



INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL (ICA)

of the

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DE L'AUTOMOBILE

Appeal brought by

Fusion Motorsport

against

**Decision No. 269, dated 12 April 2026, of the Stewards of the Muro-Leccese
Competition (Italy) counting towards the 2026 Mondokart.com FIA Karting
European Championship – Junior**

Case ICA-2026-02

Hearing of 16 June 2026

Decision of 2nd July 2026



The INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL (“the Court”), which comprised Mr Rui Botica Santos (Portugal), who was designated President of the Hearing, Mr André Bezuidenhout (South Africa), Mr Yves Hängärtner (Switzerland) and Mr Jean-Christophe Leroy (France), collectively referred to as “the Judges”, held a hearing at the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile, 2, chemin de Blandonnet, 1214 Vernier, Switzerland, on Tuesday, 16 June 2026.

Nobody challenged the composition of the Court or submitted a request for the recusal of any of the Judges.

Prior to the hearing, the Court received and considered submissions and attachments thereto made by Fusion Motorsport (“the Team” or “the Appellant”) and the FIA (“the Respondent”) (the two of them collectively referred to as “the Parties”).

The following persons attended the hearing:

On behalf of the Appellant, Fusion Motorsport:

Ms Kizzy Hazlewood, Company Director

Mr Dan Hazlewood, Company Director

Mr Zac Krekelaar, Team Manager

On behalf of the Respondent, the FIA:

Ms Delphine Lavanchy, Senior Legal Counsel

Mr Alejandro Artiles Jiménez, Legal Counsel

Ms Ninon Jeanneret Troboas, Junior Legal Counsel

Mr Vincent Caro, Head of Circuit Mass Participation disciplines & activities

Also attending the hearing:

Mr Jean-Christophe Breillat (Secretary General of the FIA Courts)

Mr Nicolas Cottier (Clerk of the FIA Courts)

Ms Sandrine Gomez (Administrator of the FIA Courts)

Mr Nick Bamber (Legal Counsel, Motorsport UK, Observer)

The Parties filed written submissions and, at the hearing on 16 June 2026, set out oral arguments and addressed the questions asked by the Court. The hearing took place in accordance with the adversarial principle, with the aid of simultaneous interpretation in French and English. None of the Parties raised any objections, in relation either to the composition of the Court or to the manner in which the proceedings and the hearing were conducted, notably concerning the respect of the adversarial principle or the simultaneous interpretation.

I. REMINDER OF THE FACTS

1. The FIA organises and regulates the 2026 FIA Karting European Championship – Junior (“the Championship”).
2. The Championship is run over the following four Competitions:
 - Round 1: Muro-Leccese, Italy (9-12 April) (“the Competition”).
 - Round 2: Valencia, Spain (7-10 May).
 - Round 3: Mülsen, Germany (11-14 June).
 - Round 4: Kristianstad, Sweden (30 July-2 August).
3. Like the other three competitions of the Championship, the Competition comprised 3 free practice sessions, 3 qualifying practice sessions, 15 qualifying heats, 2 super heats and 1 final phase.
4. On 13 February 2026, Fusion Motorsport and Mr Daniel Miron Lorente (“Driver No. 203” or “the Driver”) respectively signed the following declaration included in the Championship entry form:

“I have read the Sporting Regulations issued for this competition and agree to be bound by them and by the FIA Karting General Regulations, the International Karting Regulations, Article 1 of the FIA Code of Ethics and the FIA International Sporting Code in force (available on www.fiakarting.com/page/sporting-regulations).”
5. Between 10 and 12 April 2026, the Driver participated in one Free Practice session, one Qualifying Practice session, five Qualifying Heats and one Super Heat.
6. Once the aforementioned sessions were completed, on 12 April 2026, at 13:18, the Final Phase of the Competition started. Driver No. 203 started in 1st position on the grid and provisionally ended in 5th position.



