



INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL (ICA)

of the

FEDERATION INTERNATIONALE DE L'AUTOMOBILE

Appeal brought by MP Motorsport B.V.

against

**Decision No. 13/2024 dated 4 December 2024 of the National Appeal and
Disciplinary Court of the Real Federación Española de Automovilismo ("RFEdA")
in the framework of the last round of the 2024 International Series Eurocup-3
which took place in Montmeló, Spain**

Case ICA-2024-14

Hearing of 11 February 2025

Decision of 24 February 2025



The FIA INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL (“the Court”), which comprised Mr Arnas Paliukenas (Lithuania), who was designated President, Mr Sergio Araújo (Portugal), Mr Guillermo Esquivel Herrera (Costa Rica) and Mr Michael Grech (Malta), held a hearing at the Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile, 8 place de la Concorde, 75008 Paris, on Tuesday, 11 February 2025.

Nobody challenged the composition of the Court or submitted a request for the recusation of any of the judges.

Prior to the hearing, the Court received and considered submissions and attachments thereto made by MP Motorsport B.V. (“the Competitor” or “the Appellant”), the RFEdA (“the Respondent”), as well as the Third Parties Campos Racing and the FIA (the four of them collectively referred to as “the Parties”)

The following persons attended the hearing:

On behalf of the Appellant, MP Motorsport B.V.:

Mr Wouter Blokhuis, Team Manager
Mr Pierre Daureu, Legal Counsel
Mr Emmerson Fittipaldi, Driver (Witness)
Mr Xavier Navès, Chair of Stewards Panel (Witness) (via videoconference)

On behalf of the Respondent, RFEdA:

Mr Andrés Fernández Cepeda, Deputy Secretary General
Mr Luis González, Race Director for the 2024 Eurocup-3 Championship (Witness)

On behalf of the Third Party, Campos Racing:

Mr Rafael Mateu, Chief Financial Officer
Ms Catherine Schroeder, Legal Counsel

On behalf of the Third Party, the FIA (via videoconference):

Ms Alejandra Salmerón García, Head of Regulatory
Mr Alejandro Artiles Jiménez, Legal Counsel

Also attending the hearing:

Mr Jean-Christophe Breillat (Secretary General of the FIA Courts)
Mr Nicolas Cottier (Clerk of the FIA Courts)



The Parties filed written submissions and, at the hearing on 11 February 2025, set out oral arguments and addressed the questions asked by the Court. The hearing took place in accordance with the adversarial principle, with the aid of simultaneous interpretation in French and English. None of the Parties raised any objections, in relation either to the composition of the Court or to the manner in which the proceedings and the hearing were conducted, notably concerning the respect of the adversarial principle or the simultaneous interpretation.

I. REMINDER OF THE FACTS

1. The 2024 Eurocup-3 is an international series organised by “Eurocup Racing Promotion S.L.”, with the approval of the FIA and the Real Federación Española de Automovilismo (RFEdA), as set out under Article 1 par. 1 of the 2024 Eurocup-3 Sporting Regulations (“SR”).
2. In this context, Article 8.5 of the SR provides that the 2024 Eurocup-3 is composed of 8 rounds, the Competition that took place in Montmeló, Spain (“The Competition”) being the last round thereof.
3. During Race 1 of the Competition, held on 9 November 2024 (“the Race”), a racing incident occurred in Turn 1-2 of lap No. 16 (“the Racing Incident”). This Racing Incident involved Mr Christian Ho (“Driver No. 23”), who raced for the competitor Campos Racing, and Mr Emerson Fittipaldi (“Driver No. 24”) who raced for the Appellant.
4. In particular, Driver No. 23 overtook Driver No. 24 at the apex of Turn 1 and the latter went off the track, taking to the escape road and re-joining the track in front of Driver No. 23.
5. Once the Stewards analysed the elements at their disposal, they decided that “no further action” should be taken concerning the Racing Incident. After said Racing Incident, Driver No. 24 maintained his leading position in the Race, ending up in first place, followed by Driver No. 23, who finished the Race in second place.
6. After the Race, Campos Racing approached the Stewards, requesting them to review the CCTV cameras – as well as the onboard cameras of both drivers involved in the Racing Incident – and reassess the consequences thereof.
7. On 9 November 2024, at 19:02 CET, the Stewards issued a Decision No. 17, which confirmed the Stewards’ previous assessment and classified the Racing Incident with “no further action” (“the Stewards’ Decision”).



