

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Jordan Fureman vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-08-NE May 11, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On March 29, 2026, following Race 2 for Group 1 at the March MARRS Regional held on the Summit Point Circuit at Summit Point Motorsports Park, Arif Kazim, driver of Showroom Spec Miata (SSM) #98, protested Jordan Fureman, driver of SSM #8, for violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1. (On Course Driver Conduct). Mr. Kazim cited contact by Car #8 forcing Car #98 off course onto the grass and into a tire barrier, leading to Car #98 retiring from the race.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Marshall Lytle, Larry Oliver, Steve Pence, Lin Toland, and Terry Hanushek (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM determined Mr. Fureman violated GCR 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact) and 6.11.3.B. (Reentry from Off Course) by moving directly across the course from right to left resulting in side-to-side contact with Car #98 and forcing Car #98 off course. The SOM penalized Mr. Fureman with loss of position to finish behind Car #98, which incurred two penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Fureman appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Costa Dunias, Rick Mitchell, and Lee Hill (Chair) met on April 23, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Jordan Fureman, submitted March 31, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received April 15, 2026.
3. SOM Video from Car #8, Car #98, and Sunday Live Stream broadcast, received April 15, 2026.
4. SOM Photo of Car #8 showing evidence of left side contact, received April 15, 2026.
5. Appellant videos from Car #8, Car #98, following Car #132 (Christopher Kelley), and following Car #63 (John Hotz), received April 15, 2026.
6. Additional video from Mr. Fureman showing a different transit of the Turn 3-4 area, received April 15, 2026.
7. Response from SOM member Steve Pence, received April 28, 2026.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Fureman asserted he was not responsible for the contact between his Car #8 and Car #98 because Car #98 was not sufficiently alongside to be visible prior to the contact, since the right front of Car #98 contacted the left rear tire of Car #8. The contact occurred at the turn in point for Turn 4. Mr. Fureman also stated that he made a proper effort to rejoin the track safely after being pushed off by Car #132.

The SOM interviewed both drivers, collected their witness statements, reviewed a witness statement from a spectator, and reviewed the in-car video from both cars, as well as the Live Stream broadcast video. The SOM determined that Mr. Fureman drifted off course driver right at the exit of Turn 3 (a 90-degree left-hand corner) and upon reentry, drove immediately to the left to set up for right-hand Turn 4 in violation of GCR 6.11.3.B. (Unsafe reentry). As he moved left, Mr. Fureman (Car #8) had side-to-side contact with Car #98 at the left edge of the track in violation of 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact).

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, as well as the documentation provided by the SOM, including witness statements and all other evidence. Video from all sources shows Car #8 (Mr. Fureman), Car #98 (Mr. Kazim), and Car #132 (Mr. Kelley) were in line behind the overall leader for a single file restart. On the restart, Car #132 initiated an outside pass in right-hand turn 1, passing Car #98 and getting fully alongside Car #8. The three cars approached left-hand turn 3 in this same formation with Car #132 to the left of Car #8 and Car #98 following closely behind Car #8. In turn 3, Car #132 tracked out to the normal track boundary forcing Car #8 off course to avoid contact. Car #98 made a later apex than Cars #132 and #8, exited the corner at driver left with a speed advantage on Car #132 and moved alongside. Car #8 retained control of his car and maintained race direction and speed while returning to the course and moving ahead of Car #132. Once he cleared Car #132, Mr. Fureman moved left to set up for Turn 4. As he crossed in front of Car #132, his left rear tire contacted the right front of Car #98 which was overtaking Car #132 on the left edge of the track.

Videos from Car #132 (Mr. Kelley) and Car #63 (Mr. Hotz) provided by the appellant show Car #8 got a better exit from turn 3, even with two wheels in the gravel, and returned to the track fully in control and moving slightly faster than Car #132. Those videos also show Car #132 moved to the left leaving Mr. Fureman plenty of room to reenter safely and he did so. Video from Car #8 clearly shows Mr. Fureman checking his left side mirror repeatedly as he reentered and moved towards the left.