7. On lap 19 of the Final Phase of the Competition, Driver No. 203 tried to prevent the Driver No. 217, Mr Julian Frasnelli (“Driver No. 217”), from overtaking him and performed a manoeuvre to that end (“the Incident”). The Incident (referred to by the Appellant as a “manoeuvre”) comprised three identifiable parts which are addressed below.
8. Mr Nigel Edwards, Race Director, reported it to Mr Kris Lambrecht, Head of Race Control.
9. Subsequently, Mr Kris Lambrecht drafted a report (“the Report” – FIA’s Appendix 3), which described the Incident as follows:

“ÉNONCÉ/STATEMENT

Dangerous Blocking Tag 139

MOTIF/REASON

Kart no 203 was dangerous blocking kart no 217.

Reported bij [sic] the Race Director

Tag 139

MP Start/Finish line

Cam. 1

Time 13.33.27

Lap 19”.

10. The official cameras that captured the Incident were: (i) the CCTV1 (also named “Cam. 1”, as stated in the Report); and (ii) the streaming cameras that recorded and broadcast the session. Each of these cameras recorded a video of the Incident, which are provided as follows:
 - Video of the CCTV 1 Camera / Cam. 1 (Video 1 – FIA’s Appendix 4),
 - Video of the streaming cameras (Video 2 – FIA’s Appendix 5).
11. The Report was provided to the Stewards who, having examined it, summoned Driver No. 203 and the Team. A hearing was held on that same day at the Stewards’ office, where the Stewards heard Fusion Motorsport’s Team Manager, Mr Zac Krekelaar, and Driver No. 203.
12. Also on 12 April 2026, once the Stewards had analysed all the relevant evidence and had heard the Appellant and the Driver, they issued their decision at 14:23 (“the Appealed Decision” or “the Decision No. 269”). In it, they found that Driver No. 203 performed an unsafe manoeuvre by dangerously blocking another driver on the start/finish line, in breach of Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct.

13. Consequently, the Stewards decided to impose a penalty in accordance with Article 2.24 of the CIK-FIA 2026 Karting General Prescriptions (“the General Prescriptions”) and Article 12.4 of the International Sporting Code (“the Code”). Driver No. 203 was thus disqualified from the Final Phase of the Competition, and two points were removed from his Digital Licence.
14. The Appealed Decision was notified to the Appellant on 12 April 2026 at 14:24 and reads in essence as follows:

“(…) STATEMENT:

Disqualification from the above-mentioned session.

2 Points on the Digital Licence.

“(…) REASON:

The Stewards having received a report from the Race Control (Doc n°186) requested by the Race Director, having examined this report, summoned and heard the Driver and Competitor concerned (Summon Doc n°267), have considered the following matter, determine the following:

The above-mentioned Driver did an unsafe manoeuvre by blocking dangerously on the start/finish line. This fact is a violation against Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct. The Stewards impose this penalty according to Art. 2.24 of the CIK FIA 2026 General Prescriptions and Art. 12.4 of the 2026 FIA International Sporting Code. (…)

[emphasis in the original text]

15. On that same day at 14:35, within one hour of the notification of the Appealed Decision, the Appellant notified its intention to appeal.
16. Subsequently, at 15:04, the Stewards issued the Document No. 283, whereby they suspended the effects of the Appealed Decision, in accordance with Article 12.3.3.a of the Code.
17. Benefiting from the suspensive effect, Driver No. 203 finished the Final Phase in 5th position, thereby scoring 30 Championship Points.
18. Due to his participation in the Competition, Driver No. 203 scored a total of 80 Championship Points, placing him in 2nd position in the Championship standings after the Competition.



II. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE COURT

19. On 16 April 2026, at 12:50 (CEST), within 96 hours of the notification of the intention to appeal to the Stewards, the ICA received the notification of appeal from the Appellant.
20. On 27 April 2026, the Appellant requested the FIA Legal Office via email to provide *“a copy of the video footage shown by the stewards to the driver at the hearing”*.
21. On 30 April 2026, the FIA Legal Office provided the video footage requested by the Appellant, namely, Video 1.
22. On 7 May 2026, the Appellant provided its Grounds for appeal.
23. On 29 May 2026, the FIA notified its Response to the Grounds for appeal.
24. On 5 June 2026, at 21:38, the Appellant filed a procedural request with the Court requesting, principally, that the second (*“contact with driver No. 217”*) and third (*“crowding driver No. 217 beyond the edge of the track”*) breaches alleged by the FIA in its Grounds in response be struck-out from the proceedings or, in the alternative, permission given to respond in writing prior to the hearing.
25. On 9 June 2026 at 16:02, the FIA filed its Observations on the Appellant’s procedural request arguing that whether or not to include the second and third breaches alleged by the FIA falls within the scope of the Judging Panel’s assessment of the merits of the case and not of a mere procedural decision by the President of the Hearing.
26. On 10 June 2026, the President of the Hearing issued the Procedural Decision No. 1, deciding *inter alia* that *“The Appellant’s main request to strike-out from the proceedings the second and third breaches alleged by the FIA is dismissed at this stage and will be fully examined by the Judging Panel.”*

III. REQUESTS OF THE PARTIES

27. The Appellant asks the Court to set aside the Appealed Decision and remove the disqualification from the Junior Final and the associated penalty points imposed upon the Driver’s Digital Licence. In the alternative, the Appellant asks the Court to substitute the penalty with a lesser sanction and/or grant such further relief as the Court considers appropriate.



28. In its Grounds in Response, the FIA asks the Court to dismiss the appeal, to confirm the Appealed Decision in its entirety and to order the Appellant to pay the costs of the appeal in accordance with Article 15.2 of the 2026 FIA Judicial and Disciplinary Rules (“the JDR”).

IV. ADMISSIBILITY OF THE APPEAL BEFORE THE COURT

29. The Court notes that the FIA does not contend that the appeal was not brought in accordance with the provisions of the JDR.
30. The Court also considers that it has jurisdiction to hear this appeal.
31. Therefore, the Court deems the appeal admissible.

V. ON THE SUBSTANCE

a) Arguments of the Parties

The Appellant

32. The Appellant puts forward in essence that the Manoeuvre did not constitute a dangerous one and therefore did not amount to a breach of Article 3.6.2 b) and e) of the Code of Driving Conduct.
33. The Appellant further contends that the penalty imposed by the Stewards in the Appealed Decision is disproportionate.
34. From a procedural point of view, the Appellant argues that the Stewards’ failure to specify the specific sub-provision of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct that would have been breached by the Driver fails to meet the standards of clarity and transparency, necessary to ensure a fair opportunity to understand and respond to the allegations. In other words, this situation amounts to a breach of its right of defence.
35. Relying on the video footages of the Incident and on telemetry data, the Appellant claims that the Manoeuvre was not dangerous and that the Driver maintained a consistent and controlled trajectory throughout the latter, which was purely defensive.
36. The Appellant stresses that the Stewards do not refer to any contact in the Appealed Decision and only refer to Driver No. 203 allegedly blocking Driver No. 217.



