

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSOM Reference Number 25
Jose Osiris Peña vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 25-01-RO
October 2, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following Qualifying Session 1 for Super Touring Under (STU) on October 2, 2025, at the SCCA Runoffs at Road America, Race Director Steve Pence submitted a Chief Steward's Action (CSA) removing all qualifying times from Jose Osiris Peña, driver of STU #199, citing multiple readings that exceeded the sound level limits for the event. Mr. Peña protested the Race Director's action.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Gloria Larson and Mike Smith (Chair) interviewed witnesses, reviewed sound logs, and determined Mr. Peña's car exceeded the allowable decibels. The SOM disallowed Mr. Peña's protest.

Mr. Peña appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Lee Hill, Jack Kish, and Costa Dunias (Chair) met on October 2, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mr. Peña, received on October 2, 2025.
2. SOM Hearing, Decision, and related documents, received October 2, 2025.
3. Witness Statement and in-person testimony from Steve Pence, Race Director, received October 2, 2025.
4. The court visited the sound control location and interviewed the crew to ascertain facts and view the operation in action on October 2, 2025.
5. Manual for Quest Technologies Model 2700 Impulse Sound Meter.
6. SCCA Sound Control Manual (Rev2018).

FINDINGS

In his appeal Mr. Peña states the Race Director raised the increment for sound levels from 103 to 108 due to the large number of readings over 103dB within all classes. He also stated he had not modified his car since arrival for test days and had never had issues with sound before this week. He also said he had not been notified of issues by SOC. He believed something was amiss with the sound equipment.

The COA reviewed all available documentation including the SCCA Sound Control Manual, evaluated the Sound Control processes, discussed the equipment and procedures with the Sound Control Team, and examined additional evidence.

The COA was satisfied the Sound crew was following procedures required by the Sound Control Manual. Therefore, the COA focused on the meter as the possible culprit because of its designed purpose. The device in use was Quest Model 2700, an Impulse Sound Level Meter. The manual for this device does not indicate it is capable of reading time weighted average sound levels as required per the SCCA Sound Control Manual (Rev2018). An Impulse Sound Level Meter measures and reports the highest reading within the selected measurement period rather than the time weighted average dB over 125 milliseconds pass by as specified in the Sound Control Manual.

The COA found the implemented procedures are consistent with the Sound Control Manual, yet the sound readings were being impacted by unknown factors believed to involve the meter being used due to reasons stated above.

DECISION

The COA overturned the SOM decision against Mr. Peña. The Penalty of loss of qualifying times was removed and his times for Qualifying Session 1 were restored. Mr. Peña's appeal was well founded and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, was returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSC Reference No. 57
Francisco Barroso vs. SOM COA Ref. 25-02-RO
October 4, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following Qualifying Session 2 for Spec Miata (SM) on October 3, 2025, at the SCCA Runoffs at Road America, Race Director Steve Pence submitted a Chief Steward's Action (CSA) against Francisco (Frankie) Barroso, driver of SM #48, for violation of Supplemental Regulations (Supps) 5.15.4. (Out lap procedures for Qualifying). Mr. Barroso was penalized with loss of his two fastest times on the final qualifying grid. He protested the Race Director's action.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Jerry Anderson, Kathy Bradley, and Bob Gardner (Chair) interviewed witnesses, reviewed documents and statements, viewed video, and determined Mr. Barroso made excessive movements on track constituting "weaving" after Turn 8 on his first lap of the qualifying session. The SOM disallowed Mr. Barroso's protest.

Mr. Barroso appealed the SOM's decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Costa Dunias, Jack Kish, and Laurie Sheppard (Chair) met on October 4, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mr. Barroso, received October 3, 2025.
2. SOM Decision, associated documents, and video from several sources, received October 3, 2025.
3. Interview with Bob Gardner, SOM Court Chair, on October 4, 2025.
4. Interview with Mr. Barroso, on October 4, 2025.

FINDINGS

During the out lap of the second qualifying session, several SM cars did not immediately proceed when released from the grid. As the course was yellow from Pit Out to Turn 8, there was no passing allowed on that part of the track. After Turn 8, some of the cars accelerated away but others continued to maintain a slower pace and make multiple short side-to-side movements, staying off the racing line. Race Director Pence

submitted a CSA against every driver noted in the race log with the same penalty against each. Seven drivers, including Mr. Barroso, protested the action.

The SOM interviewed witnesses and gathered available video, including a track video that showed multiple cars making similar movements in the area of Turn 11b. Due to the distance and angle of the camera, no car numbers were identifiable in the video. A competitor video with a rear-facing perspective clearly showed Mr. Barroso and an unidentifiable car behind him making multiple short side-to-side movements although never crossing the mid-line of the track. The SOM disallowed Mr. Barroso's protest because he was indisputably identified in the rear-facing video.