8. In particular, the Stewards' Decision states that Driver No. 24 used the auxiliary road ("the Escape Road") to avoid a collision with Driver No. 23, who overtook Driver No. 24 too late, with a significant portion of his car to the inside of the car of Driver No. 24 at the apex of Turn 1, and that Driver No. 24 respected the Race Director's instructions when using the Escape Road and re-joining the track in front of Driver No. 23.
9. On 9 November 2024, at 19:46 CET, Campos Racing filed an appeal against the Stewards' Decision before the Appeal and Disciplinary Court of the Real Federación Española de Automovilismo ("the NCA"), in accordance with Article 15.1.4 of the FIA International Sporting Code ("the Code").
10. On 4 December 2024, the NCA overturned the Stewards' Decision, as it found that the manoeuvre perpetrated by Driver No. 24 during the Racing Incident breached Article 20.16 of the SR and Article 12.2.1.i of the Code ("the NCA Decision"). In so finding, the NCA Decision imposed a 5-second time penalty on the Appellant and Driver No. 24.

II. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE COURT

11. On 11 December 2024, the Appellant lodged an appeal against the NCA Decision before the ICA ("the Appeal"), in accordance with Article 15.2 of the Code and Article 10.4.1 lit. b.) of the FIA Judicial and Disciplinary Rules ("JDR") (2024 edition – the correlative in the 2025 edition of the JDR is Article 10.6.1 lit. b).
12. On 6 January 2025, the Appellant filed its Grounds of Appeal.
13. On 24 January 2025, the Respondent filed its Grounds in Response.
14. On 27 January 2025, Campos Racing filed its Written Observations.
15. On 27 January 2025 (English version) and 31 January 2025 (French version), the FIA filed its Written Observations.
16. Before the hearing, the President of the Hearing issued 6 procedural decisions whereby:
 - (i) the FIA could attend the hearing remotely (Procedural Decision No. 1);
 - (ii) Campos Racing shall be considered as a third party (Procedural Decision No. 2);
 - (iii) the challenge by the Appellant of Procedural Decision No. 2 is rejected (Procedural Decision No. 3);
 - (iv) the RFEdA is ordered to submit, together with its Grounds in response, amongst the annexes that will be attached to the said Grounds, all the materials that were examined and discussed before the National Appeal and Disciplinary Court (Procedural Decision No. 4);



- (v) the Appellant's request that the Stewards Thierry Deflandre and Enric Arrazola be summoned to appear at the hearing as witnesses is rejected and, when examined by the Appellant and counter-examined by the other parties during the hearing, Mr Xavier Navès shall be asked solely about the circumstances in which the Stewards took the initial contested decision, but will refrain from explaining why such Decision was taken (Procedural Decision No. 5);
 - (vi) Mr Xavier Navès is authorised to remotely attend the hearing on 11 February 2025 (Procedural Decision No. 6).
17. Reference is made to the full Procedural Decisions with respect to the grounds put forward by the President when issuing those 6 Procedural Decisions.
18. During the hearing held on 11 February 2025, the Court heard the Parties and their Witnesses who, in essence, confirmed the statements made in the Parties' Written submissions and their appendices.

III. REQUESTS OF THE PARTIES

19. The Appellant asks the Court to set aside the Decision, to annul the sanction imposed on it and to *"re-establish the classification of the Race and therefore of the 2024 Eurocup 3 Championship, taking into account the original decision of the Stewards and thus confirm the Driver as winner of the Race by also ordering the competent sporting authority to draw the consequences of this ruling"*.
20. In its Grounds in Response, the RFEDA asks the Court *"to dismiss the Appeal lodged by Competitor MP MOTORSPORT and, therefore, fully confirm the Judgement rendered by RFEDA's National Court of Appeal, in the Appeal Procedure n° 13/2024"*.

IV. ADMISSIBILITY OF THE APPEAL BEFORE THE COURT

21. The Court notes that neither the Respondent nor the Third Parties dispute that the appeal has been brought in accordance with the provisions of the JDR.
22. The Court also considers that it has jurisdiction to hear this appeal.
23. Therefore, the Court deems the appeal admissible.

