

## COURT OF APPEALS

### JUDGEMENT OF THE COURT OF APPEALS Lage Powers vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-15-NE August 23, 2026

#### FACTS IN BRIEF

On July 18, 2026, following Race 1 for Group 2 at the July MARRS Regional Race at Summit Point Raceway, Assistant Chief Steward Russ Gardner filed a Request for Action (RFA) to investigate contact at Turn 5 involving Spec Miata (SM) #89, driven by Robert Cahall, and SM #78, driven by Theodore Cahall. During the investigation by the SOM, two additional cars were found to be involved in the incident. The RFA was amended to include SM #50, driven by Lage Powers, and SM #54, driven by Michael Cohen.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Larry Oliver, and Grant McStay (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM found Mr. Powers violated General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.1.1.B. (Yellow Flag) and penalized him with probation for three events, which incurred three penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Powers appealed the decision of the SOM.

#### DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA), Costa Dunias, Lee Hill, and Jack Kish (Chair) met on August 13, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

#### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal and appellant documentation from Lage Powers, submitted July 29, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received August 6, 2026.
3. SOM Video from Car #54, Car #78, Car #89, and Car #22 (Jed Erdahl), received August 6, 2026.
4. Witness statements from F&C Officials at Turn 5, received August 6, 2026.

#### FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Powers states he continued racing after the first lap incident and was resolute in his belief “the wreck was cleared from the track”. He then saw the waving yellow flag at Turn 5 and began to slow down. He asserts his car must have “picked up damage from the contact on lap one” which prevented him from avoiding the contact with the Car #78.

The SOM interviewed all four drivers, collected witness statements, reviewed two witness statements from F&C Officials at Turn 5, and reviewed the in-car video from Car #54, Car #78, Car #89, and a following Car #22. The SOM determined Cars #50 and #54 failed to slow sufficiently for a waving yellow flag approaching an incident.

The COA reviewed all videos submitted, the documentation provided by the SOM (witness statements and the SOM narrative), and the narrative provided by Mr. Powers in his appeal.

The videos show on the opening lap, Car #89 spun and was contacted by Car #78. Both cars were disabled and together they blocked 50% of the track surface. Turn 5 marshals displayed a vigorously waving yellow flag prior to the arrival of the field on the lap following the first incident. In his appeal, Mr. Powers acknowledged the waving yellow flag. Most of the field successfully passed the incident. As two leading cars tracked left of the stationary cars, Car #50 moved right, locking wheels in a last attempt to avoid, and contacted Car #78.

The COA finds Mr. Powers did not slow significantly and maintain control of his car past the waving yellow flag and into the incident.

All drivers are reminded that when approaching a waving yellow zone, whether by itself or within a full course flag condition, significant adjustments may need to be made prior to reaching the waving yellow flag itself. For instance, a passing attempt may need to be abandoned or speed may need to be reduced in order to be able to comply with the requirements of the waving yellow zone.

The COA finds the SOM conducted their investigation and hearings in accordance with the GCR. They made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the testimony and all available video evidence and acted within their authority.

## **DECISION**

The Court of Appeals upholds the decision of the SOM in its entirety. Mr. Power'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 Filippo Massa vs. SOM COA Ref. No. 26-16-SE August 23, 2026

#### FACTS IN BRIEF

On August 2, 2026, following Race 2 for Group 4 at the CFR Daytona Double at Daytona International Speedway, Timothy (T.J.) Preble, driver of Spec Racer Ford 3 (SRF3) #16, filed a Protest against Filippo Massa, driver of SRF3 #3, alleging violation of General Competition Rules (GCR) 6.11.1.A., B., and D. (Rules of the Road) after car-to-car contact in Turn 5.

The Stewards of the Meeting (SOM), Herbert Gomez, Barb Magnuson, and Philip Croyle (Chair) met, heard witnesses, and reviewed the evidence. The SOM determined Mr. Massa deprived Mr. Preble of racing room, thus initiating avoidable contact while attempting to pass Car #16. The SOM penalized Mr. Massa with loss of position sufficient to place him last in the SRF3 class, which incurred 2 penalty points on his competition license.

Mr. Massa appealed the decision of the SOM.

#### DATES OF THE COURT

The SCCA Court of Appeals (COA) Scott Bowman, Costa Dunias, and Laurie Sheppard (Chair) met on August 20, 2026, to review, hear, and render a decision on the appeal.

#### DOCUMENTS AND OTHER EVIDENCE RECEIVED AND REVIEWED

1. Request to Appeal from Filippo Massa, submitted August 5, 2026.
2. Official Observers Report and related documents, received August 11, 2026.
3. In-car video from Cars #16, #3, and #132 (David Perez), plus a spectator video available to the SOM, received August 11, 2026.
4. Additional spectator video from appellant, received August 11, 2026.
5. Chair SOM's Response to Appeal, received August 17, 2026.

#### FINDINGS

In his appeal, Mr. Massa asserted "Car No. 3 had established a meaningful inside overlap and was already committed to the inside line before the vehicles converged." He also provided a lengthy and detailed technical evaluation of the dynamics of the incident for the COA to consider.

The SOM reviewed written statements from both drivers and all available video and determined that there was insufficient overlap between Car #3 and Car #16 as Mr. Massa initiated his passing attempt.

The COA reviewed all unedited video and driver statements, as well as all submissions relating to the appeal. As the field was approaching right-hand Turn 5 on the opening lap of the race, they were tightly bunched – in some cases running three wide. Mr. Preble (Car #16) was passed on his left side by Car #178 (Tray Ayres) as he followed Car #20 (Tim Preble) toward the turn-in point. Both were taking a similar entry to the right-hand hairpin while giving room to Car #178 on their left side. Car #3 moved to the right as Cars #20 and #16 angled toward the apex. Mr. Massa drew slightly alongside the rear of Car #16 into the rapidly closing gap between #16 and the curbing on the right. GCR 6.11.1.D. states, “The overtaking driver is responsible for the decision to pass another car and to accomplish it safely.” At the time he initiated the pass, Mr. Massa’s Car #3 was likely not visible to Mr. Preble due to his angle of trajectory. The forward- and rear-facing video from Car #16 shows Mr. Preble had steered to the right committed to the turn before Car #3 initiated the pass. Mr. Massa was not sufficiently alongside Mr. Preble in Car #16 to have earned the right to racing room.

The COA finds the SOM acted within their authority and made a thoughtful and reasoned decision based on the evidence. The penalty assessed was within their purview.

## **DECISION**

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