

5 - 7 September

Date: Thursday, 4th September 2025

Time (Decision): 20:25

Subject:

DECISION No. 1

Document No.: 2.2

From:

The Stewards

To:

Competitor car no 2 Name: Andrea MABELLINI

Crew: Andrea MABELLINI/Virginia LENZI

Number of pages: 4

Attachments:

[...]

The Stewards, having received a report from the FIA Safety Delegate with photo evidence attached, summoned, and heard the Competitor/the driver Mr. Andrea Mabellini, the Co-driver Ms. Virginia Lenzi, Mr. Manuel Huguet Panella, Mr. Andre Barbosa, FIA Safety Delegate Mr. Benjamin Schmidt, Deputy Clerk of the Course /Chief Safety Officer Ms. Sue Sanders. The stewards have considered the following matter and determine the following:

Fact:

Team personnel members of Competitor Car No 2 were identified as being on the SS10/12 at

11:17 on Wednesday 03.09.25.

Offence:

Breach of Art. 35.3 and Art. 35.4.2 of the FIA 2025 RRSR, art. 9 of the SR, art. 12.2.1.c of the FIA

2025 ISC.

Decision:

to impose 2-minute time penalty on the Competitor Car No 2 in Leg 1

Reason: The Stewards received a report from the FIA Safety Delegate that on Wednesday (03.09.2025) at 11:17 a.m., Sue Sanders (Chief Safety Officer - CSO) and he (FIA Safety Delegate) conducted a safety check when they approached a car (plate number: KM25 XHN) with two people at the TC stop on SS 10/12. When CSO asked if everything was okay and if they were looking for anything, they replied that they are engineers from car No. 2 Mabellini. They said that the rally car was still at customs, so they had nothing to do.

The Stewards launched an investigation. On Wednesday (03.09.2025), the Stewards summoned representatives of the Competitor. The hearing began in the STW room on the same day at 21:45. The Competitor was represented by crew members Mr. Andrea Mabellini (who is also the competitor of the car no2) and Ms. Virginia Lenzi.

When the Stewards asked the Competitor's representatives what the team members were doing on SS 10/12 at the time specified in the FIA Safety Delegate report, the representatives explained that there were people there with whom all contracts had already been terminated and who had not been team members since Tuesday evening. Therefore, at the time they were spotted on SS 10/12, they were no longer team members, as their contracts had been terminated the day before the incident.

The representatives also explained that they did indeed have evidence that the contracts with the aforementioned individuals had been terminated. They provided the Stewards with messages sent to the organiser requesting a change of location in the service park because, in their words, they no longer had their former engineer and were forced to ask to be placed next to competitor No. 4 so that they could use the services of the same engineer used by competitor No. 4. The Stewards verified that the messages



5 - 7 September

shown by the representatives were not sent on Tuesday evening (when, according to the representatives, the contracts with the former team members/engineers were terminated), but on Wednesday, when the Stewards had already sent the summons to the hearing.

The Stewards also asked the representatives how it happened that the summons to the hearing was sent to them electronically at 19:42, but they (the Stewards) had to wait almost two hours (till 21:35) for a response confirming receipt of the summons. And it was during those two hours that they (the Competitor's representatives) sent requests to the organiser and official persons asking to change their place in the service park.

There was no clear response.

The representatives repeated many times that they had terminated the agreements on Tuesday. And that everything that happened on Wednesday could in no way be related to their team.

The hearing was suspended and resumed the next day. A summons was sent to Mr. Manuel Huguet Panella, who was driving the car at the time of the incident (when the car with two people was spotted on SS 10/12), in order to clarify more of the facts. The hearing continued at 14:15 on 04.09.2025. Mr. Manuel Huguet Panella explained that his contract had been terminated on the Competitor's initiative on Tuesday evening. He was unable to explain to the Stewards why, on Wednesday (the day after, in his words, his contract had been terminated), he told the FIA Safety Delegate and the CSO that he is still the team's engineer.

In the Stewards' opinion, the explanations provided by the Competitor's representatives and Mr. Manuel Huguet Panella raise doubts due to their inconsistency. The Stewards also believe that such explanations (that the contracts were terminated on Tuesday evening) are not supported by any objective data that the Stewards could consider sufficient evidence. On the contrary, the principle applies in law that in order for an agreement between two parties (in this case, an agreement to terminate a contract) to have consequences for third parties (in this case, all those who did not participate in the agreement to terminate the contract), the two contracting parties must inform those third parties in a timely manner. In this case (if the contract had indeed been terminated on Tuesday evening), in order to ensure that the actions of the two persons (who were on SS 10/12 on Wednesday at 11:17) did not have any consequences for the Competitor, the latter should have informed all interested third parties (in this case, the officials of the event and so on) on Tuesday evening that the specific individuals could no longer be considered team members as of Tuesday evening. If other interested parties are not aware of the agreement between the two parties (in this case, to terminate the contract), such an agreement between the two parties cannot have any consequences for those who are not aware of the agreement.