37. Driver No. 217, who was subjected to the Manoeuvre, retained sufficient momentum to continue his overtaking manoeuvre and complete the pass, with no material loss of control or avoidance action being required. Also, Driver No. 203 ultimately lost the position, as well as a further position, which, according to the Appellant, undermines the allegation that Driver No. 217 was dangerously impeded and unlawfully prevented from overtaking, or materially hindered by the manoeuvre in question.
38. Driver No. 217 was at no point pushed outside of the confines of the track by Driver No. 203.
39. The Appellant contends further that Driver No. 203 is the only competitor to have been disqualified for an alleged breach of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct without any aggravating elements having been recorded against him.
40. In that context, the Appellant refers to various Stewards' decisions where drivers caused collisions or forced a driver off the track, and were sanctioned with a 5-second time penalty and 1 point on their Digital licence.
41. According to the Appellant, the Officials' application of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct is further illustrated by a comparable incident in the Super Heat B where during Lap 12, Driver No. 205 made multiple defensive changes of direction and forced a competitor fully beyond the track limits. The Appellant stresses that this incident occurred on the same section of the circuit as that which led to the Appealed Decision. This incident was reported by the Race Director but did not result in any penalty by the Stewards. The Appellant claims that this indicates that the Officials had accepted this as legitimate racing conduct, and that equivalent manoeuvres would not result in any penalty.
42. The Appellant acknowledges the established FIA appellate principle that the Court should ordinarily exercise restraint before interfering with factual assessments made by the Stewards, particularly in driving conduct matters where the Stewards have had the benefit of reviewing contemporaneous evidence and race control materials. However, the Appellant submits that it is reasonable to do so in the present case because the Court has before it additional video footage that the Appellant understands was not considered by the Stewards at the time the Appealed Decision was rendered. The Appellant refers on this point to the Case ICA-2022-03, *Koski Motorsport*, par. 66.



43. In its procedural request, the Appellant contends that Decision No. 269 found only that the Driver "*did an unsafe manoeuvre by blocking dangerously on the start/finish line*", which the Stewards stated was "*a violation against Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct*". The Appealed Decision did not identify any sub-provision of Article 3.6, and made no finding of contact or collision, nor any finding that another kart was crowded or forced beyond the edge of the track. The attempt by the FIA to recharacterise the single manoeuvre as three distinctive breaches (i.e. that the single Incident comprised three breaches - see para. 51 below) must be rejected as the alleged second and third breaches) were not the subject of any finding in Decision No. 269. According to the Appellant, "*they appear, in the present form, for the first time in the Response.*"

The FIA

44. The FIA states first that the Appealed Decision contained a minor clerical error in failing to cite the specific sub-provision of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct. Nevertheless, under Article 11.7.5 of the Code, the Appellant was entitled to request, following notification of the Appealed Decision, that the Stewards who issued it correct or clarify any clerical error present in the reasoning and/or the operative part thereof, provided that such correction or clarification did not alter or modify the substantive meaning of the decision. The FIA also submits that neither the FIA Karting Regulations nor the JDR stipulate any mandatory content for a Stewards' decision. Consequently, the Appellant's contention that the Appealed Decision lacks the required clarity to meet the standard of a properly reasoned and transparent judicial decision, is unfounded and without merit.
45. Even if it is true that the Appealed Decision contained a minor clerical error in failing to cite the specific sub-provision of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct that was breached, the principles of predictability and legality put forward by the Appellant concern the applicable rules, not the Appealed Decision. Accordingly, the clerical error of the specific Article in the Appealed Decision does not constitute a breach of those principles. However, the Appellant could have nevertheless requested a correction or clarification as ruled by the ICA in the case ICA-2025-01, *SRP Racing Shop*, par. 23.
46. The FIA adds that any breach of the Appellant's right of defence could be cured by the devolutive effect of the Appeal before the ICA.



