sporting Code, art. 2.4.4.1-f) of Appendix H ; Article 16.6 of the Regulations of the 2011 FIA European Championship for	The Court annuls decision of KNAF National Court of Appeal and annuls decision of Panel of Stewards with regard to the exclusion of M. Tanner Foust.

						Rallycross Drivers – SuperCars]	
5/2010 4/2010	12.11.2010	MSA	Chevrolet World Touring Car Team	WTCC	Decisions No. 1 and 2 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 30 October 2010, confirming the eligibility of Cars No. 10 and No. 11, both of BMW Team RBM, to participate in the event run at Okayama (Japan) and counting towards the FIA WTCC 2010	Homologation of car models - derogation reserved to use by a disabled driver [2010 WTCC Sporting Regulations, App. 1(B)] Authorised gearboxes [2010 International Sporting Code, App. J, Art. 263-8.1] Calculation of compensation weights [WTCC Sporting Regulations, Art. 79]	The Court annulled the Contested Decisions and excluded cars No. 10 and 11 from the results of the Event. It ordered that, for the event held in Macau (China) on 21 November 2010, any compensation weight attributed to cars No. 10 and 11 in accordance with Article 79 of the WTCC Sporting Regulations, be calculated on the basis of their results during the three events preceding the Event run at Okayama.
3/2010	30.11.2010	RACB	Prospeed Competition	GT3	Decision No. 18 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 10 October 2010, excluding the car of Prospeed Competition from the race 6 run at Zolder (BE) and counting towards the FIA GT3 Championship 2010, because its rear braking discs were not in compliance with the car's homologation form	Responsibility of the competitor to ensure car is compliant [2010 International Sporting Code, App. J, Art. 257A-2.5]	The Court confirmed that it is the competitor's responsibility to produce a car that is in conformity. It confirmed the Contested Decision insofar as it held that car no. 61 did not comply with its homologation form, but substituted the exclusion imposed by the Decision with a financial penalty in the amount of 10,000 euros upon the Appellant, in light of the exceptional circumstances of the case.

2/2010	29.06.2010	ACAFA	-	-	Decision of the FIA General Assembly of 23 October 2009 relating to the affiliation of the Automobile Club de l'Ouest to the FIA	Time-limits for notifying an appeal to the ICA [2010 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 17]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the grounds that the Appellant did not formulate his appeal within seven days of the notification of the decision by the FIA General Assembly, as required by Article 17 of the ICA Rules of Procedure. The notification of the decision must be defined as the moment when the party concerned first becomes aware of it.
1/2010	18.05.2010	DMSB	Young Driver AMR	GT1	Decision No. 24 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 2 May 2010, excluding the car of Young Driver AMR from the Event run at Silverstone (UK) and counting towards the FIA GT1 Championship 2010, because its friction block failed to comply with the minimum thickness prescribed by Article 257.3.3.2.d.3 of Appendix J to the ISC	Minimum thickness of the friction block [2010 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 257-3.3.2.d.3] Responsibility of the competitor to ensure car is compliant [2010 GT1 World Championship Sporting Regulations, Art. 5]	The Court confirmed the Contested Decision on the basis that no exceptional circumstances existed in this case to justify a reduction of the penalty imposed.
26/2009	23.01.2010	RACB	Pekaracing NV	GT	Decision No. 18 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 5 December 2009, excluding Pekaracing NV from the results of the event held at Zolder (Belgium) and counting towards the FIA GT Championship 2009, due to non-compliance of the cylinder heads and cylinder block with the homologation form	Compliance of cylinder heads and cylinder block with homologation form [2009 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 258.5.2.1] Responsibility of the competitor to ensure car is compliant [2009 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art.	The Court confirmed the Contested Decision with respect to the finding that Pekaracing NV breached Article 258.5.2.1 of Appendix J, but annulled the sanction of exclusion and replaced it with a fine of €20,000.

						258.2.6]	
25/2009	21.10.2009	Referral by FIA President	–	–	–	Governance of FIA Mobility Region III “North America”	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
24/2009	3.12.2009	RACB	Pekaracing NV	GT	Decision No. 17 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 25 October 2009, which imposed a drive through penalty (converted into a 30-second time penalty) on competitor Vitaphone Racing Team at the event held at Zolder and counting towards the FIA GT Championship 2009 for breach of Article 104 of the GT Sporting Regulations concerning assistance in the pit lane	Drive-through penalty; right of appeal [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 152, fifth paragraph]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the basis that Article 152 ISC does not permit the Court to review the merits of drive-through penalties.
23/2009	5.11.2009	MSA [in name of BARC, Organiser of the Formula BMW Europe	–	Formula BMW Europe	Decision of the Spanish National Court of Appeal of 21 September 2009, setting aside the Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 20 August 2009, which had excluded competitor Mücke Motorsport from	Jurisdiction of the National Court of Appeal; Requirement to render a decision within 30 days [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 182]	The Court confirmed that the ISC determines jurisdiction by reference to the location at which the decision is taken, rather than the nationality of the Stewards or any other criteria. The Court further reversed the Decision of the Spanish National Court of Appeal, on the basis that the Stewards’ Decision of 20 August 2009 was validly made and that the Stewards had

		Series]			the meeting held in Valencia, imposed a fine of €1,000 for each of its three cars, and requested the matter to be considered by the Organising Committee	Substitution and competence of Stewards of the Meeting; nationality of the Stewards [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 141] Replacement of damaged parts by original parts [2009 Formula BMW Regulations, Art. 5.4.1] Replacement of springs [2009 Formula BMW Regulations, Art. 5.3.3]	competence, and confirmed that the Stewards' Decision was well-founded.
22/2009	5.11.2009	DMSB	Mücke Motorsport GmbH	Formula BMW Europe	Decision of 20 August 2009 by the Organising Committee of the 2009 Formula BMW Europe Series to exclude Mücke Motorsport GmbH (cars N° 15, 16, and 17) from the race run in Spa-Francorchamps (Belgium) on 28-30 August 2009 counting towards the 2009 Formula BMW Europe Series	Powers of organizers [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 25] Power to impose penalties ; compatibility with International Sporting Code [2009 Formula BMW Regulations, Art. 3.36.3] Power to impose suspension and exclusion penalties [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 159]	The Court dismisses the appeal, on the ground that the Organising Committee had the necessary authority to take the Contested Decision.

						<p>Replacement of damaged parts by original parts [2009 Formula BMW Regulations, Art. 5.4.1]</p> <p>Replacement of springs [2009 Formula BMW Regulations, Art. 5.3.3]</p>	
21/2009	14.10.2009	FFSA	Hexis Racing AMR	GT	<p>Decision of the German National Court of Appeal of 3 September 2009, which confirmed Decision N°17 of the Panel of Stewards excluding car N° 3 of Hexis Racing AMR from Race 2 of the event run at Oschersleben and counting for the 2009 FIA GT3 Championship, on account of non-conformity with the car's homologation form</p>	<p>Duty to comply with the regulations [2009 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 257A-2.5]</p> <p>Responsibility of the competitor to ensure car is compliant [2009 International Sporting Code, Art. 123]</p>	<p>The Court confirmed that it is the competitor's responsibility to produce a car that is in conformity. In the exceptional circumstances of the case, the Court quashed Contested Decision, annulled the exclusion imposed by Decision N°17 of the Panel of Stewards of 13 August 2009; and substituted it with a financial penalty in the amount of 10,000 euros upon the Appellant.</p>
20/2009	6.10. 2009	QMMF	Barwa Rally Team	Rally	<p>Decision N° 3 of the Panel of Stewards of 30 July 2009 to exclude car N° 50 of Barwa Rally Team from the Acropolis Rally of Greece 2009, on the grounds that its engine was not in conformity with its homologation form</p>	<p>Modifications to the crankshaft; "normal servicing" works to the car [2009 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 254]</p>	<p>The Court confirmed the Contested Decision, on the grounds that the practice of crankshaft "blue printing" is not authorized under Article 254 of Appendix J to the International Sporting Code. In light of the circumstances, the Court lightened the Appellant's sanction by replacing the penalty of exclusion from the final classification of the Event, with a drop to the last place.</p>