V. ON THE SUBSTANCE

a) *Arguments of the Parties*

24. The Appellant puts forward in essence the following grounds in support of the appeal:
- (i) The NCA was not provided with any new and/or decisive evidence that was not previously available to the Stewards. As a consequence, based on the ICA constant jurisprudence on this issue, restraint in assessing the Race Incident should have been observed by the judges of the NCA and should be now observed by the ICA in the present Appeal, in an even more restrictive manner, therefore maintaining the factual reconstruction made by the Stewards and the related decision not to impose any sanction on the Appellant and the Driver.
 - (ii) In any event, the behaviour of the Driver should be considered solely as a track limits infraction and no sanction on the Driver would be grounded and justified pursuant to the SR, since a penalty is only triggered by the third infraction (and solely in the form of a warning). The 5-second penalty imposed by the NCA would only be imposed after the fifth infraction. And yet the Driver did not commit a single track limits infraction, as demonstrated by the official track limits report of the Race and, as proof of the impeccable race conduct of the Driver, he only left the track on the occasion of the circumstances in question, in the course of a fair fight with Driver No. 23, resulting in a normal racing incident not needing any further action.
25. The RFEDA contends in its Grounds in Response, in essence, the following:
- (i) The three videos shown to the Appellant during the procedure before the NCA demonstrate that Driver No. 23 successfully overtook Driver No. 24, and the latter decided to use the Escape Road at full speed to gain back his position, overtaking Driver No. 23 while using the Escape Road, obviously exceeding the track limits, before re-joining the track.
 - (ii) The above statement is “uncontroverted” as the Stewards’ Decision states that *“during Race 1 (turn 1-2) car #23 overtook car #24 at the apex and car #24 went out of the track joining the auxiliary road, rejoining in front of car #23.”*
 - (iii) As noted in the NCA Decision, Driver No. 24 entered the Escape Road at approximately 120 km/h, continued accelerating at full throttle, and re-joined the track at approximately 161 km/h. Therefore, it seems evident that Driver No. 24’s intentions were to gain as much advantage as possible, and gaining advantage while exceeding the track limits is a breach of Article 20.16 SR and Article 6.5 of the Race Director’s event notes (“the Event Notes”).

- (iv) It seems evident that when the Stewards decided to take no further action, they erred by not applying or enforcing the aforementioned articles of the SR, especially when the Stewards recognised that Driver No. 23 overtook Driver No. 24 and that the latter then “re-joined” the track in front of Driver No. 23.
 - (v) The use of the word “re-join” shows that the Stewards admit that Driver No. 24 gained a position, although they denied it at the hearing before the NCA. According to the RFEDA, this issue is an objective one and leaves no room for “*any sort of debate*”.
 - (vi) The Race Director of the 2024 Eurocup-3 Championship, Mr Luis González (“the Race Director”) agreed with all the teams at the beginning of the season that in case a driver gains a position while exceeding track limits, Race Control would not demand said driver to give back the position so as to avoid having to take any hasty and possibly unfair decision, but rather – and after confirming that a position was gained while exceeding the track limits – the infringing driver would receive a 5- to 10-second penalty, depending on the assessment made by the Stewards on the specific case, based on Article 20.16 and Appendix I SR, which provides that in case of a sporting advantage gained from an infraction of the SR “*the Stewards may apply such other penalty they consider more appropriate. If this advantage consists of the driver gaining one or more positions, the Race Director may demand the driver to give them back*”.
 - (vii) The NCA remedied the lack of enforcement of the SR; it did not assess any sanction imposed by the Stewards because there was none.
 - (viii) The FIA, ASNs, National Courts and the ICA itself cannot allow human errors to consolidate and cause an injustice; this is why there are legal mechanisms – such as the right to appeal – to contest these decisions and rectify mistakes.
 - (ix) In general, the National Courts and the ICA are not bound by precedents.
26. Campos Racing contends in its Written Observations, in essence, the following:
- (i) The National Court and the ICA can review Stewards’ Decisions without referring to additional or new information.
 - (ii) The existence of a right to review the Stewards’ Decisions does not prevent the National Court and the ICA from reviewing a case *de novo*, as clearly provided by Article 10.11.1 and seq. of the JDR.