Car #132's video shows Car #98 (Mr. Kazim) visible alongside Car #132 on the left and moving faster than Car #132. It is clear from the videos of both trailing cars that as Mr. Fureman crossed in front of Car #132, he had limited time to see Car #98 in his mirror and very little time to realize that Car #98 was moving faster than Car #8. It is also clear

Mr. Kazim in Car #98 had time to anticipate the impending contact and could have taken steps to avoid it. From trailing car videos, it appears the nose of Car #98 moved into the contact point from behind just as the rear of Car #8 moved into the contact point from the right.

The COA finds Mr. Fureman's reentry after being forced wide at turn 3 was executed with due care and was accomplished safely. The COA also finds both drivers bore some responsibility for avoiding the contact. The COA disagrees Mr. Fureman is solely responsible for this incident and reduces his penalty to a Reprimand with the requisite one point on his competition license.

DECISION

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM but modifies the penalty to a Reprimand and 1 point on Mr. Fureman's competition license. Mr. Fureman's original finishing position is to be restored and the associated 2 points on his license are to be removed. Mr. Fureman's appeal is well founded, and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, will be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Jason Fichter vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-09-SE May 20, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On Saturday, April 5, 2026, following Race 1 for Group 6 at the Hoosier Racing Tire SCCA Super Tour Spring Sprints at Virginia International Raceway, Race Director Kathy Barnes filed a Request for Action (RFA) seeking investigation of contact between Spec MX-5 (SMX) #13, driven by Emy Kissick, and SMX #7, driven by Jason Fichter, at Turn 13 during the race.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM) Steve Pence and Russ Gardner (Chair) met, heard witnesses, reviewed video, and concluded Mr. Fichter violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact) by contacting Car #13 at Turn 13-14 (Roller Coaster). The SOM penalized Mr. Fichter with loss of two positions in class which incurred two penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Fichter appealed the SOM decision.

DATES OF THE COURT

The Court of Appeals (COA) Scott Bowman, Lee Hill, and Costa Dunias (Chairman) met on May 7, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to appeal from Mr. Fichter, submitted on April 8, 2026.
2. Notification of Appeal, received April 28, 2026.
3. Official Observer's Report, in-car videos, and related documents, received April 28, 2026.

FINDINGS

In his Appeal, Mr. Fichter asserted the penalty of loss of two positions plus 2 points against his license seemed excessive for the alleged infraction. He acknowledged he "tapped the rear of the 13 car" and "neither of our cars got upset, loose etc." He argued that "had the #13 braked at the normal braking point like the rest of the field does it would not have been an issue." He further asserted that SMX racers touch and push each other all the time based upon their being a spec class and "nearly all of these are NOT malicious".

The SOM based their decision on the in-car videos and witness statements from both drivers. Mr. Gardner explained it is undisputed that SMX #7 contacted SMX #13 while SMX #13 was completing a pass on a third car. The impact to Car #13's left quarter caused it to become unsettled, permitting the third car to regain position.

The COA reviewed the available videos from SMX #13 and SMX #7 which showed Car #13 was passing a car (SMX #86) on its right approaching Turns 13-14, a relatively high-speed portion of the track, and had reached marker 2 fully ahead of Car #86. As Car #13 approached marker 1, Car #7 hit Car #13 in the left rear quarter, unsettling Car #13 enough to cause Ms. Kissick to apply brakes to regain control of the car. This action allowed Car #86 to regain position. There was no other change in position.

The COA finds Mr. Fichter was solely responsible for contact with Car #7 which resulted in a change in position between Cars #86 and #7. The SOM properly heard the RFA, including all evidence and witness testimony. Mr. Fichter provided no new evidence in support of his appeal. The COA finds insufficient grounds to overturn the SOM's decision. The COA finds the SOM made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the testimony and video evidence available and applied a measured penalty which was within their purview.