19/2009	17.09.2009	RACB	Prospeed Competition ASBL	GT	Decision No. 10 of the Panel of Stewards of 23 July 2009 excluding competitor Prospeed Competition from the event run in Oscherleben counting for the 2009 FIA GT Championship, on the grounds that its engine was not in conformity with its homologation form	Presence of the competitor during technical controls [General Prescriptions for Circuit events, Art. 10(F)(b)] Replacement or modifications to the cylinder block; replacement or machining of the sleeves [2009 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 257-257-2.11.1, -5.2, Art. 251-2.3.3]	The Court confirmed the Contested Decision, on the grounds that in the GT2 Championship all modifications are prohibited unless a strong case can be made that the modification is authorized by some exception, which was not the case here.
18/2009	17.08.2009	FFSA	ING Renault F1 Team	F1	Decision N°45 of the Panel of Stewards taken on 26 July 2009 at the Grand Prix of Hungary, suspending ING Renault team (driver F. Alonso) from the next event of the 2009 FIA Formula One World Championship for releasing car no. 7 from the pit stop without one of the retaining devices for the wheel-nuts being securely in position	Unsafe release of the car from the pit stop [2009 FIA Formula One Sporting Regulations, Art. 23.1.i and Art. 3.2] Severity of sanction imposed Right of an affected party to be heard by the ICA [2009 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 21]	The Court confirmed the appeal and overturned the Contested Decision. It further issued a reprimand and imposed a fine of \$50,000 upon the Appellant, in accordance with Article 153 of the International Sporting Code.

17/2009	16.07.2009	RFEA	SEAT SPORT	WTCC	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 24 June 2009 concerning the 2009 FIA World Touring Car Championship, rejecting a request by SEAT Sport to annul certain decisions by the TC Bureau which imposed upon SEAT a limit on the maximum supercharged air pressure	Procedure for notifying an appeal to the ICA ; Requirement to confirm intention to appeal by letter [2009 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 14]; Performance adjustments; technical waivers [2009 WTCC Regulations, Art. 83]; Competences the Permanent Bureau of the Touring Car Commission [2009 WTCC Regulations, Appendix 1, Art. 2]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible on the grounds that the appeal submitted by the Appellant did not meet the formal and mandatory technical requirements set out in the ICA Rules of Procedure for filing an appeal with the ICA.
14/2009 15/2009 16/2009	16.07.2009	DMSB	BMW Sauber F1 Team	F1	Decisions No. 29 to 31 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 4 April 2009 at the 2009 Grand Prix of Malaysia, confirming that the Brawn GP cars, AT&T Williams cars and Panasonic Toyota Racing cars comply with the appropriate 2009 Formula One Technical Regulations	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
5/2009 6/2009 7/2009 8/2009 9/2009 10/2009	15.04.2009	ÖAMTC FFSA	Red Bull Racing ING Renault F1	F1	Decisions No. 16 to 24 taken by the Panel of Stewards on 26 March 2009 at the 2009 Grand Prix of Australia, confirming that the Brawn GP cars, AT&T Williams cars and Panasonic Toyota	Obligation to comply with the regulations at all times during an event [2009 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.4] Duty to satisfy the FIA	The Court rejected the appeals and confirmed the contested decisions.

11/2009 12/2009 13/2009		CSAI	Scuderia Ferrari Marlboro		Racing cars comply with the appropriate 2009 Formula One Technical Regulations	<p>technical delegate and the stewards that the car is in compliance with the regulations [2009 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.7]</p> <p>Possibility to seek clarification from the FIA Technical Dept regarding new designs or systems [2009 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.4]</p> <p>Bodywork; Bodywork facing the ground [2009 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 3 and 3.12]</p>	
4/2009	21.04.2009	RFEA	SEAT Sport	WTCC	Decision N°12 by the Panel of Stewards of 22 March 2009 at the event run in Puebla (Mexico), imposing upon driver G. Tarquini a drive-through penalty and a drop of ten grid positions, both suspended for three events, for having caused a collision	<p>Causing a collision [2009 WTCC Sporting Regulations, Art. 42]</p> <p>Imposition of penalties on a driver involved in an incident; drop of grid positions; drive-through penalty [2009 WTCC Sporting Regulations, Art. 44]</p> <p>Requirement that the Stewards mention a competitor's right to</p>	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible in so far as the drive-through penalty is concerned, this penalty thus remaining unaltered. The Court declared the appeal admissible in so far as the drop of ten grid positions is concerned. It further annulled the part of the contested decision that imposed a drop of ten grid positions suspended for three events, on the grounds that Art. 44 of the WTCC Sporting Regulations allows the Stewards to impose only one of the three penalties foreseen by that Article and thus does not permit the Stewards to impose a drive-through penalty in addition to a grid position penalty.

						appeal	
3/2009	27.02.2009	CAA Referral by FIA President	Nicos Thomas	Pirelli Star Driver Award Rally	Decision of the Pirelli Star Driver (PSD) Working Group declaring Nick Georgiou the winner of the 2008 Middle East PSD	Dead heat; tie breaker regulation [2008 MERC Regulations, Art. 40; Pirelli Star Driver Award Conditions]	The Court invalidated the decision of the PSD Working Group and declared Nicos Thomas the winner of the 2008 Middle East PSD award, on the grounds that the "Pirelli Star Driver Award Conditions" constituted the applicable regulation for selecting the winner of the award.
2/2009	06.02.2009	MAI			Decision of the FIA General Assembly of 7 November 2008 to transfer the Sporting Power in India from the MAI to the FMSCI	Failure to timely circulate the agenda and accompanying report ahead of a General Assembly meeting [FIA Statutes, Art. 10]; Introduction of a frivolous appeal [ICA Rules of Procedure, Article 16]	ICA confirms the decision of the General Assembly of 7 November 2008 to transfer the Sporting Power in India from the MAI to the FMSI
1/2009	03.02.2009	DMSB	Aaron Burkart	European Rally Cup	Decision of the National Court of Appeal of CSAI on 5 November 2008		ICA invalidated the decision of the CSAI
5/2008	22.09.2008	MSA	Vodafone Mc Laren	F1	Decision N° 49 by the Panel of Stewards of 7 September 2008 at the 2008 Belgian Grand Prix imposing a 25-second penalty on McLaren driver L. Hamilton for cutting a chicane	Imposition of a 25- second time penalty at the end of the race <i>in lieu</i> of a drive-through penalty [2008 F1 Sporting Regulations, Art. 16.3, final paragraph]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the grounds that the penalty imposed by the Stewards must be considered a drive-through penalty, given that the nature of a penalty imposed under the last paragraph of Article 16.3 of the 2008 F1 Sporting Regulations is identical to the nature of the penalties under points a (drive through the pit lane without

							<p>stopping) and b (ten second stop at the pit) of that Article (the last paragraph of Article 16.3 merely sets out a specific mode of execution of penalties a and b).</p> <p>As a consequence, the Court considered that the contested penalty fell within the scope of Article 152, para. 5, of the 2008 International Sporting Code, which stipulates that drive-through penalties are not susceptible to appeal.</p>
4/2008	10.09.2008	RACB	Prospeed Competition	GT	Decision N° 24 by the Panel of Stewards of 4 July 2008 concerning the 2008 FIA GT Championship, race 3 run in Adria (Italy) on 20 June 2008, excluding cars n°60 and °61 of the competitor Prospeed Competition due to a failure to appropriately homologate the cars' suspension arms	Obligation to homologate (new) suspension elements prior to use in a race [2008 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 257-10.4 and 257-10.1.2.a]	<p>The Court upheld the contested decision on the grounds that Article 257-10.4 of Appendix J to the 2008 International Sporting Code, which states that “all new suspension elements must be homologated”, did not exempt the suspension arms in question from specific homologation.</p> <p>The Appellant failed to demonstrate that the specific parts used at the Race were homologated at the time of their actual use during the Race, as required by Article 257-10.4 and Article 257-10.1.2.a, which states that suspensions “must conform to the Homologation form”. The fact that they may have been subsequently homologated is not a defense to the obligation to race at all times using the required homologated parts.</p> <p>The Court also held that it is the responsibility of the competitor to observe the rules of the competition that it has entered.</p>
3/2008	29.07.2008	MAI	–	–	Decision of the WMSC of 25 June 2008 transferring the Sporting Power in	Recognition by the FIA of one organization per country to hold the Sporting Power [2008	The Court invalidated the contested decision, on the grounds that the Appellant's rights of defense were breached by the FIA's failure to give the MAI sufficient notice of the vote