In direct testimony to the COA in support of his appeal, Mr. Barroso requested a definition of "weaving" and asked for additional interpretation of the rule he was alleged to have violated. He asserted that since the violation occurred during Qualifying Session 2, he should be allowed to retain his times from Qualifying Session 1.

The COA noted the event Supps state in part, "Weaving, scrubbing tires and/or impeding the progress of other drivers after Turn 8 on the out lap or thereafter is considered blocking and is subject to penalty." The COA also noted that all other drivers' protests were upheld and their penalties removed due to the SOM's inability to confirm the identity of any cars making side-to-side movements except Mr. Barroso.

The COA found on Mr. Barroso's out lap in Qualifying Session 2, he continued to weave slightly when on straight track, although he did not cross the mid-line of the track. Although some cars remained behind Mr. Barroso, it did not appear he intentionally impeded or blocked those cars, as they were making similar movements. However, Mr. Barroso's movements meet the definition of weaving. The COA found Mr. Barroso violated Supps 5.15.4. (Weaving) but did not agree the loss of position - applied only to him and severely affecting the start of the race - when other unknown parties were making similar movements was fair and equitable.

DECISION

The COA upheld the SOM decision but modified the penalty assessed by the Race Director. The COA assigned the penalty of Probation for one race weekend which incurred three penalty points on Mr. Barroso's competition license. Mr. Barroso's qualifying times were restored prior to the race and his grid position was determined in the typical manner. Mr. Barroso's appeal was well founded and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, was returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSC Reference No. 68
Bobby Gossett vs. SOM COA Ref. 25-03-RO
October 5, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the Spec Miata (SM) race on Saturday, October 4, 2025, at the SCCA Runoffs at Road America, Tyler Brown, entrant for Tom Brown, driver of SM #27, protested Bobby Gossett, driver of SM #44, for violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., C., and D. (Rules of the Road) citing contact at Turn 7.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Mike Smith and Gloria Larson (Chair) interviewed witnesses, reviewed documents and statements, viewed video, and determined Mr. Gossett was responsible for the contact. The SOM issued a penalty of loss of position (placing Car #44 behind Car #27) plus two race weekends probation and 3 penalty points on Mr. Gossett's competition license.

Mr. Gossett appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Lee Hill, Laurie Sheppard, and Bev Heilicher (Chair) met on October 5, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mr. Gossett, received October 5, 2025.
2. SOM Decision, associated documents, and video from several sources, received October 5, 2025.
3. Interview with Mr. Gossett, on October 5, 2025.

FINDINGS

Mr. Gossett asserted he was alongside Mr. Brown in the previous corner and it was Mr. Brown who deprived Mr. Gossett of racing room. He asserted Mr. Brown did not follow the usual racing line entering Turn 7, instead approaching from mid-track. He also alleged Car #27 turned toward the apex while Car #44 was alongside.

The COA reviewed the available witness statements and examined video from both cars. Mr. Gossett presented the SCCA Live Stream as new evidence for his case.

In reviewing Mr. Gossett's in-car video, on the 12th lap of the Spec Miata race, while exiting Turn 5, Car #44 and Car #27 were side-by-side coming up the hill approaching Turn 6 with Car #44 on driver's right. The two cars continued side by side into Turn 6, a 90-degree left, with Car #44 losing ground through the turn. By the exit of Turn 6, Car #44 had little or no overlap with Car #27. Car #27 ran a defensive line in the middle of the track on the short straight between turns 6 and 7. When Car #27 gradually turned in to Turn 7 (a fast sweeper to the right), Car #44 tried to regain his position alongside. Car #44's left front contacted the right side of Car #27 behind the passenger door causing Car #27 to spin clockwise. Car #27 left the race track on driver's left and rejoined after losing several positions. Car #44 continued, having gained the position.

The COA found Mr. Gossett had not earned the right to racing room as he had not presented himself sufficiently alongside Car #27 prior to the turn-in for Turn 7.