- (iii) The Stewards' view was that *"Car #23 had a significant portion of the car to the inside of car 24 at the apex of Turn 1, however, to so do he was significantly on the kerb, and in the view of the Stewards the manoeuvre was late"* and the NCA's view was that *"the overtake of vehicle No. 24, driven by Emmo Fittipaldi, was performed correctly"*. Those opposing interpretations of the facts require that the ICA reviews the case and issues its own decision.
- (iv) The videos confirm the NCA's opinion that Driver No. 24 gained an advantage by choosing to use the Escape Road in order to speed up and pass Driver No. 23, although there was *"still asphalt and a white line available to stay within the track limits."* Driver No. 24 is driving at 125 km/h, time frame 04:38:58 pm, undoubtedly aiming towards the Escape Road when there is enough distance from Car No. 23 and consequently no collision to avoid. He further keeps increasing his speed (up to 130 km/h), demonstrating that his only intention by abandoning the track was to recover the first position in the race, which he had lost by being correctly overtaken by Driver No. 23, and finally re-enters the track at 163 km/h. This behaviour was clearly in breach of the applicable regulations during the Race. On the contrary, Driver No. 23 consistently complied with those regulations throughout the Race.
- (v) According to the SR, *"a driver cannot leave the track without a justified reason"* and in case he does so and has to return he may do so only *"in a safe manner and without gaining advantage"*. More specifically according to the Event Notes, the Escape Road should be used only if a driver loses control of his car. Yet, as demonstrated by the pictures, Driver No. 24 did not lose control of his car and in fact, as rightly acknowledged by the National Court of Appeal, *"(...) gained an advantage by driving off the track through the escape road at high speed"* but also by not relinquishing this position upon re-joining the track. Indeed, and contrary to the Stewards Chair's allegation, Driver No. 24 constantly went full throttle on when he was driving on the Escape Road.
- (vi) Considering the above, and the fact that Driver No. 24's objective had been to gain a position by using the track limits, Campos Racing finds that the imposition of a 5-second penalty is justified and proportionate.

27. The FIA contends in its Written Observations, in essence, the following:

- (i) The Stewards shall have supreme authority for the enforcement of the Code, including the assessment and settlement of any matter or incident taking place during an event.
- (ii) In performing the abovementioned duties, the stewards may decide that a racing incident may lead to no further action, if the applicable regulations are complied with (as was decided in the Stewards' Decision); or they may decide to impose penalties, should they find that the applicable regulations have been breached.

- (iii) The general rule, according to the ICA's jurisprudence, is that *"although the national courts of appeal and, ultimately, the ICA can review the case de novo based on the devolutive effect of the appeals, the ICA considers that the national courts of appeal and, ultimately, the ICA must in principle exercise restraint when it comes to the pure assessment of a race incident and of the sanction imposed on a competitor by the Stewards."* (see notably ICA-2015-06, 18 December 2015, *Tsunami R.T. s.r.l.*, par. 39).
- (iv) As an exception to this general rule, the ICA has also determined that, in certain specific circumstances, it may be entitled to review a racing incident. Only if the ICA considers that such circumstances are present in this case may the NCA's Decision to review the Racing Incident be confirmed. Thereafter, the ICA would be entitled to analyse the case *de novo* and pass its own decision as provided under Article 10.12.1 JDR, which provides that *"[t]he ICA has all the decision-making powers of the authority that took the contested decision"*.
- (v) The Appellant was sanctioned not only for a track limits infraction, but also for gaining an advantage. In this respect, neither the SR nor the Event Notes foresee any specific sanction to be imposed in case of breach of Article 20.16 of the SR or Article 12.2.1.i of the Code. However, the jurisprudence confirms that, where there has been a track limits infraction and an advantage has been gained, it is possible to impose a time penalty. The racing incidents that have been subject of this jurisprudence are comparable in nature to the present Racing Incident. Therefore, the FIA submits that, should the ICA determine that the Appellant breached Article 20.16 of the SR and, consequently, Article 12.2.1.i of the Code, the imposition of a time penalty would be appropriate.
- (vi) If the NCA Decision is upheld, Driver No. 23 will be declared the winner of the 2024 Eurocup-3 whereas, should it be dismissed, the Driver J. Sagrera, who is part of the Appellant's team, would be the winner. In both cases, Driver No. 24 would remain fifth in the 2024 Eurocup-3.

b) Applicable Regulations

- 28. The applicable regulations relevant to the merits of the present case are the 2024 Edition of the FIA International Sporting Code ("the Code") and the 2024 edition of the Eurocup-3 Sporting Regulations ("the SR") and the Event Notes (collectively referred to as "the Regulations").