					India from MAI to FMSCI	<p>FIA Statutes, Art. 4]</p> <p>Procedure in case of expulsion of a Member of the FIA [2008 FIA Statutes, Art. 27(d)]</p> <p>Authority of the WMSC to settle a question forwarded by the General Assembly [2008 FIA Statutes, Art. 16]</p> <p>Authority of the General Assembly to admit or expel Members to or from the FIA [2008 FIA Statutes, Art. 9(10)]</p>	<p>leading to the contested decision and to allow it an opportunity to present its arguments. The Court moreover found that the mandate given by the General Assembly to the WMSC in this matter could not be regarded as a mandate for the WMSC to decide on the removal of the Sporting Power in India from MAI.</p>
2/2008	12.06.2008	RACB	Prospeed Competition	GT	Decision N° 28 by the Panel of the Stewards of 18 May 2008 at the event run at Monza (Italy) on 18 May 2008, counting towards the 2008 FIA GT Championship, excluding car n°61 from the race	<p>Provisions governing the refueling procedure and the number of persons allowed to be present in the pit during the servicing of a car [2008 FIA GT Championship Regulations, Art. 104 and 109]</p>	<p>The Court invalidated the contested decision on the grounds that it was based on facts the material accuracy of which was not proved. The Court further ordered to reinstate car n°61 in its proper place in the classification.</p>
1/2008	31.01.2008	ACI CSAI	GPC Sport	GT	Decision of the Spanish National Court of Appeal of 28 November 2007 concerning the event run on 27-28 October 2007 in Jerez (Spain), counting	<p>Overtaking in a yellow flag zone</p>	<p>The Court declared the appeal ill-founded on the grounds that the appellant did not supply any proof regarding the different grounds of complaint put forward.</p>

					towards the 2007 Spanish GT Championship		
13/2007	13.12.2007	Referral by FIA President	–	F1	–	Prejudicial statements by the team PK Racing against the FIA and the ICA [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 58, 151(c) and 153]	The Court imposed a fine of € 20,000 on the team PK Racing. The Court further ordered a license suspension on the drivers A. Kumpen and B. Longin, that sanction being suspended for one year and becoming become effective if they should commit a similar offence calling into question the integrity of the FIA or the independence of the ICA or its members within a period of two years.
12/2007	13.12.2007	ACCR	Buggyra Int'l Racing System	Truck Racing	Decision of the Spanish National Court of Appeal of 22 October 2007 concerning the event run at Jarama (Spain) on 7 October 2007 and counting towards the 2007 FIA European Truck Racing Championship, overturning a decision by the Panel of Stewards to impose a ten-second time penalty	Responsibility for collision of two competitors [2007 FIA European Truck Racing Championship Regulations, Art. 9.6 and 12] Power of the Stewards to impose a ten-second time penalty [2007 FIA European Truck Racing Championship Regulations, Art. 9.7.1; 2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 141 and 153]	The Court invalidated the contested decision and confirmed the ten-second penalty decided by the Panel of Stewards, in pursuance not of Article 12 of the European Truck Racing Championship regulations, but of Articles 9.6 and 9.7.1 of the same Championship regulations and Articles 141 and 153 of the International Sporting Code.
11/2007	21.11.2007	ACI CSAI	Scuderia Island Motorsport	Rally	Decision N°2 of the Panel of the Stewards of 7 October 2007 at the 32nd ELPA Rally run in Greece on 5-7 October 2007 and	Duty of scrutineers to check the mechanical components of the cars; communication by the Stewards to the	The Court confirmed the contested decision on the grounds that the Stewards was regular and did not violate the rights of defense of the Appellant.

					counting towards the 2007 FIA European Rally Championship	contestant regarding same [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 145]	
10/2007	15.11.2007	MSA	Vodafone McLaren Mercedes	F1	Decision N° 41 of the Panel of Stewards of 21 October 2007 at the 2007 Grand Prix of Brazil, not to impose a penalty given the existing doubts as to the existence of an infringement of the permitted fuel temperature, and counting towards the 2007 FIA Formula One World Championship	<p>Meaning of “parties concerned” by a Stewards’ decision [2007 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 1]</p> <p>Right of a third party to appeal the classification or non-compliance of a vehicle [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 174d]</p> <p>Permitted fuel temperature [2007 FIA F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 6.5.4]</p>	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on account of the lack of direct interest of the Appellant in the contested decision. The Court held that the only manner for the Appellant to obtain a modification of the race classification, would have been to lodge a protest against the classification at the latest thirty minutes after the posting of that classification.
9/2007	08.11.2007	ACI CSAI	Prema Power Team	Formula Renault 2000 Eurocup	Decision of the Belgian National Court of Appeal of 16 May 2007 concerning the “Formula Renault 2000 – Eurocup” event run on 21-22 April 2007 at Zolder (B)	Time-limits for notifying an appeal to the ICA [2007 ICA Rules of Procedure, Article 17]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the grounds that the Appellant did not formulate his appeal within seven days of the notification of the decision of the Belgian National Court of Appeal, as required by Article 17 of the ICA Rules of Procedure.
8/2007	07.11.2007	RFEA	RSV Motorsport	GT	Decision of the French National Court of Appeal of 28 August 2007, reducing the penalty imposed by the Panel of Stewards on 15 July 2007 on the competitor	Procedure for notifying an appeal to the ICA [2007 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 14]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the grounds that the Appellant failed to confirm his intention to appeal by written letter to the ICA, as required by Article 14 of the ICA Rules of Procedure.

					Autorlando Sport at the event run at Magny-Cours (F), counting for the 2007 International Open GT Championship, from a one-lap penalty to a 40-second time penalty		
7/2007	12.10.2007	ACI CSAI	Scuderia Toro Rosso	F1	Decision N° 41 of the Panel of the Stewards of 30 September 2007 at the Japanese Grand Prix, imposing a 25-second penalty on Toro Rosso driver V. Liuzzi for ignoring a yellow flag and counting towards the 2007 FIA Formula One World Championship	Imposition of a 25-second time penalty after the race [2007 F1 Sporting Regulations, Art. 16.3, final paragraph] Purpose of cockpit lights and precedence of flag signals ; Yellow flag [2007 FIA F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 8.4]	The Court dismissed the appeal and confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the absence of a green flag could not give the Appellant reason to think that he was no longer bound by the obligations of the yellow flag and could therefore overtake.
6/2007	12.10.2007	MSA	Vodaphone McLaren Mercedes	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 26 July 2007 finding Vodafone McLaren Mercedes to be in possession of confidential Ferrari information in breach of the International Sporting Code	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
5/2007	12.10.2007	MSA	Vodaphone McLaren Mercedes	F1	Decision N°26 of the Panel of the Stewards of 4 August 2007 at the 2007 Hungarian Grand Prix run, depriving the Appellant of any points scored during the next race due to non-	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