DECISION

The COA upholds the SOM decision in its entirety. Mr. Fichter's appeal is not well founded, and his entire appeal fee is retained by SCCA.

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Mike Molter vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-10-CN May 20, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On April 19, 2026, following Qualifying for Group 6 at the CENDIV Drivers School and Double Regional held at Blackhawk Farms, Assistant Chief Steward Joseph Helser issued a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate reported nose-to-tail contact in Turn 1 involving Super Touring Under (STU) #186, driven by David Wessel, Spec Miata (SM) #99, driven by Michael Gardner, and SM #97, driven by Mike Molter.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Bev Heilicher, Jim Marinangel, and Karen Crider (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM determined Mr. Molter in Car #97 violated GCR 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact), 6.11.1.B. (Racing Room), and 6.11.1.D. (Decision to Pass) due to contact with Car #99 on the approach to Turn 7. The SOM penalized Mr. Molter with a reprimand, which incurred one penalty point on his competition license.

Mr. Molter appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Jack Kish, Laurie Sheppard, and Scott Bowman (Chair) met on May 7, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Mike Molter, submitted April 27, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received April 30, 2026.
3. SOM Video from Car #99 and Car #186, received April 30, 2026.
4. SOM Photo of Car #97, received April 30, 2026.
5. Appellant documentation and attachments, received April 30, 2026.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Molter asserted that he was not responsible for the contact between his Car #97 and Car #99. He argued Car #99 was not alongside prior to the turn and tracked wide hitting his right side. Mr. Molter provided his personal analysis of the contact in Turn 7, the layout of the track, weather conditions during the session, and general behavior of the group during the event.

The SOM interviewed the three drivers, collected their witness statements, reviewed witness statements from two corner marshals, and reviewed the in-car video from Car #186 and Car #99. No video was available from Car #97 which was the subject of a separate CSA. The SOM determined that prior to the contact in Turn 1, there were at least two contacts between Car #99 and Car #97 in Turn 6 through Turn 7. During the second contact (after Turn 6a), Mr. Molter did not alter his racing line while Car #99 was fully beside, violating GCR 6.11.1.A. (Avoidable Contact), 6.11.1.B. (Racing Room), and 6.11.1.D. (Decision to Pass).

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, the documentation provided by the SOM (witness statements, results, call log), and the material provided by Mr. Molter in his appeal. The videos show Car #99 initiated a pass attempt approaching Turn 6a just as Car #97 turned toward the apex. Car #99 locked his brakes and quickly came up alongside Car #97. The COA could not confirm if there was contact, but if not, it was very close. Car #97 appeared to react with a move to the left as the two cars exited the turn.

From this point until the braking zone for right-hand Turn 7, Car #97 (left) and Car #99 (right) were side-by-side, clearly visible to each other. Car #97 turned right toward the apex contacting Car #99, who was braking heavily and was at the extreme right side of the track. Both cars slowed and exited onto the front straight, with Car #97 right behind Car #99 as they headed to start/finish. Car #97 was extremely close to the tail of Car #99 as seen in that car's rearview mirror.

Car #186, a much faster STU car, passed both SM cars just after start/finish, moved to the left, and applied the brakes. It is clear that Car #99 hit the rear of Car #186. However, it is unclear if Car #97 hit Car #99 before this. Car #186 was going into the turn much faster and may have braked sooner than the slower SM cars, which could have caused the impact as well. Car #99 spun off drivers left, hit a berm, and was able to continue. Car #186 did not spin but sustained damage to the rear bumper cover.

The COA finds Mr. Molter did not provide racing room to Car #99 in Turn 7 going onto the front straight and caused avoidable contact. The SOM made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the testimony and video evidence available and applied a measured penalty which was within their purview.

DECISION

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Molter's appeal is well founded, and his appeal fee, less the amount retained by SCCA, will be returned.