



2024 MELBOURNE EVENT

21 to 24 March 2024

From	The Stewards	Document	67
To	The Team Manager, Campos Racing	Date	24 March 2024
		Time	18:09

Title DECISION - Campos Racing - Right of Review (Hadjar)

Description DECISION - Campos Racing - Right of Review (Hadjar)

Enclosed Doc 67 - DECISION - Campos Racing - Right of Review (Hadjar).pdf

Silvia Bellot

David Domingo

Christopher McMahon

The Stewards



MELBOURNE EVENT

21 TO 24 MARCH 2024

From	The FIA Formula 2 Stewards	Document	67 (3 pages)
To	Campos Racing	Date	24 March 2024
		Time	18:05

Right of Review – Campos Racing (against Document 41)

Procedure

1. On March 24, 2024, the Stewards received a petition from Campos Racing requesting a Right of Review in accordance with Article 14 of the FIA International Sporting Code (“the Code”).
2. The request related to the Decision of the Stewards contained in document number 41 (10 seconds time penalty plus 2 penalty points on Car 20 (Hadjar) for a breach of Appendix L, Chapter IV, Article 2d) of the Code.
3. A hearing was convened at 13:30 hrs ADST on March 24, 2024, and concerned parties were summoned (document numbers 50 and 51).
4. The Stewards of the 2024 Formula 2 Melbourne Event conducted the hearing.
5. Attending the hearing was the FIA F2 Stewards Panel for this Event and the following:
 - On behalf of Campos Racing – Enrique Colomina
 - On behalf of Invicta Racing – Paul Devlin
 - On behalf of the FIA – Javier Maffioli , Pedro Lamy (driver advisor)
6. This hearing was dedicated to determining if the Petition of the Right of Review was presented in accordance with the requirements established in Articles 14.4.1 (petition of review period) and 14.4.3 (deposit fee).
7. In addition, the hearing also was dedicated to determining at the sole discretion of the Stewards (as specified in Article 14.3 of the Code) if “a significant and relevant new element is discovered which was unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned”.
8. Therefore, the Stewards were required to determine if any evidence presented to them was able to meet each and every one of the above criteria namely significant, relevant, new and unavailable to the party seeking the review.
9. Campos Racing cited two issues which it regarded as meeting these criteria. These were:
 - a. Data of Car 20 showing the maximum steering angle before, during the crash and after.
 - b. Screenshots from the TV Host feed showing the position of the cars from various angles.
10. In its written submission Campos Racing also submitted a link to video footage from an incident in a 2022 Formula 2 Feature Race.
11. During the hearing, Campos Racing explained Car 20’s data is significant and relevant as it indicates that the maximum steering angle of Car 20 before the crash is only 10 degrees, just enough to try to overtake and not block someone coming from behind. In addition, they explained that the screenshots are significant and relevant because it’s possible to see Car 10 pointing towards the left of the track.
12. The representative of Invicta Racing indicated that the data of Car 20 is not a significant and relevant element, and that it was available to Campos Racing at the time of the decision concerned. Teams get access to a USB stick with the Car’s data when reaching the Parc Ferme. In



MELBOURNE EVENT

21 TO 24 MARCH 2024

addition, he mentioned that the video footage presented on the Petition of Review was already discussed during the original hearing.

13. The representative of Campos Racing replied that they had a malfunction on the USB and therefore the data was not available to the team until Car 20 was released from Parc Ferme.
14. The Stewards asked the Technical Delegate regarding the data distribution procedure after the race. The FIA Technical Delegate confirmed that the teams have access to the data as soon as the race is concluded by USB but, on some occasions, teams have to wait until the cars are released to download the data by cable.
15. The Stewards adjourned the hearing at 14:00 hrs to determine the existence or otherwise of any “elements” which complied with all the criteria required in Article 14.1.1 of the Code.
16. The Stewards also note the decisions of the Stewards in relation to the existence of such elements in the previous cases of the Right of Review Requests. It is fair to say that Article 14.1.1 sets a very “high bar” to clear before opening a new hearing and reviewing the decision.
17. Accordingly, the Stewards then assessed each of the “elements” submitted by Campos Racing against each of the criteria referred to in point 7 above.

Decision

The Petition was not accompanied by the deposit required by Article 14.4.3 at the time it was presented. Further and in any event, there is no significant and relevant new element which was unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned. Therefore, the Petition for the Right of Review is DISMISSED.

In accordance with Article 14.4.3 of the Code, the deposit may only be returned if the right of review is upheld, unless fairness requires otherwise. The Stewards do not find there are any fairness issues requiring the return of the deposit.

Reasons

1. Regarding the period during which the petition for review may be brought, the Stewards determine that Campos Racing presented the petition before the commencement of the 96-hour period from the end of the Competition concerned, as requested in Article 14.4.1 of the Code.
2. Regarding the Petition of Right of Review deposit, the Stewards determine that the Petition of Review was presented at 9.10 hrs ADST, without the required fee of 2,000 Euros deposit. The team admitted to not being aware of the changes in Article 14 of the Code, which mandates that the Petition must be accompanied by a deposit. Campos Racing presented proof of payment at 12:28 hrs.
3. Regarding the data of Car 20 the Stewards:
 - a. Determine that it is not significant nor relevant. Whether these screenshots are “significant” is really a question of whether or not it is likely to change the initial decision of the Stewards. The Stewards already determined in the decision that Car 20 moved to the right of the track. At no point, the Stewards considered this movement as deliberate blocking.
 - b. Determine that it is new. This element was not discussed in the original hearing.
 - c. Determine that it may not have been available to Campos Racing (the party seeking the review) at the time of the decision, as they may have experienced a USB malfunction.
4. Regarding the screenshots from the TV Host feed the Stewards:
 - a. Determine that it is not significant. These images were taken from the video footage that had been already evaluated in the original hearing; therefore, this evidence is not likely to change the initial decision of the Stewards.



MELBOURNE EVENT

21 TO 24 MARCH 2024

- b. Determine that it is not relevant. The screenshots don't show the trajectories of the cars at the start of the race, nor during the crash.
 - c. Determine that it is not new. Video evidence, including the on-board cameras of Car 20, Car 5, TV Host feed and helicopter images were already reviewed during the original hearing.
 - d. Determine that it was available to Campos Racing (the party seeking the review) at the time of the decision. As explained above, these items were already discussed with both team representatives and drivers.
5. Regarding the video footage of the incident during the 2022 F2 Imola Feature Race. The Stewards determined that each incident has its unique circumstances and should be judged on those alone. Further, the Stewards are not bound by any preceding decision of another Stewards' panel. The Stewards have supreme authority for the enforcement of the Code (Article 11.9.1). Accordingly, it is not significant and relevant in this case.

Conclusion

The four key points under Article 14.1.1 are not met and the Stewards, therefore, dismiss the Competitor's Petition of Right of Review.

Competitors are reminded that, in accordance with Article 14.3 of the Code, this decision is not subject to appeal.

Silvia Bellot
The Stewards

David Domingo

Christopher McMahon