					respect of the timing during the pit stop, and counting towards the 2007 FIA Formula One World Championship		
4/2007	24.07.2007	RACB	PK Racing	GT	Decision N° 7 of the Panel of Stewards of 8 July 2007, at the event run at Oschersleben and counting towards the 2007 FIA GT Championship imposing a penalty on PK Racing for exceeding the maximum fuel capacity allowed onboard the vehicle	<p>Sovereign right of the ICA to rule on the admissibility of an appeal before it</p> <p>Time-limit for payment of the appeal fee [2007 ICA Rules of Procedure, Art. 15]</p> <p>Fuel capacity; Measurement of fuel carried on board [2007 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 258-6.5.1]</p>	The Court partially invalidated the contested decision in so far as the latter refused to accept the intention to appeal formulated by the Appellant, on the grounds that the Stewards of the Meeting do not have the ability or the right to substitute for the ICA, which is in this respect the only competent judge to give a ruling on the admissibility of an appeal. The Court, however, confirmed the contested decision in so far as it imposed a penalty on the Appellant for exceeding the maximum fuel capacity allowed under Article 258.6.5.1 of Appendix J to the International Sporting Code, on the grounds that the Applicant did not comply with the restrictions set out in this Article.
3/2007	23.07.2007	ACI CSAI	Seat Sport Italia	WTCC	Decision N° 8 of the Panel of Stewards of on 7 July 2007, at the event run at Porto (P) and counting towards the 2007 FIA World Touring Car Championship, imposing a fine of €1,500 and a drop of 10 grid positions in the first race of the next event for ignoring a yellow flag, ordering the cancellation of all qualifying times and a drop of 10 grid positions	<p>Ignoring a yellow flag [2007 International Sporting Code, Appendix H, Art. 4.1.2.b]</p> <p>Penalty for abusive behavior [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 151.c]</p> <p>Responsibility for an incident [2007 FIA</p>	The Court partially confirmed the contested decision in so far as it imposed a penalty on the Appellant for failure to respect the yellow flag. The Court, however, invalidated the contested decision in so far as it held the Appellant responsible for the incident that occurred during the race, on the grounds that the responsibility was not solely attributable to the Appellant. The Court moreover invalidated the €3,000 fine for abusive behavior imposed by the contested decision on the Appellant on the grounds that this penalty appeared insufficient, and increased the fine to €6,000.

					in the second race of the next event, and imposing a fine of €3,000 for use of aggressive language and behavior towards another competitor	WTCC Regulations, Art. 42]	
2/2007	30.01.2007	UAMK CR	–	–	Alleged <i>de facto</i> delegation by The Autoclub of the Czech Republic (ACCR) of its Sporting Power to the commercial company ABA without consent of the FIA	Holding of the Sporting Power [2007 FIA Statutes, Art. 4] Delegation of the Sporting Power [2007 FIA Statutes, Art. 5]	The Court confirmed that it had jurisdiction in the matter. It rejected the claims of the Appellant on the grounds that the latter did not adduce proof of a transfer of Sporting Power from ACCR to ABA.
1/2007	11.01.2007	Referral by FIA President	CRG S.p.A.	CIK-FIA	Decision of the Belgian National Court of Appeal of 24 October 2006, quashing Decision N° 21 of the Panel of Stewards of 3 September 2006, imposing a ten-second penalty on competitor CRG S.p.A., at the event at Mariembourg (BE) and counting towards the 2006 CIK-FIA Karting Super ICC World Cup	Standing start [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 92] Penalty for false start [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 94] Hearing of the Race Director in the event of a protest [2007 International Sporting Code, Art. 174-e] Starting procedure and penalties for jumping the start [2007 CIK-FIA General Prescriptions, Art. 2.20-K and 2.24]	The Court quashed the contested decision on the grounds that an infringement was committed by the Appellant regardless of whether or not it was his intention to commit that infringement. The Court also declared null and void Decision N° 21 of the Panel of Stewards on the grounds that the Race Director was not heard, in breach of Art. 174-e of the International Sporting Code. The Court further exercised its right to hear a case before a lower court and imposed a ten-second penalty on the Appellant pursuant to Article 2.24 of the CIK-FIA General Prescriptions, on the grounds that the driver anticipated the start in breach of Article 92 and 94 of the International Sporting Code and Article 2.20-K of the CIK-FIA General Prescriptions.

7/2006	4.12.2006	ACI CSAI	Vortex Srl	CIK-FIA	Decision N° 9 of the Panel of Stewards of 17 November 2006 concerning the event run at Angerville on 28 September-1 October 2006 and excluding driver Francesco Antonucci (competitor Vortex srl) from the 2006 CIK-FIA World Karting Championship	<p>Right of review; failure to sufficiently describe grievances in the summons; failure by the Stewards to sufficiently motivate their decision [2006 International Sporting Code, Art. 179bis]</p> <p>Starting procedure; Use of video evidence by the Stewards in reaching a decision [2006 CIK-FIA Sporting Regulations, Art. 51]</p> <p>Starting procedure; Authorized works on a kart [2006 CIK-FIA Regulations, Art. 2.19 H]</p> <p>Access to the Paddock and to the «Start» Servicing Park; Number of mechanics allowed [2006 CIK-FIA Specific Prescriptions, Art. 10 and 11]</p>	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that (i) the rights of defense were respected as the competitor was aware of the charges against it; (ii) the Stewards in making their decision were entitled to rely on video evidence provided to them after the event concerned; and (iii) examination of the video evidence revealed the presence of a second mechanic and the performance of works other than changing the tires or checking tire pressure, both of which are prohibited by the CIK-FIA regulations.
6/2006	28.11.2006	ACI CSAI	Draco Multiracing Prema Powerteam	World Series by Renault	Decision of the Belgian National Court of Appeal of 25 July 2006, concerning the event run at Zolder (Belgium) on 30 April 2006 counting	<p>Right of a third party to appeal a Stewards' decision</p> <p>Rights of defense and</p>	The Court declared admissible the appeal by Draco Multiracing USA. It also declared admissible the opposition appeals lodged by the third parties Prema Powerteam and R.C. Motorsport on the grounds that the Belgian NCA had failed to respect the adversarial

			(third party) R.C. Motorsport (third party)		towards the World Series by Renault 2006, ruling jointly on two separate appeals lodged by resp. Draco Multiracing USA and Eurointernational, and annulling the results of Race No. 1	adversarial principle Cutting a chicane	principle and had not given these parties an opportunity to assert their rights of defense. The Court invalidated the contested decision on the grounds that the Belgian NCA (i) was wrong to combine two appeals which concerned different races and different decisions with separate causes; (ii) ruled <i>ultra petita</i> as it failed to answer the appeal formulated by Draco and as the cancellation of the event was not requested by neither the parties nor by the Stewards or Clerk of the Course; and (iii) failed to respect the adversarial principle by ruling on Race No. 1. The Court further confirmed the Stewards' decision concerning Draco on the grounds that Draco failed to provide evidence that the competitor Salignon cut the chicanes during the qualifications and rejected Draco's request to impose a time penalty of at least 10 seconds. The Court also confirmed the results of Race No. 1.
5/2006	27.11.2006	SBF	Per-Gunnar Andersson	Junior WRC	Decision N° 6 of the Panel of Stewards of 15 October 2006, excluding Car No. 35 (driver Per-Gunnar Andersson) from the Rally of Turkey, counting towards the 2006 FIA Junior World Rally Championship	Works authorized on the car during the race [WRC Regulations] Persons authorized to perform works on the car during the race [WRC Regulations]	The Court declared the appeal admissible and confirmed the contested decision on the basis that the appellant adduced insufficient proof that the Scrutineer's report, on which the contested decision was based, was inexact.