29. As determined under Articles 14.2 and 14.4 JDR, French law applies to the present proceedings on a complementary basis.
30. As to the Procedural Rules, the Notification of Appeal was filed on 11 December 2024 whereas some modifications to the said rules came into effect as from 1st January 2025. Insofar as, under French law, new procedural rules are applicable immediately, the 2025 Procedural Rules took over as from 1st January 2025, unless there was an obvious impossibility to do so or if fairness would be affected by proceeding in that way.
31. Neither the Appellant nor the Respondent and the Third parties dispute the above.

c) Conclusions of the Court

32. Having carefully considered the written submissions presented by the Parties, and the oral pleadings and evidence addressed at the hearing, the Court rules as follows.
 - a. On the question of the ability of the ICA to review the case de novo with or without restraint
33. Article 10.12.1 JDR provides that *“the ICA has all the decision-making powers of the authority that took the contested decision.”*
34. It is undisputed that the ICA has the power to review a case *de novo* and, by doing so, has the same powers as the Stewards or, as the case may be, the National Court of Appeal, to decide on a specific case. Yet the Appellant puts forward the jurisprudence of the ICA, where the ICA found that decisions of the Stewards should be reviewed *“with restraint”*.
35. In ICA-2018-01, 4 May 2018, *M-Sport Ford World Rally Team* (par. 22 and 30) and ICA-2024-08, 21 November 2024, *Miguel Gayoso Vázquez* (par. 73), the ICA confirmed that the Stewards were in the best position to analyse a racing incident. The ICA also decided that it should only moderate a sanction if the Stewards issued the sanction without a regulatory basis or if the sanction is *“obviously disproportionate”*. This jurisprudence is based *inter alia* on another ICA decision, namely ICA-2015-06, 18 December 2015, *Tsunami R.T. s.r.l.* (par. 39), where the ICA had decided in this case that the competent appeal bodies should exercise *“restraint”* when reassessing a racing incident and the sanction imposed.



36. In decisions ICA-2020-06, 5 March 2021, *Pierre Furon and Maxime Furon-Castelain* and ICA-2022-03, 4 July 2022, *Koski Motorsport*, the ICA also explained that an appeal body can be in a better position than the Stewards to decide on a case, when new materials or evidence is provided to the appeal body that the Stewards did not have access to. In that case as well, no restraint should be exercised by the competent authority.
37. In the present case, the Court stresses first that it is not the Stewards who imposed a sanction but the NCA. The Court finds therefore that it shall have no restraint when it comes to reassessing the sanction imposed by the NCA, the above-mentioned ICA decisions referring exclusively to decisions taken by the Stewards.
38. This being stated, it is necessary to determine whether the NCA should have exercised, and if the ICA must exercise, restraint while reviewing the Stewards' Decision in the present case.
39. Firstly, the Court notes that no sanction was imposed by the Stewards. The situation is thus quite different compared to those precedents referred to by the Appellant in its Grounds of Appeal or by the FIA in its Written Observations. The absence of a sanction in the Stewards' Decision simply means that the criteria of the "obviously disproportionate sanction" and of the lack of a regulatory basis are not applicable in the present case, as rightly mentioned by the FIA in its Written Observations.
40. As to the criteria of the new evidence brought before the NCA or the ICA, the Court notes that it is undisputed that in the present case no such new evidence was produced in the second or third instance. The Stewards, the NCA and the ICA saw the very same videos when assessing the Incident.
41. Should those criteria be considered as exhaustive, and according to the Appellant's position, this would mean that the Stewards' Decision in the present case should be confirmed by the Court.
42. However, the Court finds first that it cannot of course be deduced from the previous decisions issued by the ICA that the decision-making powers of the ICA and of the National Courts of Appeal are only limited to cases where sanctions were imposed without a regulatory basis or were disproportionate, or to cases where new evidence was available to the appeal bodies. This would otherwise limit considerably the scope of the powers of the appeal bodies, in particular the powers of the ICA clearly established by Article 10.2.1 JDR.
43. The Court then concludes that the criteria put forward in the previous decisions were not meant to be exhaustive but were examples of cases where the appeal bodies did not have to exercise restraint.

