

## DECISION No: 18

---

|                                                            |                                |
|------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>From:</b> The Stewards                                  | <b>Date:</b> 7/09/2025         |
| <b>To:</b> Car 66 Paul Lucchitti                           | <b>Time:</b> 18:00 hrs         |
| <b>Series:</b> GT World Challenge Australia powered by AWS | <b>Event:</b> Round 5 The Bend |

---

The Stewards, having received a report from the Technical Delegate and hearing from the Team Representative, have considered the following matter and determine the following:

**No. / Driver:** Car 66

**Competitor:** Car 66 Paul Lucchitti

**Time (fact):** 18:00 hrs

**Session:** After Race 2

**Fact:** Alleged failure to comply with homologation documents, namely by failing to have knockback springs in place in front brake calipers.

**Offence:** Breach of Article 10.3.3 of the International Sporting Code of the FIA

**Decision:** Allegation not proved.

**Reason** During the Parc Ferme after Race 1, the Technical Delegate sealed the front brake calipers in several cars. The same calipers were used by those cars in Race 2. During the Parc Ferme after Race 2, the calipers were dismantled. In 4 cars, including this competitor, the calipers were not fitted with knockback springs behind the pistons. The Stewards hearing, which commenced at 17.15 on Sunday 7<sup>th</sup> September 2025, was conducted contemporaneously in respect of this competitor and the 3 other cars alleged to have failed to comply with the relevant homologation documents. All cars the subject of the alleged breach, were Mercedes-AMG GT3 Evo cars. The defence of the allegations and evidence on behalf of each competitor was provided by representatives of each team. The evidence and submissions in support of the alleged breaches was provided by the Technical Delegate, Stephen Page, and a technical team member.

It was contended that the springs were required to be fitted as they formed part of a complete caliper and were clearly identified and described in a Mercedes-AMG Technical Information document provided to the hearing. All parties agreed that the calipers provided at the hearing were used by each of the competitors during the meeting and that the knockback springs were not fitted to any of the cars. A caliper, with the springs fitted, from another Mercedes-AMG GT3 Evo, was tendered to the hearing in support of the contention that the springs were a required component. In defence of the allegations, it was contended that the homologation documents for the relevant cars did not contain any photos or description or specifically mention the knockback springs. Pages 94- 95 of the Homologation Document, which was tabled at each race meeting was provided to the hearing. There was no reference to the Technical Information document being included or referred to in the Homologation Document. It

was argued that it was, therefore, not a document which regulated required the use of these components.

Technical Delegate submitted that the FIA homologation document does not identify every specific part number, and were a complete caliper to be purchased, it would have the springs fitted, and that a caliper with the relevant part number would have the springs fitted.

Representatives from the Teams stated that neither the Homologation Document nor the Build Manual for the model contained any information that the springs being included and, further, the rebuilding instructions for the calipers, including fitting seals, made no reference to the springs being included.

Representatives from the Teams argued that there was no requirement for the fitting of the springs, and the fact was that Balance of Performance requirements in other jurisdictions did invoke the requirement that springs be fitted, was supportive of the of the argument that springs not being required to be fitted. There was no such requirement in the Balance of Performance for this meeting and consequently the competitors were not required to have springs in place.

At 17.45 the hearing adjourned to enable Stewards to deliberate. The hearing reconvened soon after.

The Stewards advised the finding that there was no requirement that any document other than the Homologation Document regulated the components to be used. The admitted absence of the springs did not mean the cars competed in a form not in compliance with the Homologation Documents. The competitors had not breached the relevant regulations.

Having given a verbal indication of the findings, the Stewards advised all parties that a detailed decision would be provided in due course.

Competitors are reminded that they have the right to appeal certain decisions of the Stewards, in accordance with Article 15 of the FIA International Sporting Code, within the applicable time limits.

Steven Chopping AM  
Steward (Chair)

Trevor Neumann  
Steward

Trisha Davidson  
Steward



*\*A signed copy of this document is available to view at the Secretary of the Event Office.*

**Received by the Competitor:**

Name: ..... Signature: .....

Date ..... Time: .....