4/2006	9.11.2006	DMSB	Vitaphone Racing Team	GT	Decision N°30 of the Panel of Stewards of 28 May 2006, concerning the event run at Brno and counting towards the 2006 FIA GT Championship, imposing a penalty on car N° 2 (crew Jamie Davies/ Thomas Biagi)	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
3/2006	9.11.2006	Referral by FIA		CIK-FIA	Decision of the French National Court of Appeal of 24 July 2006 and its revised decision of 1 September 2006, concerning the event run as Varennes sur Alliers on 25 June 2006, counting towards the 2006 CIK-FIA European Championship (Formula A)	Power of the Stewards to cancel the results of a race [2006 International Sporting Code, Art. 141] Difference between an individual penalty and an overall sanction	The Court quashed the contested decisions and confirmed Decision N° 37 of the Panel of Stewards, on the grounds that the Stewards have the power to annul the results of a race when the circumstances of the race make it impossible to establish a fair classification, so as to avoid unfair treatment of the competitors.
2/2006	22.08.2006	Referral by FIA	Mild Seven Renault F1	F1	Decision N°8 of the Panel of Stewards of 28 July 2006 at the 2006 Grand Prix of Germany	Obligation to comply with the regulations at all times during an event [2006 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.4] Possibility to seek clarification from the FIA Technical Dept regarding new designs or systems [2006 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.4]	The Court quashed the contested decision and held that the use of a device known as Tuned Mass Dampers (TMD) constitutes an infringement of Article 3.15 of the F1 Technical Regulations given that the device impacts the aerodynamic efficiency of the car.

						<p>Bodywork; sprung parts [2006 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 1.4]</p> <p>Aerodynamic influence [2006 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 3.15]</p> <p>Sprung suspension [2006 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 1.14]</p>	
1/2006	28.02.2006	NAMK			Decision of the FIA Extraordinary General Assembly of 31 March 2005 to strike the NAMK off the rolls	<p>Failure of a party to attend a ICA hearing</p> <p>Financial obligations of FIA Members [FIA Statutes, Art. 25]</p> <p>Striking off the rolls [FIA Statutes, Art. 25]</p>	The Court confirmed the contested decision on the grounds that the proposal submitted by the World Council for Mobility and the Automobile on 30 March 2005 and the consequent striking of NAMK off the rolls pronounced by the FIA Extraordinary General Assembly on 31 March 2005 were right and proper.
22/2005	8.12.2005	FFSA	Larbre Competition	GT	Decision N°9 of the Panel of Stewards of 25 November 2005, excluding team Lamy/Gardel (competitor Larbre Competition) from the event run in Bahrain and counting in the FIA GT Chmapionship, for failing to contain the required 3 liters of petrol at the end of the race	Requirement for the car to contain at least three liters of petrol for the taking of fuel samples [2005 GT Sporting Regulations, Article 60d]	The Court quashed the contested decision on the basis that doubts remain as to the precise manner in which to remove the required fuel from the tank and the possibility of removing additional fuel from the tank in question.

21/2005	8.12.2005	MSA	Chevrolet	WTCC	Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 20 November 2005 concerning the event run in Macao and counting towards the FIA WTCC	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
20/2005	7.11.2005	Referral by the FIA	Berthon	CIK-FIA	Decision of the Italian National Court of Appeal of 21 September 2005 annulling, for obstruction of rights of defense, Decision N° 17 of the Panel of Stewards of 21 August 2005 excluding driver Nathanael Berthon from the event run at La Conca and counting towards the CIK-FIA European Intercontinental A Championship	<p>Minimum weight of the kart [FIA-CIK Technical Regulations, Articles 1.3, 4.2 and 10]</p> <p>Failure to meet the required weight of the car due to <i>force majeure</i> [2005 General Prescriptions, Article 12(A)(c)]</p> <p>Rights of defence</p>	The Court confirmed the contested decision insofar as the nullity of Decision N°17 is concerned on the basis that the competitor's rights of defense were obstructed. However, as to the substance, the Court quashed the contested decision for failing to rule on the competitor's violation of the technical regulations with regard to the weight of the kart. Re-ruling on the matter, the Court confirmed that driver Nathanael Berthon (competitor Jean-Yves Berthon) must be excluded from the pre-final race run at La Conca on the grounds that the applicable technical regulations were not respected.

19/2005	13.09.2005	ACI CSAI	Alfa Romeo Racing Team	WTCC	Decision N°4 of the Panel of Stewards of 30 July 2005 imposing a 3-second penalty on driver Stefano d'Aste (competitor Proteam Motorsport) for having left the circuit to avoid an accident, thereby yielding an advantage	Protest against classification of the race [2005 International Sporting Code, Art. 174(d)]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on the basis that the appeal did not originate from the competitor or driver concerned by the contested decision. The Court noted that if the appellant intended to contest the penalty imposed, it should have filed a protest against the classification rather than against
18/2005	13.09.2005	ACI CSAI	Alfa Romeo Racing Team	WTCC	Decision N° 8 of the Panel of Stewards of 30 July 2005 concerning the racing incident involving the drivers Antonio Garcia (BMW, Team Italy-Spain), Dirk Müller (BMW, Team Deutschland) and Gabriele Tarquini (Alfa Romeo Racing Team)		The Court confirmed the contested decision on the basis that the relevant facts constituted a racing incident.
17/2005	13.09.2005	ACI CSAI	Alfa Romeo Racing Team	WTCC	Decision N° 7 of the Panel of Stewards of 30 July 2005 to exclude driver Augusti Farfus (competitor Alfa Romeo racing Team) from the event run at Spa (Belgium) on 26-31 July 2005 and counting towards the FIA WTCC, following a racing	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

					incident		
16/2005	13.09.2005	ASS	Sauber Petronas	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
15/2005	13.09.2005	FFSA	Renault F1 Team	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

14/2005	13.09.2005	DMSB	Panasonic Toyota Racing	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
13/2005	13.09.2005	MSA	British American Racing (BAR) GP Ltd	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
12/2005	13.09.2005	MSA	McLaren Racing Ltd	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

11/2005	13.09.2005	MSA	Red Bull Racing	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
10/2005	13.09.2005	MSA	Williams GP Engineering Ltd	F1	Decision of the World Motor Sport Council of 29 June 2005 finding the seven Michelin teams guilty of failing to ensure that they were in possession of suitable tyres for the 2005 US Grand Prix	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
9/2005	19.07.2005	MSA	Aston Martin Racing	Mobil 1 Twelve Hours	Decision of IMSA's Appeal Review Board of 21 April 2005, concerning the 53 rd Annual Mobil 1 Twelve Hours of Sebring, rejecting a request by competitor AMR to exclude competitor Maserati from the race based on the alleged non-conformity of the latter's car	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

8/2005	19.07.2005	ACI CSAI	Alfa Romeo Racing Team	WTCC	Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 15 May 2005	Filing of an appeal to the ICA; requirement to confirm intention to appeal by letter [2005 International Sporting Code, Art. 186] Requirement to submit an appeal to the ICA through the competitor's ASN [2005 International Sporting Code, Art. 185.2]	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant. The Court held that, in any event, in the absence of an appeal brought before the Court, the contested decision had acquired the authority of <i>res judicata</i> .
7/2005	4.05.2005	Referral by the FIA	Lucky Strike BAR Honda	F1	Decision N° 49 of the Panel of Stewards of 24 April 2005 at the San Marino Grand Prix (Imola) refusing to take action against driver Jenson Button for using an underweight car	Weight of the car [2005 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 1.9 and 1.10, Art. 4.1] Weighing of the car after the race [2005 F1 Sporting Regulations, Art. 77-a-4 and 77-b]	The Court invalidated the contested decision and declared that the competitor failed to comply with the applicable regulations by using an underweight car. The Court excluded competitor Lucky Strike BAR Honda from the event in question and from the next two events. The Court further suspended the competitor for a period of six month after the mentioned two events, with this penalty suspended for a period of one year.
6/2005	3.05.2005	DMSB	Panasonic Toyota Racing	F1	Decision N° 45 of the Panel of Stewards of 24 April 2005 at the San Marino Grand Prix (Imola), imposing a 25-second time penalty on driver Ralf Schumacher	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