47. Although the FIA does not dispute that only one video (the so-called Video 1) was shown to the Appellant, the FIA contends that the other video produced by the Appellant in these proceedings (the so-called Video 2), which was anyway available to the Stewards when they issued the Appealed Decision, does not entail new evidence and should not be considered as “*new evidence*”.
48. The Driver’s change of direction was not a natural continuation of the ideal racing line. On the contrary, Driver No. 203 moved away from the left-hand side of the track and towards the middle/right-hand side, directly into the path of Driver No. 217, to impede the overtake.
49. The footage therefore shows that the Manoeuvre was clearly an unsafe blocking manoeuvre. Driver No. 203 did not merely defend his position by choosing a racing line, but he reacted to Driver No. 217’s overtaking attempt by dangerously changing the direction of his kart, making contact with Driver No. 217, crowding him and forcing him beyond the edge of the track.
50. Such conduct left Driver No. 217 with no sufficient space and no viable option to stay on the track. Had Driver No. 203 intended to defend his position in accordance with fair racing standards, he could have done so without making contact with Driver No. 217 and while leaving him sufficient space on the right-hand side of the track.
51. Driver No. 203 committed three breaches of the Code of Driving Conduct namely 1) a dangerous change of direction, 2) contact with Driver No. 217 and 3) crowding the latter beyond the edge of the track. Driver No. 203 therefore breached Articles 3.6.2 b) and 3.6.2 e) of the Code of Driving Conduct.
52. As to the Appellant’s argument that the Manoeuvre did not impede Driver No. 217 from overtaking Driver No. 203, the FIA argues that a breach of the Code of Driving Conduct arises at the moment the manoeuvre is performed. The fact that Driver No. 203 did not benefit from the Manoeuvre does not alter the unlawful nature of the driving conduct followed by the latter.
53. Coming to the issue of the proportionality of the sanction, the FIA argues that the sanction imposed on the Appellant and its Driver is in line with numerous precedents dealing with similar incidents. The disqualification and removal of two points from a Driver’s digital licence is therefore a proportionate penalty. As a rebuttal to the submissions made by the Appellant on the alleged disproportionality of the sanction imposed on Driver No. 203, the FIA produces the video of the 12 incidents mentioned by the Appellant in its Appeal Brief in order to support its submissions.

54. According to the FIA, the Driver's degree of culpability is high as the video footages confirm that he was fully aware of Driver No. 217's position and he nonetheless deliberately executed the blocking Manoeuvre.
55. The FIA stresses that the Driver *"has been sanctioned in every competition of the Championship during both 2025 and 2026"* so that the Driver's prior racing conduct cannot be used as a mitigating circumstance. The FIA produces seven decisions issued against Driver No. 203 to support this submission.
56. In its opinion on the Appellant's procedural request, the FIA argues that *"the ICA has all the decision-making powers of the authority that took the contested decision"* and that *"it would thus amount to narrowing the Court's review to a single part of the Manoeuvre because the Appellant is of the opinion that only that specific sub-provision of the Code of Driving Conduct was breached, disregarding other factual aspects of the Incident that are inherent to what the Stewards sanctioned as "an unsafe manoeuvre by blocking dangerously on the start/finish line", in blatant breach of Article. 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct."* According to the FIA, the Stewards did find that the Driver *"committed an unsafe manoeuvre consisting of blocking dangerously on the start/finish line (i.e. the overall manoeuvre under review) and referred to a violation of Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct, without confining the prohibited racing conduct to a single breach of the Code of Driving Conduct."*

b) Conclusions of the Court

Applicable Regulations

57. The applicable regulations relevant to the present case are:

- the 2026 FIA International Sporting Code;
- the 2026 FIA Karting European Championship - Junior Sporting Regulations ("the Sporting Regulations");
- the 2026 CIK-FIA Karting General Prescriptions ("the General Prescriptions");
- the 2026 CIK-FIA Karting Specific Prescriptions ("the Specific Prescriptions");
- the 2026 FIA International Drivers Licences for Karting Drivers and Code of Driving Conduct ("the Code of Driving Conduct");

(hereinafter jointly referred to as: "the FIA Karting Regulations")

As well as:

- the Supplementary Regulations of the Competition ("the Supplementary Regulations").

The breach of the Regulations and the proportionality of the sanctions

58. The Stewards found in the Appealed Decision that Driver No. 203 *“did an unsafe manoeuvre by blocking dangerously on the start/finish line. This fact is a violation against Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct. The Stewards impose this penalty according to Art. 2.24 of the CIK FIA 2026 General Provisions and Art. 12.4 of the 2026 FIA International Sporting Code.”*
59. Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct provides the following:

“3.6 CODE OF DRIVING CONDUCT ON KARTING CIRCUITS

3.6.1 - Observance of signals

The instructions detailed in Article 2.15 of the General Prescriptions and in Article 2.3 of the Circuit Regulations (Part II) are deemed to be part of this Code of Driving Conduct. All Drivers must abide by them.