This is particularly important when (as already mentioned) no evidence confirming the termination of the contract on Tuesday evening was presented to the Stewards, apart from verbal explanations.

The Stewards' suspicions were confirmed (and later substantiated) by the investigation, which was subsequently extended.

The hearing was suspended and later resumed (at 16:00). Another person (Mr. Andre Barbosa), who was in the car on SS 10/12 at the time of the incident, was summoned to the hearing.

During the hearing, it was unequivocally confirmed that the latter person (Mr. Andre Barbosa) continues to represent and assist the team.



5 - 7 September

Although he explained to the Stewards that he is not the team's actual engineer, as he has not yet completed his studies, he confirmed that he is the team representative who communicates with the organisers' representatives and officials of the event via email. It was he who sent emails on Wednesday evening and later, providing the latest known information about when the team's rally car would arrive, etc. He told the Stewards that he did not consider himself a representative of the team, that he was only assisting the team. In the Stewards' opinion, it is clear that he is a representative of the team if he performs the functions of a team representative. It is irrelevant whether this is considered representation or assistance to the team. It is clear that he is a member of the team. His links with the team are completely obvious.

Although Mr. Andre Barbosa explained that he has no written contracts with either the Competitor or the team, he confirmed that he acts on behalf of the team on the basis of verbal agreements.

When the Stewards asked what currently connects him to The Racing Factory (whose details are provided in the entry form of the Competitor car No. 2), Mr. Barbosa replied that there is no written contract.

When asked by the Stewards how he could explain why he (along with his photo) is listed on The Racing Factory website alongside other members, he confirmed that he is acting on the basis of a verbal agreement.

Thus, the Stewards' investigation confirmed that at the time indicated in the FIA Safety Delegate report, there were individuals on SS10/12 who were undoubtedly associated with Competitor car No. 2. At least one of them continues to act on behalf of the Competitor and the team even after the Stewards' investigation.

The Stewards do not have any proof that any crew member was on SS10/12. However, according to the FIA 2025 RRSR Art. 2.23 a team is made up of the competitor, the crew and support personnel. Article 35.3 of the FIA 2025 RRSR specifies that as from the publication of the rally Supplementary Regulations, any driver, or his co-driver, or any other team member who has entered or intends to enter a Championship rally and who wishes to drive on any road which is used as a special stage in that rally, may only do so after he has obtained the organiser's written permission.

FIA 2025 RRSR Art. 35.4.2 states that only with the express authorisation of the Clerk of the Course may any person connected with an entered crew travel on or over the route of a special stage of the rally (except on foot) from the publication of the rally Supplementary Regulations until that special stage is terminated, open for public traffic and will no longer be used within the rally. The provisions of Art. 35.3 must nevertheless be respected.

The Stewards conclude that the presence of support personnel on a Special Stage 10/12 is a breach of the FIA 2025 RRSR Art. 35.3 and Art. 35.4.2. At the same time, this constitutes a violation of Art. 9 of the Supplementary Regulations.

Art. 12.1.1.a of the code makes clear that offences or infringements are punishable, whether they were committed intentionally or through negligence.

Every Competitor and driver should also be aware that visiting the SS before the scheduled time is not only unsportsmanlike towards his competitors, but also causes considerable difficulties for the organiser to get permits in the following year. The reputation of rallying is damaged by behaviour like this.



5 - 7 September

The stewards also consider that the facts set out above in this decision confirm that, in this case, the actions of the team members and the Competitor undoubtedly constitute a violation of Article 12.2.1.c of the FIA 2025 ISC. Such behaviour is unacceptable and undoubtedly leads to the conclusion that it meets the definition of a violation: Any fraudulent conduct or any act prejudicial to the interests of any Competition or to the interests of motor sport generally.

The Stewards feel that this infringement of the reconnaissance regulations may have led to the crew gaining an unfair advantage over fellow competitors and thus they decide on a time penalty.

For the violation specified in Art.12.2.1.c of the FIA 2025 ISC, the Stewards could impose an additional penalty, but in this case, considering that the sporting penalty (time penalty) is a sufficient punishment for the Competitor's behaviour, they decide not to impose an additional penalty. The Stewards decide that in this case (regarding the violation provided for in Article 12.2.1.c of the FIA 2025 ISC), it is sufficient to establish that the violation has been committed without imposing an additional penalty.

Competitors are reminded that they have the right to appeal certain decisions of the Stewards, in accordance with Article 15 of the FIA International Sporting Code and Chapter 4 of the FIA Judicial and Disciplinary Rules, within the applicable time limits.

According to Art. 12.3.3.b of the FIA 2025 ISC this decision of the Stewards becomes immediately binding even in the event of an appeal, since it concerns a breach of Article 12.2.1.c

Arnas PALIUKENAS (LTU)
FIA Chair of the Panel of Stewards

Jároslaw NOWOROL (POL)

FIA Steward

Jonathan LORD (GBR)

ASN Steward

Name in block letters

Alows of alero

Date

04/09/25

Position in the team

Tean funger

Signature

Date

04/09/25