

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Kathleen Barnes vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-13-NE July 23, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On June 20, 2026, following Race 1 for Group 2 at the Finger Lakes Region SCCA Hoosier Super Tour at Watkins Glen, Race Director Kathleen (Kathy) Barnes filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate contact in Turn 1A between Spec Miata (SM) #02, driven by Christian Meyer, SM #55, driven by Marcello Paniccia, and SM #169, driven by John Dean, on a restart for possible violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., C., and D. (On Course Driver Conduct).

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Rob Foley, Phil Kelley, Richard Muise, and Chris Current (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM ruled no further action was necessary.

Ms. Barnes appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA), Lee Hill, Jack Kish, and Costa Dunias (Chair) met on July 16th, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Kathy Barnes, submitted June 30, 2026.
2. Appellant video from Car #46 (D. Leuci) and Car #5 (Ryan Maloney), received July 10, 2026.
3. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 10, 2026.
4. SOM Video from Car #02, Car #55, Car #169, Car #72 (Gianni Maiuro), and Car #66 (Charles Mactutus), and SCCA Live Stream, received July 10, 2026.
5. Appellant documentation and attachments, received July 10, 2026.
6. Class Ambassador Greg Amy Witness Narrative and video analysis, received July 10, 2026.

FINDINGS

In her appeal, Ms. Barnes asserted the SOM failed to follow GCR 8.2: ("Each party must be given the opportunity to review and consider all evidence presented to the SOM...") She stated, "Christian Meyer 02 SM was not given that opportunity. An unanswered phone call is not sufficient opportunity – especially when Hoosier Super

Tour has available PA and use of Sportity app for contact with participants. Also – the author of the RFA, Race Director Kathy Barnes was not given the opportunity to provide input.”

The SOM held a hearing with the drivers of Car #s 55, 66, and 169, and collected their witness statements. The SOM viewed all available videos and concluded the drivers in the incident did not make any errors and the incident was due to close three-wide racing in the paved runoff outside Turn 1 on the restart.

The next day, the SOM reopened the hearing to interview Mr. Meyer and review his video. After the interview, they determined their decision on the RFA would remain “no further action”. Mr. Meyer was given a witness statement to complete, but he never returned it as he was urgently trying to leave to catch a plane Sunday afternoon.

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, documentation provided by the SOM, the statement provided by the Class Ambassador, and the narrative provided by Ms. Barnes in her appeal. The Race Director stated she was too busy to view all videos, so she filed the RFA for the SOM to investigate, which they thoroughly did in accordance with their duties and responsibilities.

The COA finds the following:

The SOM made every reasonable attempt to comply with GCR 8.2., by informing his father that Mr. Meyer was to come to the SOM room on June 20th (which he did not do) and notifying Mr. Meyer again on June 21st.

The SOM conducted their investigation and hearing entirely in accordance with the GCR.

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

DECISION

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Ms. Barnes’ appeal is well founded and her entire appeal fee will be returned.

COURT OF APPEALS

JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Brian Goldberg vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-14-NE August 19, 2026

FACTS IN BRIEF

On July 3, 2026, at the New England Region Last Chance Majors held at Thompson Speedway Motorsports Park, Alexandre Cole, driver of Grand Touring 2 (GT2) #13, protested Brian Goldberg, driver of GT2 #42, for suspected violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 9.1.2.F.7.a.4. (Aftermarket body panels not identical to OEM), 9.1.2.F.7.b.*. (Diffuser on car without specific approval or spec), and GT2 Spec documentation (lack of Panoz assembly book required for confirming specifications).

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Laurence Dignan, William Fralick, Christopher Milton-Hall, and Charles (Chuck) Dobbs (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM determined Mr. Goldberg had in his possession the appropriate Panoz assembly documentation and ruled the body panels in question compliant per the GT2 rules.

The SOM found the rear close out panel on GT2 #42 noncompliant based on GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b.2. They penalized Mr. Goldberg with loss of position sufficient to finish last in class, which incurred two penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Goldberg appealed the decision of the SOM.

DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Scott Bowman, Spencer Gorham, and Lee Hill (Chair) met on July 30, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Brian Goldberg, submitted July 12, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received July 22, 2026.
3. Statement from the Road Racing Competition Committee, received August 14, 2026.

FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Goldberg asserted that his rear close out panel is an OEM part with a Panoz part number and is compliant with GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b.15.E.3. describing the rear close out panel.

The SOM visually confirmed the body [hood and trunk] panels on GT2 #42 matched the original panels in size, shape, and function but were constructed of an alternate material (carbon fiber) which is allowed in the GT2 rules. Mr. Goldberg was in possession of appropriate documentation. Therefore, items 1 and 3 were ruled as compliant and those items in the protest were denied.

The 2nd item – the diffuser – was determined by the SOM to be noncompliant based on language found in GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b.: *"Restrictions regarding external body shape and use of belly pans are aimed at preventing attempts to obtain ground effect or streamlining. Provisions in the rules permit one-off chassis and frames, to reduce the cost of building and repairing GT cars, not to permit high technology (streamlining and/or ground effects)."* and in GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b.2.: *"The floor behind the rear wheel opening shall be flat and follow, but not exceed, the line of the rear fender bottom. Only the fuel cell container may protrude or extend below this plane."*

The SOM noted that the spec line for the Panoz Esperante does not include a range of model years and, with backdating and updating allowed, there is some potential for confusion since parts produced by Panoz for any Esperante variety at any time in the past, present, or future would be considered OEM parts if they carry a Panoz part number and appear in the Panoz documentation. The "rear close out panel" with the diffuser is shown in the Panoz parts list as an OEM part. The SOM determined that even though the part was an OEM part, it violated the class rules specified in GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b. and 9.1.2.F.7.b.2. making it noncompliant.

The COA reviewed the evidence included with the SOM decision and found the SOM had thoroughly researched the issue in reaching their decision. In particular, the witness statement prepared by Paul Messier, the NER Event Tech Chief, was extremely thorough and well presented.

The COA notes the OEM part appears to conflict with the broad intent of the Chassis and Bodywork rules cited in GCR 9.1.2.F.7.b. Per GCR 1.2.3.D.1., "The CRB determines the intent of a rule." The COA requested review of this determination by the Road Racing Competition Committee before issuing a ruling on Mr. Goldberg's appeal.

Dayle Frame, Chair of the Road Racing Competition Committee, provided the following analysis for a Panoz Esperante GTS: "...all components of the car must meet the traditional GT2 rules, meaning a [rear close out] panel must meet the intent of such in the GT2 rules, which a diffuser attached to a panel that closes off the fuel cell clearly does not."

The COA finds that GCR 9.1.2.F.7. which says in part, “*No permitted component/modification shall additionally perform a prohibited function.*” applies to this case and finds the part in question is noncompliant with the GT2 Class Rules.

DECISION

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