3.6.2 - Overtaking during a race

a) A kart alone on the track may use the full width of the said track. However, as soon as it is caught by a kart which is about to lap it the Driver must allow the faster Driver past at the first possible opportunity. If the Driver who has been caught does not seem to notice that another Driver wants to overtake him, flag Marshals will display waved blue flags to indicate that the faster Driver wants to overtake. Any Driver who appears to ignore the blue flags will be reported to the Stewards of the meeting.

b) Overtaking, according to the circumstances, may be carried out either on the right or the left. However, manoeuvres liable to hinder other Drivers such as more than one change of direction to defend a position, deliberate crowding of karts beyond the edge of the track or any other dangerous change of direction, are strictly prohibited. Any Driver who appears guilty of any of the above offences will be reported to the Stewards of the meeting.

c) Drivers must use the track at all times. For the avoidance of doubt:

- the white lines defining the track edges are considered to be part of the track but kerbs are not.

- a Driver will be judged to have left the track if no part of the kart remains in contact with the track.

Should a kart leave the track for any reason, and without prejudice to 2d) below, the Driver may rejoin. However, this may only be done when it is safe to do so and without gaining any advantage.

d) Repetition of serious mistakes or the appearance of a lack of control over the kart (such as leaving the track) will be reported to the Stewards of the meeting and may entail the disqualification of any Drivers concerned.

e) Contacts / collisions (during the race, deceleration [sic] lap included): sanctions may be imposed on a Driver who pushes another Competitor.

3.6.3 - Karts stopping during a race

a) The Driver of any kart leaving the track because of being unable to maintain racing speed and should signal the intention to do so in good time and is responsible for ensuring that the manoeuvre is carried out safely and as near as possible to a point of exit.

b) Should a kart stop outside the pit lane or outside the Repair Area, it must be moved as soon as possible so that its presence does not constitute a danger or hinder other Drivers.

If the Driver is unable to move the kart, it shall be the duty of the Marshals to assist. If such assistance results in the Driver rejoining the race, this must be done without committing any breach of the regulations and without gaining any advantage.

c) Replenishment of any kind is prohibited, save when the kart concerned is in an area specifically provided for this purpose.

d) Apart from the Driver and duly appointed officials, nobody is allowed to touch a stopped kart except when in the pit lane or in the Repair Area.

e) Except during a race suspension, any kart abandoned on the circuit by its Driver, even temporarily, shall be considered as withdrawn from the race.

3.6.4 - Entrance to the pit lane (to the Repair Area or to the "Finish Park")

a) The so-called «deceleration zone» is a part of the pits area. The section of track leading to the pit lane shall be referred to as the «pit entry».

b) During the practice sessions and the race, access to the pits lane, to the Repair Area or to the "Finish Park" is allowed only through the pit entry. deceleration zone. The penalty for a breach of this rule shall be disqualification from the race.

c) Any Driver intending to leave the track or to enter the pit lane, pits or the "Finish Park" or the Repair Area shall signal his intention in good time and should make sure that it is safe to do so.

d) Except in cases of force majeure (accepted as such by the Stewards of the meeting), the crossing, in any direction, of the line separating the pit entry deceleration zone and the track is prohibited.

e) Except in cases of force majeure (accepted as such by the Stewards of the meeting), any line painted on the track at the pit exit or the Repair Area for the purpose of separating karts leaving the pits or the Repair Area from those on the track must not be crossed by any part of a kart leaving the pits."