44. The Court finds as a consequence that in order to determine in the present case whether restraint should have been exercised by the National Court of Appeal of the RFEdA, and by way of consequence by the Court, it is necessary to go back to the general principle issued by the ICA in those precedents, namely the fact that restraint should be exercised by the appeal bodies because the Stewards are in principle in the best position to assess the circumstances of an incident, as they hold, still in principle, the best knowledge of the relevant facts in the given time and place.
45. This means, in other words, that appeal bodies should not quibble over decisions issued by the Stewards but only amend or set aside such decisions when the appeal body finds clear reasons to do so.
46. This tallies with the criteria of the “*obviously disproportionate sanction*”, and the Court concludes that if a Stewards’ decision is obviously wrong, it is equally obvious that an appeal body can review the case *de novo* and issue a new decision.

b. On the question of the Appellant’s breach of the regulations

47. In the present case, the NCA imposed a sanction on the Appellant finding that “*the overtake of car No. 24, driven by Emmo Fittipaldi, was performed correctly*” and that “*in this regard, and in view of the video evidence in the file, it is a certain fact – and without any doubt – that Driver No. 24 gained an advantage by using the circuit’s escape road, and that this advantage consisted of overtaking Driver No. 23, as can be seen at the end of the circuit video (...)*”.
48. After having watched the videos, the Court draws exactly the same conclusion as the NCA.
49. The Appellant put forward at the hearing that Driver No. 23 went off track on the previous curve and that this allowed him to gain momentum in order to overtake Driver No. 24.
50. Having examined the entire case file, including but not limited to the video material, the Court finds that the Appellant has failed to provide any convincing evidence in support of its claim that the two situations were in any way connected. The Appellant’s argument is thus rejected by the Court.
51. The Appellant claimed further that when Driver No. 24 re-joined the track, he had not yet overtaken Driver No. 23, and overtook Driver No. 23 in a fair manner while back on the track. The Court finds that this statement is not at all supported by the videos of the Incident, which clearly show that Driver No. 24, who was second at the moment of the Incident, managed to overtake Driver No. 23 by using the Escape Road.

52. Based on the foregoing, the Court finds that Driver No. 24 breached Article 20.16 SR, which states that:

"(...) A driver will be considered to have left the track if no part of their vehicle remains in contact with it. A driver cannot leave the track without a justified reason. If a driver leaves the track for any reason, they may return, but only in a safe manner and without gaining any advantage (...)."

53. The Court notes further that, contrary to what the Appellant put forward during the hearing, the intention of Driver No. 24 or the reasons why he left the track are not relevant to assess whether or not Article 20.16 SR was breached. What is key is whether or not Driver No. 24 gained an advantage.
54. The Court finds without any doubt that the Driver breached the regulations. As he did gain an advantage and did not give the position back, he should have been sanctioned.

c. *On the proportionality of the sanction*

55. Having found that the Appellant had breached the Regulations, notably Article 20.16 SR, the Court now comes to the proportionality of the sanction.
56. As mentioned above, the Court can review the sanction issued by an Appeal Body without any restraint.
57. In the present case, the Court notes that the purpose of the sanction is to ensure that the time penalty inflicted results in the elimination of the advantage gained by Driver No. 24 during the Incident. With the sanction, Driver No. 24 therefore loses one rank, finishing second, and Driver No. 23 gains one rank, finishing first.
58. As a consequence, the Court finds the sanction proportionate and concludes that the NCA Decision must be upheld.

VI. COSTS

59. Considering the outcome of the proceedings, the Court leaves it to the Appellant to bear all the costs.



ON THESE GROUNDS,

THE FIA INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL:

- 1. Declares the appeal admissible;**
- 2. Upholds Decision No. 13/2024 dated 4 December 2024 of the National Appeal and Disciplinary Court of the Real Federación Española de Automovilismo ("RFEdA");**
- 3. Orders the competent Sporting Authority to draw, as appropriate, the consequences of this ruling;**
- 4. Awards the costs to the Appellant, in accordance with Article 11.2 of the Judicial and Disciplinary Rules of the FIA, to be calculated by the General Secretariat of the Courts and notified later on;**
- 5. Rejects all other and further conclusions.**

Paris, 24 February 2025
The President

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of several fluid, overlapping strokes that form a cursive representation of the name Arnas Paliukenas.

Arnas Paliukenas