5/2005	3.05.2005	ACI CSAI	Minardi F1 Team	F1	Decision N° 8 of the Panel of Stewards of 4 March 2005 at the Australian Grand Prix, finding Minardi's cars not to be in conformity with the Technical and Sporting Regulations	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
4/2005	24.02.2005	ACI CSAI	Victory Engineering	Eurocup Formula Renault V6	Decision N° 4 of the Panel of Stewards of 6 October 2004 disqualifying car N° 11 for not being in conformity with the Technical Regulations	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
3/2005	24.02.2005	ACS	Loris Kessel Racing	GT	Decision of the Italian National Court of Appeal of 18 June 2003 annulling the results of the National GT Championship event run at Mugello on 13 April 2003, following an incident involving the alleged opening of a fire extinguisher in a competitors' car by a Steward	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

2/2005	24.02.2005	CAMS	Team Dynamic PTY LTD	V8 Supercar	Decision of 19 November 2004 by a body described as the "V8 Supercar National Court of Appeal" (V8 SNCA)	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
1/2005	24.02.2005	ÖAMTC	Robert Lechner	Internat'l 31st ADAC Zurich 24 Hours	Two decisions of the German National Court of Appeal of 1 July 2003 concerning the event entitled "International 31 st ADAC Zurich 24 Hours" run on the Nürburgring circuit on 31 May and 1 June 2003	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
8/2004	03.11.2004	ACL	Jama Investments Luxembourg	Formula 1600 (International Series)	Decision of the Spanish National Court of Appeal of 15 July 2004, confirming Decision N° 3 of the Panel of Stewards of 20 June 2004 at the event run in Valencia and counting towards the Spanish Formula Junior 1600 Championship, which had excluded car n° 18 (competitor Jama Investments) on the grounds that its braking system was not in conformity with the regulations	Irregularity in the scrutineering procedure; Impartiality in the organization of a race [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 136] Publication of a provisional classification; modification of the classification [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 177; F1600 Sporting Regulations, Art. 40.5]	The Court invalidated the contested decision on the grounds that the brake pads used by the competitor were in conformity with the applicable technical regulations, and invalidated Decision N°3 of the Panel of Stewards, based inter alia on the irregularities that appear to have taken place during the scrutineering procedure.

						Braking system; Types of brake pads authorized [F1600 Technical Regulations; Art 11.2.1]	
7/2004	03.11.2004	MSA	Jenzer Motorsport GmbH	Formula Renault V6	Decision of the British National Court of Appeal of 10 August 2004, declaring inadmissible an appeal against two sanctions pronounced by the Stewards on 26 June 2004 at the event run at Donington and counting towards the Formula Renault V6 Championship (for causing an avoidable collision and for ignoring a yellow flag, respectively), on the grounds that the appeal was not confirmed before the deadline	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

6/2004	21.09.2004	ACI CSAI	GPC Motor Srl	GT	Decision N° 13 of the Panel of Stewards of 5 September 2004 at the event run at Imola and counting towards the 2004 GT Championship, excluding car n°62 (competitor GPC Sport) from the event because its air box was not in compliance	Air boxes; Restrictors blocking the air feeding the engine [2004 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 257-5.3.2] Exclusion [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 141 and 158]	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the car in question was not in conformity with the applicable regulations.
5/2004	09.08.2004	MSA	BAR	F1	Decision N° 16 of the Panel of Stewards of 24 July 2004 at the event run at Hockenheim and counting towards the 2004 Formula One Championship, finding the T car of competitor Bar Honda not to be in compliance with the Technical Regulations and prohibiting the use of an electro hydraulic software-controlled device connecting the front wheels via drive shafts and allowing controlled torque transfer from a faster wheel to a slower wheel even under braking	Brake systems; Powered devices affecting the brake system; Changes to the brake system whilst the car is moving [2004 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 11(1)(3) and (4)] Obligation to comply with the regulations at all times during an event [2004 F1 Technical Regulations, Art 2.4] Possibility to seek clarification from the FIA Technical Dept regarding new designs or systems [2004 F1 Technical Regulations, Art 2.4]	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the device in question is not in conformity with the F1 Technical Regulations.

						Inspection of electrical system by FIA Technical Department prior to start of season [2004 F1 Technical Regulations, Art 8.1.1]	
4/2004	20.07.2004	ACM	JMB Racing	GT	Decision N° 16 of the Panel of Stewards of 27 June 2004 at the event run at Donington and counting towards the 2004 GT Championship, imposing a 5 min. penalty on driver Karl Wendlinger (competitor JMB Racing) for infringing the rule that after the end of the race cars must proceed directly to the parc fermé without stopping	Parc fermé [2004 International Sporting Code, General Prescriptions, Art. 21(c); 2004 GT Sporting Regulations, Art. 158]	The Court annulled the contested decision, and replaced the time penalty imposed by the Stewards with a more lenient penalty consisting of a USD 15,000 fine, for making an unjustified stop before proceeding to the parc fermé.
3/2004	20.07.2004	ACI CSAI	Coloni Motorsport	F3000	Decision N° 20 of the Panel of Stewards of 3 July 2004 at the event run at Magny-Cours and counting towards the 2004 F3000	-	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

					Championship, suspending the license of driver Can Artam (competitor Coloni Motorsport) for the next F3000 Championship for having ignored a yellow flag		
2/2004	12.05.2004	ACI CSAI	BMS Scuderia Italia Spa	GT	Decision N° 3 of the Panel of Stewards of 2 May 2004 at the event run at Magny-Cours and counting towards the 2004 GT Championship, imposing a 50-second time penalty on driver Gabriele Gardel (competitor Ferrari) following a collision between the latter and driver Luca Cappellari (competitor Ferrari)	Imposition of penalties on a driver involved in an incident; 50-second time penalty	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the appellant caused an avoidable collision which was ascribable to his conduct alone.
1/2004	12.02.2004	KNAF	Carly Motors B.V.	WTCC	Decision of the Italian National Court of Appeal of 11 December 2003 confirming Decision N° 13 of the Panel of Stewards of 19 October 2003, which had dismissed a protest by Carly Motors against the classification of the race run in Monza and counting for the 2003 European Touring Cars Championship, following a	Right of a third party to appeal a Stewards' decision; National appeal procedure [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 182] Competence to examine the validity of a license; Jurisdiction of ASNs [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 47]	The Court invalidated the contested decision and declared the appeal admissible on the grounds that the appellant had a manifest interest in filing the appeal. The Court, however, noted that it is not competent to examine the regular application of the procedure by which an ASN granted a license to a competitor. Given that both drivers carried out manoeuvres likely to hinder the other drivers, and given the impossibility to apply after the race the penalties set out at Article 37, the Court

					collision between drivers Duncan Huisman (competitor Carly Motors) and Garbiele Tarquini (competitor Autodelta)	Obstructive manoeuvres [2004 International Sporting Code, Appendix L, Chapt. IV, Art. 2(c) and (d)] Imposition of penalties on a driver involved in an incident [2004 International Sporting Code, Art. 152 and 153]	imposed a fine of USD 25,000 on both competitors.
10/2003	03.12.2003	DMSB	Aqua Nova Racing Team	International Series	Decision of the Italian National Court of Appeal of 21 October 2003 concerning the 2003 Porsche Michelin Supercup Event run at Monza on 12-14 September 2003, replacing the Decision of the Stewards to impose a fine of € 2,000 on competitor Aqua Nova Racing Team (driver Wolf Henzler) for non-conformity of the weight of the engine flywheel, by the exclusion of car n° 3 of driver Wolf Henzler	Relevant regulations; Precedence of FIA regulations over Porsche's internal manual [2003 International Sporting Code, Art. 24-b] Authorized modifications to the engine [Technical Regulations, Art. 1]	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the flywheel used by the competitor weighed much less than those checked in the factory during the official expertise, and was not in conformity with the original part.
9/2003	03.12.2003	DMSB	Aqua Nova Racing Team	International Series	Decision of the American National Court of Appeal of 21 October 2003 concerning the 2003 Porsche Michelin	Obstructive manoeuvres; braking [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix L, Chapt. IV,	The Court quashed the contested decision and confirmed the Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 27 September 2003, excluding car n°5 of competitor Infineon Farnbacher (driver Frank Stippler) from the event on the grounds that