60. Article 2.24 of the CIK FIA General Prescriptions provides the following:

"2.24 – Incidents

An «Incident» means a fact or a series of facts involving one or several Drivers (or any Driver's action reported to the Stewards by the Clerk of the Course or the Race Director or noted by the Stewards and reported to the Clerk of the Course or the Race Director for investigation), who:

- *provoked the stopping of a Race in application of Article 12 of the Code;*
- *violated these Sporting Regulations or the Code;*
- *have jumped the start;*
- *started from an incorrect position (e.g. ahead of the pole sitter during a rolling start);*
- *have not respected flag signalling;*
- *have caused one or several karts to take a false start;*
- *have caused a collision;*
- *have forced another Driver out of the track;*
- *had the front fairing on the kart in the incorrect position;*
- *have illegally prevented a legitimate passing manoeuvre by a Driver;*
- *have illegally impeded another Driver during a passing manoeuvre;*
- *have not respected the Briefing Notes;*
- *have not respected the Race Director Event Notes;*
- *have not respected the Stewards decisions.*

a) *It will be the responsibility of the Stewards to decide if one or several Driver(s) is/are involved in an Incident; he/they must not leave the circuit without the Stewards' agreement.*

b) *If a Driver is involved in an Incident, and if he was informed of this by the Stewards within thirty minutes after the end of the Race, he must not leave the circuit without their agreement.*

c) *The Stewards may use any video or electronic system likely to help them to take a decision.*

The Stewards shall inflict a 5-second time penalty on any Driver having caused an Incident. If the Incident was caused during a Qualifying Practice session, they shall proceed to the cancellation of the fastest lap which he achieved in the session concerned. However, depending on the gravity of the infringements in light of the facts, the Stewards may decide, instead of the 5-second time penalty, on a sanction among those provided for in the penalty scale of Article 12.4 of the Code, unless the offence relates to the position of the front fairing of the kart.

Time penalties for false starts, including overtaking after the red line in the formation lap, crossing the corridor lines during the starting procedure and being in an irregular position on the starting grid, will be automatically imposed by the Stewards on the Driver concerned without a hearing."

[emphasis added]

61. Article 12.4 "Scale of Penalties" of the Code provides the following:

"12.4.1 Penalties may be inflicted as follows:

(...)

12.4.1.m Disqualification;(...)

62. The Court finds first that the video shown at the hearing proves beyond any doubt that the Incident caused by the Driver was an unsafe manoeuvre that blocked Driver No. 217 and as such was "*strictly prohibited*" under Article 3.6 of the Code of Driving Conduct.

63. The Court finds further that the single Incident comprises three parts, namely (1) an unsafe manoeuvre which was "*liable to hinder*" Driver No. 217, as provided under Article 3.6.2 lit. b) of the Code of Driving Conduct, (2) contact within the meaning of Article 3.6.2 lit. e) where (3) the Driver crowded Driver No. 217 beyond the edge of the track, within the meaning of Article 3.6.2 lit. b) of the Code of Driving Conduct.



64. The Appellant claims first that the mere reference to Article 3.6 of the 2026 FIA Code of Driving Conduct and, more generally, the procedure before the Stewards violates its right of defence.
65. The Court rejects this submission as the Appellant was able to make its case in full before the Court, which the Appellant admitted at the hearing. According to the constant ICA jurisprudence and save for exceptional circumstances which are not met here, the appeal before the Court cures any procedural irregularity or violation in the first instance.
66. As to the fact that Driver No. 203 did not gain any advantage from the Incident, and that, by contrast, Driver No. 217 allegedly did not lose any advantage due to the Incident and that no damage resulted from the Incident, the Court stresses that the Regulations are preventive by nature and that, in any event, any incident caused by a wrongful manoeuvre must be sanctioned without considering the consequences of such Incident.
67. The fact that the Incident did not lead to an accident does not mean that the latter cannot be considered as “dangerous” *per se*. It is the case here, as the first part of the Incident, that the aggressive and deliberate change of direction could without any doubt have led to dangerous consequences, depending for instance on the reaction of Driver No. 217 who could have hit Driver No. 203 in a sector of the circuit where the karts were running at full speed. In other words, the Court finds that Driver No. 203 did not only proceed with a disproportionate and unjustified change of direction in order to defend his position, but that this extreme change of direction was inherently dangerous and could have led to dramatic consequences.
68. As to the two other parts of the Incident, those are specifically referred to under Article 3.6.2 of the Code of Driving Conduct which is part of Article 3.6 mentioned by the Stewards in the Appealed Decision. The Court therefore rejects the Appellant’s submissions according to which the Appealed Decision did not refer to the second and third parts of the Incident. Those two parts comprise one Incident and one cannot deduce from the wording of the Appealed Decision that the Stewards did not see it that way, for the simple reason that the Stewards did not specifically refer to contact or to Driver No. 217 having been forced off the track.
69. In any event, the Court stresses that it can review the case *de novo* and that the video footage shown to the Court confirms the second and third parts of the Incident which are part of the Incident committed by the Driver.
70. Based on the foregoing, the submissions made by the Appellant, notably in its request for a procedural decision and at the hearing are rejected.