DECISION

The COA upheld the SOM decision against Mr. Gossett but amended the GCR violation reference to GCR 6.11.1.A. (Contact). The position penalty, probation and associated penalty points were retained. Mr. Gossett's appeal was well founded and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, was returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSOM Reference Number 92
Jose Osiris Peña vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 25-04-RO
October 5, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the Super Touring Lite (STL) race on Sunday, October 5, 2025, at the SCCA Runoffs at Road America, Clerk of the Course Dennis Dean submitted a Chief Steward's Action (CSA) citing Jose Osiris Peña, driver of STL #1, with violation of Runoffs Supplemental Regulation (Supps) 5.17.8. (Start and Restart Acceleration Zone) for moving out of line on a restart. A 5-second penalty was applied to Car #1 in the race results which moved Mr. Peña from being scored as the winner to finishing in 2nd place. Mr. Peña protested the CSA, claiming the Supps do not apply to restarts.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Jim Graffy, Jim Suhr, and Bob Neff (Chair) interviewed Mr. Peña, and verified paragraph 5.17.8. did apply to restarts. The SOM disallowed Mr. Peña's protest. He appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA), Costa Dunias, Lee Hill, and Jack Kish (Chair) met on October 5, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mr. Peña, received on October 5, 2025.
2. SOM Hearing, Decision, and related documents, received October 5, 2025.
3. SCCA Video showing the field approaching the restart on lap 4 of the STL race on October 5, 2025.
4. Interview with Mr. Peña on October 5, 2025.

FINDINGS

In his appeal Mr. Peña stated, "It is not clear what is the line to follow for the restart." The COA explained, in detail, the process of restarts relative to the Start and Restart Acceleration Zone employed at the SCCA Runoffs. The video supplied clearly showed as Car #1 (the second car in line) was within the acceleration zone, it moved a full car width to the right of the single file line of cars. Supps 5.17.8. (Start and Restart Acceleration Zone:) says, "Cars must not step out of line nor pass during acceleration until the green flag is displayed." The COA notes this verbiage is consistent with GCR 6.6.2.B.3.iii. which says, "Drivers must maintain the safety car's pace and not improve

their positions or begin racing until the green flag has been displayed to restart the race.”

DECISION

The COA upheld the SOM decision against Mr. Peña. The penalties assessed via the CSA Action #90 remain in effect. Mr. Peña’s appeal was well founded, and his appeal fee, less the administrative portion retained by SCCA, is to be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

SCCA Runoffs
JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS
CSC Reference No. 91
Brad McAllister vs. SOM COA Ref. 25-05-RO
October 5, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

Following the Grand Touring 2 (GT2) race on Sunday, October 5, 2025, at the SCCA Runoffs at Road America, Race Director Steve Pence filed a Chief Steward's Action (CSA) citing Brad McAllister, driver of GT2 #24, with violation of Runoffs Supplemental Regulations 5.17.8. (Start and Restart Acceleration Zone) for accelerating before the beginning of the Acceleration Zone on the start of the race from his 1st place starting position. A 5-second penalty was applied to Car #24 in the race results which dropped Mr. McAllister from being scored as the winner to finishing in 5th place.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Matias Bonnier, Bill Blake, and Bryan Deane (Chair), interviewed witnesses, reviewed documents and statements, viewed video, and disallowed the protest due to insufficient evidence to overturn the CSA which allowed the 5-second penalty to remain.

Mr. McAllister appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Costa Dunias, Jack Kish, and Lee Hill (Chair) met on October 5, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mr. McAllister, received October 5, 2025.
2. SOM Decision, associated documents, and video from several sources, received October 5, 2025.
3. Interview with Mr. McAllister on October 5, 2025.

FINDINGS

The COA reviewed the available witness statements and examined video from the SCCA Live Stream. Mr. McAllister came prepared to demonstrate variability in the judgements of start line officials with various videos. However, the Runoffs Supplemental Regulations (5.17.8.) clearly state that the decision of a Start Judge is non-protestable. Mr. McAllister withdrew his appeal.

The COA notes the verbiage in Runoffs Supplemental Regulations 5.17.8. is consistent with GCR 5.11.3.B. which states, "A Judge's determination may not be protested." Penalties applied for a violation reported by a judge may be protested.

DECISION

The COA accepted the withdrawal of Mr. McAllister's appeal. The SOM decision remains in effect. Mr. McAllister's entire appeal fee was returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Harley Scuffil vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 25-17-SE October 16, 2025

