



FIA FORMULA 1 WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP



2025 DUTCH GRAND PRIX

29 - 31 August 2025

From	The Stewards	Document	64
To	The Team Manager, Atlassian Williams Racing	Date	13 September 2025
		Time	14:15

Title Decision - Williams Petition for Right of Review

Description Decision - Williams Petition for Right of Review

Enclosed 2025 Dutch Grand Prix - Decision - Williams Petition for Right of Review .pdf

Nish Shetty

Matthew Selley

Pedro Lamy

Natalie Corsmit

The Stewards



2025 DUTCH GRAND PRIX

29 – 31 August 2025

From	The Stewards	Document	64
To	The Team Manager	Date	13 September 2025
	Atlassian Williams Racing	Time	14:15

Petition for the Right of Review

Introduction

1. On September 4, 2025, the Stewards received a petition from Atlassian Williams Racing ("**Williams**") requesting a Right of Review in accordance with Article 14 of the FIA International Sporting Code ("**the Code**").
2. Williams' request related to the decision of the Stewards contained in document number 45 issued at the 2025 Dutch Grand Prix and issued during the race at that event that the Driver of Car 55, Carlos Sainz, caused a collision with Car 30, Liam Lawson, and in so doing contravened Appendix L, Chapter IV, Article 2d) of the Code. The Stewards imposed a 10 second time penalty on Car 55 (which was served during the race) and 2 penalty points on the Driver of Car 55 ("**Decision**").
3. A hearing was convened on 12 September 2025 at 15:30hrs CEST by video conference to determine the admissibility of the Petition and Williams was summoned accordingly (document 62).
4. A summons was also issued to the Team Manager of Visa Cash App Racing Bulls F1 Team ("**VCARB**") and the Driver of Car 30, Liam Lawson, to attend a subsequent hearing if the Stewards determined after an initial hearing that the criteria in Article 14.1.1 of the Code was satisfied (document 63). However, VCARB requested that they be afforded an opportunity to attend the initial hearing and make submissions. That request was granted. In granting the request, the Stewards were cognizant of the fact that similar requests had been granted in the past to those involved in the incident.

Attendees

5. The Stewards of the 2025 Dutch Grand Prix conducted the hearing. None of the parties raised any objection to the composition of the panel.
6. Attending the hearing on behalf of Williams were:
 - Sven Smeets, Sporting Director;
 - Dave Redding, Team Manager; and
 - Carlos Sainz, Driver of Car 55.
7. Attending the hearing on behalf of VCARB were:
 - Marco Perrone, Team Manager; and
 - Liam Lawson, Driver of Car 30.
8. Attending the hearing on behalf of the FIA was the FIA F1 Sporting Director, Tim Malyon.

Purpose of hearing

9. This initial hearing was to determine, at the sole discretion of the Stewards (as specified in Article 14.3 of the Code), if *“a significant and relevant new element is discovered which was unavailable to the parties seeking the review at the time of the decision concerned”*.
10. Therefore, the Stewards were required to determine if any evidence presented to them was:
 - a. *“significant”*;
 - b. *“relevant”*;
 - c. *“new”*; and
 - d. *“unavailable to the party seeking the review at the time of the original decision”* (**“Review Criteria”**).
11. Only if the Review Criteria is met, would the Stewards be required to convene a further hearing to reconsider the Decision.
12. Article 14.1.1 sets a high bar for reviewing a decision of the Stewards. This has been the consistent position taken in previous requests to exercise the right of review.

Submissions

13. Williams asserted that the following 3 elements, said to be significant and relevant new elements, were unavailable to it at the time of the Decision:
 - a. footage from the 360° camera on Car 55;
 - b. footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30;
 - c. testimony from the Driver of Car 55,(collectively **“the alleged new elements”**).
14. Williams submitted that the footage from the 360° camera on Car 55 and the footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30 were not available to the team during the race because it was not transmitted during the race and only recorded on a card in each camera which could only be downloaded after the race and made available by Formula One thereafter. This was confirmed by the FIA F1 Sporting Director and acknowledged by VCARB.
15. Williams also submitted that the team could not obtain the Driver of Car 55’s account of the incident which led to the Decision until after the race.
16. As the Decision explained, in arriving at the Decision the Stewards reviewed *“video, timing, telemetry, team radio and in-car video evidence”*. That evidence did not include the footage from the 360° camera on Car 55 or the footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30. Nor did it include the Driver of Car 55’s account of the incident.
17. The Stewards acknowledge that none of the new elements were *“available”* to Williams, the party seeking the review, when the Decision was issued. It follows that each of the new elements are *“new”*.
18. The new elements are all evidence relating to the incident between Cars 55 and 30 which resulted in the Decision. The footage from the 360° camera on Car 55 and rear facing camera on Car 30 show the relative positions of both cars leading up to and including the collision. They are therefore *“relevant”*. The account of the Driver of Car 55 of the incident was also relevant.