					Supercup Event run at Indianapolis on 27-28 September 2003, replacing the Decision of the Stewards to exclude car n°5 (competitor Infineon Farnbacher; driver Frank Stippler) from the race for having caused a collision with driver Wolf Henzler (competitor Aqua Nova Racing Team) by a simple reprimand on Frank Stippler with a notation on the Driving Code	Art. 2(c)] Imposition of penalties on a driver involved in an incident Xxx [2003 International Sporting Code, Art. 189]	the collision was attributable to driver Frank Stippler, who used his brakes in an abusive manner.
8/2003	21.10.2003	MSA	Lister Racing	GT	Decision N°9 of the Panel of Stewards of 21 September 2003 at the even run at Oscherleben and counting for the 2003 GT Championship, excluding car n°14 (driver Jamie Campbell-Walter) for having caused a collision with car no. 4 (driver Philippe Alliot)	Obstructive manoeuvres; overtaking [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix L, Chapt. IV, Art. 2(c)] Imposition of penalties on a driver involved in an incident [2003 GT Sporting Regulations]	The Court confirmed the contested decision on the grounds that the collision was attributable to driver Jamie Campbell-Walter who had obstructed the driving line of driver Philippe Alliot.
7/2003	07.10.2003	FPAK	Mitsubishi Motors	Cross Country Rally	Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 16 August 2003 at the Rallye d'Orient and counting towards the 2003 World Cup for Cross-Country Rallies, rejecting the protest by competitor	Obligation to follow the itinerary indicated in the Road Book; passage of check points [Rallye d'Orient Supplementary Regulations, Art. 10 P; FIA Standard	The Court invalidated the contested decision and excluded car no. 201 of competitor Coli & Cie (crew Schlessler / Lurquin) for failing to respect the itinerary indicated in the Road Book from the event in question.

					Mitsubishi Motors against competitor Coli & Cie for allegedly failing to follow the itinerary on the road book	Regulations for Off Road Rallies, Art 10.1]	
6/2003	19.08.2003	MSA	Williams GP Engineering Ltd	F1	Decision N°41 of the Panel of Stewards of 3 August 2003 at the German Grand Prix, imposing a drop of ten grid positions on Ralf Schumacher at the starting grid of the next Grand Prix for having caused a collision	Penalties; Permission to inflict penalties in addition to or instead of penalties available under the International Sporting Code [2003 F1 Sporting Regulations, Art. 59]	The Court invalidated the contested decision and replaced the drop of ten grid positions by a more appropriate penalty, namely a fine of USD 50,000. The Court further referred the case back to the Stewards in order to examine the responsibility incurred by driver Rubens Barichello and Kimmi Raikkönen in the same incident.
5/2003	15.07.2003	ACI CSAI	BMS Scuderia Italia	GT	Decision N°33 of the Panel of Stewards of 29 June 2003 at the event run in Rome and counting towards the 2003 GT Championship, excluding car n°23 (competitor BMS Scuderia Italia) from the event	Authorized modifications to the engine; lubrication of the engine [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, GT Technical Regulations, Art. 258-5.2.1] Sump [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, Art. 251-2.3.7]	The Court invalidated the contested decision, on the grounds that the alterations made by the appellant did not infringe the relevant regulations.
4/2003	15.07.2003	KNAF	Zwaans Racing	GT	Decision N°32 of the Panel of Stewards of 29 June 2003 at the event run in Donington Park counting towards the 2003 GT Championship, excluding car no. 18 (driver Rob van der Zwaan) from the	Ventilation system; cockpit ventilation; equipment permitted in the cockpit; rear window [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, GT Technical Regulations,	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the ventilation system of the appellant's car was not in compliance with the relevant rules.

					<p>event for non-conformity of its ventilation system</p>	<p>Art. 258-3.4, -13.2.1, and -15.3]</p> <p>Modifications to be re-presented for scrutineering approval [2003 GT Sporting Regulations, Art. 59]</p> <p>Inspection procedure [International Sporting Code, Art. 145]</p>	
3/2003	21.05.2003	ACI CSAI	BMS Scuderia Italia	GT	<p>Decision N° 22 of the Panel of Stewards of 11 May 2003 at the event run in Enna Pergusa, counting towards the 2003 GT Championship, excluding the car of team Cappellari/Gollin (competitor BMS Scuderia Italia) from the event because its air box was not in compliance</p>	<p>Air boxes; Restrictors blocking the air feeding the engine [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, GT1 Technical Regulations, Art. 258-5.3.2]</p> <p>Duty to satisfy the Scrutineers and the stewards that the car is in compliance with the regulations [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, GT1 Technical Regulations, Art. 258-2.6]</p> <p>Obligation to comply with the regulations at all times during an event [2003 GT1 Sporting Regulations,</p>	<p>The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the air box of the appellant's car was not in compliance with the relevant rules when scrutineered after the event.</p>

						Art. 5] End of an event [2003 International Sporting Code, Art. 16(b)]	
2/2003	07.05.2003	MSA	Team Maranello	GT	Decision N° 28 of the Panel of Stewards of 27 April 2003 at the event run in Magny-Cours and counting towards the 2003 GT Championship, excluding car no. 89 (competitor Maranello) for exceeding the maximum fuel capacity allowed onboard the vehicle	Fuel capacity; Measurement of fuel carried on board [2003 International Sporting Code, Appendix J, GT2 Technical Regulations, Art. 257-6.5.1] Parc fermé	The Court confirmed the contested decision, on the grounds that the appellant's car effectively contained fuel in excess of the 100l of fuel allowed.
1/2003	05.03.2003	DMSB	X-Raid GmbH	Cross Country Rally	Decision N° 3 of the Panel of Stewards of 6 January 2003 at the 2003 Rally of Dakar, imposing a 9 min. penalty on team Alphand/Stevenson (competitor X-Raid) for failing to reach a checkpoint	Time control; clocking of time cards [Special Regulations, Art. 17P1]	The Court quashed the contested decision, on the grounds that the circumstances due to which the appellant could not reach the checkpoint were not due to any fault of the appellant, but were solely due to the organization of the event.
6/2002	3.10.2002	ACI CSAI	Coloni Motorsport	F3000	Decisions N° 25, 26, 27 of the Panel of Stewards of 14 September 2002 concerning the event run in Monza counting towards the 2002 F3000 International Championship concerning the non-conformity of	Right of review; failure by the Stewards to sufficiently motivate their decision Bodywork and dimensions; Front and rear wing [F3000	The Court invalidated Decision N° 25 concerning car N°3 of competitor Petrobas Junior team (driver Pizzonia), for failure to state grounds of the decision. The Court however did find that car N° 3 was not in conformity with the technical regulations due to the inversion of its wing and consequently pronounced the exclusion of car N° 3 from the event.

					cars N° 3, 18 and 19 with the Technical Regulations	Technical Regulations, Art. 3.1.1] Aerodynamic influence [F3000 Technical Regulations, Art. 3.16] Anti-roll bars; rolling chassis [F3000 Technical Regulations, Art. 2.4 and 10.1.7]	The Court further dismissed the appeals against the competitor Arden International, as no violation could be established, and invalidated Decisions N° 26 (concerning car N°18 of competitor Arden International, driver Wirdheim) and N° 27 (concerning car N°19 of competitor Arden International, driver Enge), on the grounds that the Arden International could not be penalized for a possible infraction which it had no power to know, given that the anti-roll bars were removed by the official FIA-designated manufacturer of the chassis for the F3000, Lola Motorsports.
5/2002	9.07.2002	KNAF	Team Carsport Holland	GT	Decision of the Panel of Stewards of 21 June 2002 concerning the event run at Jarama on 2 June 2002 and counting towards the 2002 GT Championship, excluding car N° 3 of competitor Team Carsport Holland (driver Mr. Hezemans)	Required presence of at least three Stewards at a Meeting [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 134] Rights of defence; obligation to summon party concerned by a Stewards' decision [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 153 and 175]	The Court invalidated the contested decision on the grounds that the contested decision was taken by two Stewards instead of the required three, and that the competitor concerned was not summoned in person to present its defence to the Panel of Stewards.
4/2002	9.07.2002	DMSB	Freisinger Motorsport	GT	Decision N °16 of the Panel of Stewards of 20 April 2002 concerning the event run at Magny-Cours on 19-21 April 2002 and counting towards the 2002 GT Championship	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.