FACTS IN BRIEF

On September 21, 2025, following Race 2 for Group 5 at the 2025 SARRC Invitational Challenge held at Daytona International Speedway, Mical Fountain, driver of Spec Miata South East (SMSE) #101, protested Harley Scuffil, driver of SMSE #45, for avoidable contact, blocking, and failure to leave racing room for Car #101, causing Car #101 to lose speed and finish .008 seconds behind Car #45.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Susie Biggers, Herbert Gomez, and Phil Croyle (Chair) met, reviewed the evidence, and heard witnesses. The SOM determined Mr. Scuffil violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact), B. (Racing Room), and C. (Blocking) by making multiple lateral moves on a straight resulting in making physical contact and depriving Mr. Fountain of racing room. The SOM penalized Mr. Scuffil with loss of one finishing position (placing him behind Mr. Fountain) which incurred two penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Scuffil appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Costa Dunias, Laurie Sheppard, and Lee Hill (Chair) met on October 6, 2025, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Letter of Appeal from Harley Scuffil, submitted September 30, 2025.
2. SOM Video from Car #45 and Car #101, received on October 1, 2025.
3. Appellant Video from trailing SM #34 and SCCA Live Stream, received on October 1, 2025.
4. Appellant Photos of tire marks on Car #45, received on October 1, 2025.
5. Official Observers Report and related documents, received October 1, 2025.
6. SOM Response to Appeal including an additional witness statement from Mr. Fountain and several still photos from the SCCA Live Stream, received October 6, 2025.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Scuffil asserted he was attempting to stay in the draft of the car ahead and was not aware that Car #101 was partly alongside on his right. He also asserted

that the first contact was so light that he didn't feel it and the second contact was due to Car #101 moving left into Mr. Scuffil's right side. And finally, he stated since Car #101 had about a car width gap to the wall, he had left Car #101 plenty of racing room.

The SOM interviewed both drivers, collected their Witness Statements, and reviewed the in-car video from both cars before making their decision.

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, as well as the documentation provided by the SOM, including witness statements and all other evidence. The video from Spec Miata (SM) #34, driven by Ford Munnerlyn, proved inconclusive because the view was largely blocked by another car between SM #34 and the incident in question.

The videos showed that leaving the chicane on the 12th and final lap of the race, two SM (#4 & #24) and two SMSE (#45 & #101) were in a single file formation following each other closely. As the group entered the tri-oval section of the speedway they were running about one car width off the bottom (driver's left) of the banking. SMSE #101, running 4th in the line, moved left to the bottom and SMSE #45 immediately moved low to defend. Car #101 then moved right and began to pass Car #45. At the same time, SM #24 (2nd in the line) moved right to begin his attempt to pass SM #4 (first in the line) which placed him directly ahead of Car #101 giving Car #101 the benefit of his draft. Car #45 moved to his right in an apparent attempt to get back into Car #24's draft and initiated significant contact with Car #101 who was already part way alongside. The contact sent Car #101 up the banking to driver's right nearly to the wall. As they approached the finish line, Car #24 continued to move gradually to the right with Car #45 following while Car #101 maintained his line parallel to the wall. As Car #45 followed in Car #24's draft with both moving gradually to the right, Car #45 had a second side-to-side contact with Car #101 just short of the finish line. Car #45 was judged to have finished ahead of Car #101 with a transponder margin of victory of .008 seconds.

The COA finds GCR 6.11.1.A. B. and C. (Rules of the Road) stipulate each driver is to maintain control of their car and leave room for others, so they do not come into contact under close racing conditions. It allows just one safe (lateral) move in defense and forbids additional lateral moves as blocking.

The COA notes that while Mr. Scuffil's initial move to his left was a reasonable and safe defensive move, his subsequent move back to driver right was not – and satisfies the definition of Blocking (GCR 6.11.1.C.). This move resulted in avoidable contact (GCR 6.11.1.A.) and failed to leave racing room for Car #101 (GCR 6.11.1.B.). Mr. Scuffil's assertion that there was room for Car #101 to move to the right is not germane since Mr. Fountain had no obligation to get out of Mr. Scuffil's way. Mr. Fountain's video clearly shows he continuously maintained a course parallel to the wall while Car #24

ahead moved gradually to the right and the second contact was the result of Car #45 attempting to follow Car #24.

The COA finds Mr. Scuffil violated GCR 6.11.1.A., B., and C. by making several lateral moves resulting in at least two instances of contact with Car #101. The SOM made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the testimony and video evidence, and the penalties assessed are within the purview of the SOM.

The COA reminds all drivers that when racing on straight sections of track (and the banking at Daytona is effectively a straight), the decision to move laterally must take into consideration the location of all other cars in the vicinity as well as cars that are approaching and committed to overtaking. It is the responsibility of all drivers to be aware of the relative positions of all nearby cars and remember that if a car disappears from your mirrors, it is most likely located in your blind spot – and that following another car does not give a driver the right to push a car that is alongside out of the way.

The COA finds the additional videos and photos provided by Mr. Scuffil did not introduce any relevant new evidence.

DECISION

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Scuffil's appeal is not well founded, and his entire appeal fee will be retained by SCCA.