19. However, are these new elements “*significant*”? Williams submitted that they were for the following reasons:
- (a) both the footage from the 360° camera on Car 55 and the footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30 are further evidence of the relative positions and proximity of the cars before, during and after the collision; and
 - (b) the footage from the rear camera on Car 30 shows the rear wheels of Car 30 (which cannot be seen in the footage from the forward facing camera from Car 30) moving to the left towards Car 55 after the apex of turn 1 and the rear left tyre of Car 30 collide with the front right tyre of Car 55. This footage, Williams submitted, showed that what they described as a ‘*slight snap*’ – a momentary loss of control by the Driver of Car 30 which required corrective steering input - resulted in Car 30 colliding with Car 55, not the other way around;
 - (c) the testimony of the Driver of Car 55 explained what can be seen in the footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30 and in other video evidence which was available when the Decision was made.
20. VCARB did not make any submissions regarding the Review Criteria. The Team Manager adverted to the application of the F1 Driving Standards Guidelines to the incident but acknowledged that the submissions he wished to make in that regard would only be relevant if the Stewards were satisfied that the Review Criteria are met.
21. The Stewards agree that the footage from the rear facing camera on Car 30 and the 360° camera are significant. As that evidence is also new, relevant and unavailable to Williams at the time of the Decision the threshold is met.
22. As for the third element, namely the testimony of the Driver, the Stewards express reservations as to whether the testimony of the Driver in this case is significant. First, the testimony of a driver involved in an incident, while potentially relevant, will never be available to the Competitor concerned or to the Stewards if the Stewards, in their discretion, determine that they are able to arrive at a decision on that incident during a session. The Stewards have the power and authority to issue a decision in session without hearing from a driver. Secondly, the testimony of the Driver of Car 55 in relation to this incident, while relevant and of some assistance to the Stewards, does not materially add to an evaluation of the incident by reference to all of the video evidence, including the new video evidence.
23. Having found that the footage from the rear facing camera and the 360° camera on Car 30 satisfies all of the Review Criteria, the Stewards decided to re-examine the Decision.

Second Hearing

24. After adjourning briefly, the Stewards commenced a second hearing to re-examine the Decision. The same representatives for Williams, VCARB and the FIA were in attendance and the Stewards granted permission for representatives of the McLaren Formula 1 Team and Aston Martin Aramco Formula 1 Team to observe.

Submissions

25. Williams referred to the available video evidence which appeared to show Car 55 attempting to overtake Car 30 on the outside of the long radius turn 1 and the collision between the two cars occurring between the apex and the exit. Williams submitted that while the front axle of Car 55 was not ahead of the front axle of Car 30 at the apex, such that Car 55 did not have the right to the corner applying the F1 Driving Standards Guidelines, Car 55 was entitled to attempt to race alongside Car 30 through turn 1. They submitted that Car 55 left space for Car 30 on the inside and the collision only occurred because the driver of Car 30 had a momentary loss of control. They described the collision as a racing incident. They were at pains to make clear that they were not suggesting that the Driver of Car 30 should be penalised, only that the penalty to Car 55 was unjustified.
26. The Driver of Car 55 acknowledged that he was not strictly entitled to space on the outside of turn 1 and that the Car 30 could have used the whole of the track at the exit forcing Car 55 to yield or take evasive action and go off track. He acknowledged that if he had left the edge of the track at the exit and rejoined ahead of Car 30, he might need to give the position back. However, he said he was ready to deal with these potential eventualities. What he wasn't prepared for was Car 30 having a moment mid corner and colliding with his car.
27. VCARB pointed to the Driving Standards Guidelines and submitted that Car 55 had no right to space on the outside but that Car 30 had nonetheless left significant space for Car 55. They submitted that the collision only occurred because Car 55 chose to drive too close to Car 30. The Driver of Car 30 denied that he was not in control of his car and said that a slight snap of the type which occurred is not unusual when cars are racing closely side by side, in this case both on fresh tyres after a safety car restart.

Decision

28. Having considered the matter extensively and having reviewed the new video evidence and heard from the drivers of both cars and their team representatives, the Stewards determine to rescind the Decision. The Stewards agree with Williams' characterisation of the collision as a racing incident.
29. The Stewards are satisfied that the collision was caused by a momentary loss of control by Car 30. However, in the Stewards' assessment, no driver was wholly or predominantly to blame for that collision. Car 55 contributed to the incident by taking the risk to drive close to, and on the outside of, Car 30 when Car 55 had no right to room there and there was a real possibility that, if the collision had not occurred where it did, Car 55 would run out of track at the exit and/or a collision would have occurred at the exit for which the Driver of Car 55 would likely be predominantly if not wholly to blame.
30. The time penalty imposed by the Decision was served by Car 55 during the race. The Stewards have no power to remedy that served time penalty by amending the Classifications but note that the gap between Car 55 to the car ahead in the Final Classification of the race (coincidentally Car 30) was 17 seconds. The Decision having been rescinded, it follows that the 2 penalty points imposed on the Driver of Car 55 are to be removed.

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 and Chapter 4 of the FIA Judicial and Disciplinary Rules, within the applicable time limits.

Decisions of the Stewards are taken independently of the FIA and are based solely on the relevant regulations, guidelines and evidence presented.

Nish Shetty

Matthew Selley

Pedro Lamy

Natalie Corsmit

The Stewards