71. Coming now to the proportionality of the sanction, the Court refers to its own jurisprudence, notably in the case *Koski Motorsport* (ICA-2022-03, para. 68), and stresses that it should exercise restraint when reassessing incidents and the penalties imposed by the Stewards, unless new evidence is available that was not accessible to the Stewards at the time of their decision, which is not the case here.
72. In this respect, the Court carefully studied the precedents put forward by both parties and comes to the conclusion that, contrary to what the Appellant submitted before the Court, the sanctions pronounced by the Stewards in the Appealed Decision are consistent with the constant practice of the Stewards in other similar cases. In other words, the sanctions issued by the Stewards are proportionate and justified given the need to ensure the safety of karting competitions.
73. With the above-mentioned duty to exercise restraint when reassessing the penalties imposed by the Stewards in mind, the Court does indeed not see in the present case any specific circumstances that should lead it to reduce the sanctions imposed by the Stewards in the Appealed Decision.
74. In particular, the alleged “*clean record*” of Driver No. 203 cannot be considered as a mitigating circumstance that would lead the Court to reduce the penalties issued by the Stewards. The Appellant had the opportunity to clarify its submission on this point, confirming that by “*clean record*”, the Appellant meant the absence of similar sanctions issued against Driver No. 203 in the past, irrespective of previous sanctions imposed on Driver No. 203 for minor infringements which led to milder penalties.
75. For the sake of clarity, the Court stresses that, on the other hand, it did not consider the previous sanctions issued against Driver No. 203 when assessing the proportionality of the penalties imposed on Driver No. 203.
76. Although the Court appreciates the fact that any competition implies that drivers are doing their best to finish in the best possible position, it remains that certain rules are to be applied to ensure that this healthy spirit of competition is exercised in the safest possible way and not beyond certain limits. In that sense, the FIA Karting Regulations are of course in place, amongst others, in order to ensure safety on the track, which is a cardinal condition for a fair and sustainable competition.
77. The Court therefore concludes that the Driver committed a breach of the Karting Regulations, namely Articles 3.6.2 b) and e), and that the sanctions imposed by the Stewards are proportionate. Decision No. 269 is thus upheld.



VI. COSTS

78. Considering the outcome of the proceedings, the Court leaves it to the Appellant to bear all the costs.



ON THESE GROUNDS,

THE FIA INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL:

- 1. Declares the appeal admissible;**
- 2. Upholds Decision No. 269, dated 12 April 2026, of the Stewards of the Muro-Leccese Competition (Italy) counting towards the 2026 Mondokart.com FIA Karting European Championship – Junior;**
- 3. Orders the competent Sporting Authority to draw, as appropriate, the consequences of this ruling;**
- 4. Orders the Appellant to pay the costs, in accordance with Article 15.2 of the Judicial and Disciplinary Rules of the FIA, to be calculated by the General Secretariat of the Courts and notified later on;**
- 5. Rejects all other and further conclusions.**

Paris, 2nd July 2026

The President

Rui Botica Santos