

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Rich Olsen vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-11-CN June 8, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On May 3, 2026, following Race 2 for Group 6 at the Mark Amenda Majors held at Blackhawk Farms Raceway, Rich Olsen, driver of E Production (EP) #66, protested Jon Brakke, driver of EP #89, for violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., and D. (On Course Driver Conduct) for two incidents of contact at turns 3A and 4.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Archie Bruce, Eric Fairfield, Julie Rikken, and Kevin Coulter (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM disallowed the protest and returned the protest fee to Mr. Olsen.

Mr. Olsen appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA), Lee Hill, Laurie Sheppard, and Jack Kish (Chair) met on May 28, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Rich Olsen, submitted May 13, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received May 21, 2026.
3. SOM Video from Car #66, Car #89, and Car #23, received May 21, 2026.
4. SOM Photos of Car #66 and Car #89, received May 21, 2026.
5. Appellant documentation and attachments, received May 21, 2026.
6. SOM Narrative of the hearing, received May 29, 2026.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Olsen asserted the SOM “administered the GCR inappropriately, unfair [sic], and inequitably”. He continued, “In both incidents he [Mr. Brakke] could of [sic] moved over and not drove into me. ... He failed all the GCR sections (6.11.1.A., B., and D.) and appendix p.”

The SOM held a joint hearing with both drivers, collected their witness statements, reviewed a witness statement from a driver observing the race, and reviewed the in-car video from Car #66 and Car #89, and a following Car #23. The SOM examined both cars and took photos, which did not show damage consistent with descriptions of the

incidents. The SOM ruled contact in the Turn 3 complex could not be confirmed, and both drivers shared responsibility for contact in Turn 4. As both cars continued without apparent damage due to contact in the race, the SOM disallowed the protest.

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, the documentation provided by the SOM (witness statements, photos, and the SOM narrative), and the narrative provided by Mr. Olsen in his appeal. The videos show Car #89 initiated a pass attempt entering the Turn 3 complex just as Car #66 turned right toward the apex of the right-hand dogleg. Car #89 locked his brakes and moved right in an attempt to avoid contacting the rear of Car #66. The COA could not confirm if there was contact. Car #66 continued thru the right- and left-hand segments of the Turn 3 complex and moved to the right edge of the track.

Mr. Brakke's #89, a much faster car, stayed left and began to lap Car #66. As they reached the turn-in point of turn 4 (a left-hand turn), Car #89's nose was even with Car #66's driver's door. Car #66 turned in for the apex of turn 4, as Car #89 moved to the track edge with both left wheels on the verge of the pavement. Side to side contact occurred with Car #66 continuing to move left as Car #89 was completely alongside of Car #66. There was significant track width to the right of Car #66 which might have been used to avoid contact with Car #89.

The COA finds Mr. Olsen did not provide racing room to Car #89 (the second-place car) in Turn 4 and caused avoidable contact while he was being lapped. GCR 6.11.1.D. states in part, "The overtaken driver is responsible to be aware that they are being passed, and not to impede or block the overtaking car." The COA also finds the SOM conducted their investigation and hearing entirely in accordance with the GCR.

The COA reminds all parties that the contents in Appendix P. are "guidelines" used to enhance understanding of some typical situations on the track. They are not "rules", and therefore, they may not be cited in a protest or used as grounds for an appeal.

The COA finds the SOM made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the testimony and all available video and photographic evidence and acted within their authority.

DECISION

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