3/2002	30.04.2002	–	Christian Chemin	Rally	Decision N ° 7 of the Panel of Stewards of 24 March 2002 concerning the 38 th Rally of Catalunya and counting towards the 2002 World Rally Championship, excluding the driver Christian Chemin from the event	Requirement to submit an appeal to the ICA through the competitor's ASN [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 185.2] Obligation of the ASN to assist a competitor in bringing an appeal to the ICA [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 180] Time-limits for notifying an appeal to the ICA [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 186, para 2]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, as the appeal was brought by the competitor instead of having been brought by the competitor's ASN on his behalf.
2/2002	29.04.2002	ACI CSAI	Angelo Proietti	Rally	Decision N° 2 of the Panel of Stewards of 21 March 2002 concerning the 38 th Rally of Catalunya and counting towards the 2002 World Rally Championship	Time-limits for notifying an appeal to the ICA [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 186, para 2] Time-limit for payment of the appeal fee [2002 International Sporting Code, Art. 185.2 and 186]	The Court declared the appeal inadmissible, on account of the fact that no appeal fee was paid to the ICA within the prescribed time limit.
1/2002	4.02.2002	MSA	Allen Lloyd	WTCC	Decision by the French National Court of Appeal of 25 October 2001 concerning the event run at Dijon-Prenois on 23	Track measurement method [2001 International Sporting Code, Appendix K, Art.	The Court quashed the contested decision, on the grounds that the track measurements by the Scrutineers were not taken in accordance with the relevant regulations, and that throughout the exclusion procedure, the

					September 2001 and counting towards the 2001 European Challenge for Historic Touring Cars	11.10] Signature of Stewards' decisions [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 174 d) and e), 175 and 177]	International Sporting Code was not respected (the Stewards' decision did not mention the names of the Stewards, nor was it signed by the Stewards' in question).
11/2001	10.12.2001	MNASZ	Intermedia Motorsport Association	Rally	Decision by the Hungarian National Court of Appeal of 19 October 2001 concerning the 15 th International Michelin Rally of Budapest and counting towards the 2001 European Rally Championship, excluding car N° 6 (competitor Intermedia Motorsport Association) from the event	Pump flow measurements; conditions in which the measurements must be taken	The Court postponed the examination of the case until a future hearing and required the FIA Technical Department to obtain from the manufacturer Mitsubishi an answer to the question whether or not a filter was used when measuring the flow specified on the homologation form, when the said form was established.
10/2001	30.10.2001	SBF	Citroën Sweden	Rallycross	Decision by the Norwegian National Court of Appeal of 18 September, concerning the event run on 1-2 September 2001 in Lyngas and counting towards the 2001 European Championships for Rallycross Drivers	Signature of Stewards' decisions [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 134] Obstructive manoeuvres; overtaking [2001 International Sporting Code, Appendix L, Chapt. IV]	The Court annulled the Contested Decision and the Decision taken by the Stewards. The Court further ruled that car n°7 infringed the regulations and imposed a fine of FF 10,000.

9/2001	26.11.2001	WAC	–	–	Decision of the FIA World Council for Touring & the Automobile, taken on of 18 June 2001 to expulse the WAC	Striking off the rolls [FIA Statutes]	The Court ruled that the procedure followed which led to the proposal of 18 June 2001 put forward by the World Council to strike the WAC from the rolls was valid.
8/2001	26.10.2001	RIAC	B&H Jordan Honda	F1	Decision N°31 of the Panel of Stewards taken at the Formula One Grand Prix of Indianapolis on 30 September 2001, excluding driver Jarno Trulli (Jordan Honda) for non-compliance with Art. 3.13.1.d of the F1 Technical Regulations	Thickness of the skid-block [2001 F1 Technical Regulations, Art. 3.13.1.d] Required presence of three Stewards and of the Chairman [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 134]	The Court annulled the Contested Decision for violating the rights of the defence of the competitor (only two Stewards of the Meeting, and not three, were present at the meeting when the representatives of the Jordan Honda Team were heard).
7/2001	22.10.2001	ACI CSAI	Tony Kart Racing	Karting	Decision N°6 of the Panel of Stewards of 26 August 2001	–	The appeal was withdrawn by the Applicant.
6/2001	22.10.2001	Referral by FIA President ACM	Coli & Cie.	Cross Country Rally	–	Prohibition on reconnaissance of the route [Standard Regulations for FIA Cross-Country Rallies, Art. 10.1] Procedure and time-limits for appeal [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 171-174]	The Court held that it did not find any formal and irrefutable proof that the hand-written notes under review, which the Appellant alleges to be reconnaissance notes, were used or were in the possession of competitor MMC Sales Ile de France (team Kleinschmidt/Schultz) during the event. The Court also held that Article 171 of the International Sporting Code and following, notably Articles 173 and 174, did not apply since the presumed discovery and proof of a possible infraction, which would be particularly serious, only came to light after the running of the event.
5/2001	26.09.2001	Referral by FIA	Coli & Cie.	Cross Country Rally	–	Prohibition on reconnaissance of the	The Court postponed the examination of the case until a future hearing.

		President				route [Standard Regulations for FIA Cross-Country Rallies, Art. 10.1] Procedure and time-limits for appeal [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 171-174]	
4/2001	12.06.2001	RACMSA	Lister Storm Racing	GT	Decision N°12 of the Panel of Stewards of 20 May 2001, excluding the competitor from the event run in Zolder (Belgium) and counting towards the 2001 FIA GT Championship	Air feeding of the engine; Airbox [2001 GT Technical Regulations, Appendix J, Art. 258-5.3.2] Duty to comply with the regulations at all times [2001 GT Technical Regulations, Appendix J, Art. 258-2.6]	The Court confirmed the contested decision.
3/2001	1.06.2001	RACMSA	British American Racing GP Ltd.	F1	Decision No. 44 of the Panel of Stewards of 13 May 2001 at the Austrian Grand Prix	Overtaking in a yellow flag zone [2001 International Sporting Code, Annex H, Art. 4.1.2.b] Use of video evidence by the Stewards in reaching a decision [2001 International Sporting Code, Article 149-e]	The Court confirmed the contested decision.

2/2001	19.03.2001	WAC	Egypte	–	Decision of the FIA General Assembly of 6 October 2000 striking the Wedian Automobile Club from the rolls, for the unauthorized emission of customs documents	Striking off the rolls [FIA Statutes]	The Court invalidated the Contested Decision as the procedure followed for striking the Club from the rolls was not in conformity.
1/2001	5.03.2001	ACM	Coli&Cie	Cross Country Rally	Decision N°9 of the Panel of Stewards of 20 January 2001 concerning the Paris/Dakar event, counting towards the 2001 World Cup for Cross-Country Rallies, imposing a one-hour time penalty for car N°200 (driver J.-L. Schlessler)	<p>Time-limits for notifying an appeal to the ICA or to a NCA [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 182 and 186, para 2]</p> <p>Jurisdiction of the ICA; competence of the ICA to directly rule on appeals against Stewards' decisions; required consent of the ASN [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 184.2]</p> <p>Competition National Court of Appeal [2001 International Sporting Code, Art. 81, 180 and 182]</p> <p>Waivers; Rules not complying with FIA</p>	The Court declared the appeal admissible and confirmed the contested decision.

						regulations [Cross-Country Rally Regulations, Art. 1.6]	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--