



FIA FORMULA 1 WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP



2026 MONACO GRAND PRIX

05 – 07 June 2026

From	The Stewards	Document	98
To	The Team Manager BWT Alpine F1 Team	Date	11 June 2026
		Time	14:00

The Stewards have received in writing two petitions from BWT Alpine F1 Team (“Alpine”) for them to review, in accordance with Article 14 of the FIA International Sporting Code, the Decisions contained in Documents 73 and 75, rendered by the Stewards at the 2026 Monaco Formula 1 Grand Prix.

For ease of reference, the petition relating to Document 73 will be referred to as the first petition and the one relating to Document 75 will be referred to as the second petition.

The Stewards have determined, with the agreement of the concerned parties, that **the two petitions shall be dealt with concurrently** as they are substantially the same for all intents and purposes.

The Stewards convened a Hearing in two parts, for 1300 hrs CEST Thursday June 11, 2026 via video conference. The first part of the Hearing was to determine

- a) The admissibility of each petition
- b) Whether there is significant and relevant new element which was unavailable to the Stewards at the time of each of the original decisions, there being no hearing conducted at the time of those decisions.

In addition to those summoned (refer below) representatives of the following competitors requested, and were granted permission, to attend the hearing:

McLaren Mastercard F1 Team
Oracle Red Bull Racing
Scuderia Ferrari HP
VISA Cash App Racing Bulls Formula One Team
Aston Martin Aramco Formula One Team
TGR Haas F1 Team
Audi Revolut F1 Team
Cadillac Formula 1 Team

The Petitioner was asked if there was any objection to the composition of the Panel. No objection was raised.

Deadline: The petitions were received within the 96-hour in accordance with Article 14.4.1 of the ISC

Deposit: The required deposits for each of the two petitions were correctly lodged directly with the FIA as per the usual arrangement for Formula 1 .

The Stewards, having examined the petitions and associated submissions, summoned and heard the team representatives, FIA representatives, and FOM (as the Official Timekeeping Supplier for the Competition), (Documents numbered 94, 95, 96 and 97) determine the following:

Decision 1: The petition of review in relation to the first petition is admissible.

Decision 2: The petition of review in relation to the second petition is admissible.

Competitors are reminded that, in accordance with Article 14.3 of the FIA International Sporting Code, Decisions 1 and 2 **are subject to appeal**.

Decision 3: There is a significant and relevant new element which was unavailable to the Stewards at the time of the decision in Document 73, no hearing having been conducted at the time.

Decision 4: There is a significant and relevant new element which was unavailable to the Stewards at the time of the decision in Document 75, no hearing having been conducted at the time.

Reasons (which apply to both Decisions 3 and 4):

1. Significance

In its written submission, Alpine argued that there were four matters which demonstrated the “significance” of the element namely

- a. That the FIA and FOM, but not the Race Stewards, were aware in advance of the race that there was an issue with the timing loops in the pit lane
- b. That Alpine had data with demonstrated that the driver of Car 10 (Pierre Gasly) activated the pit lane speed limiter in advance of entry into the pit lane and did not exceed the pit lane speed limit
- c. A witness statement from Pierre Gasly that he took a cautious approach before entering the pit lane having been warned by his engineers
- d. FOM, as Official Timekeeping Supplier to the Competition, provided evidence that the distance used in calculating the F1 Official Timing (and hence the pit lane speed) was inaccurate and overestimated the speed of Car 10

The Stewards determine that item d. above is sufficient on its own to meet the required standard of “significant”.

[It is NOTED that the FIA and FOM representatives strongly refuted the assertion in “Significance” point 1a, that they had advance awareness of the issue with the timing loops in pit lane.

The Stewards also NOTED that they became concerned after the third alleged speeding breach was reported to them by the Official Timekeeper, and at that time asked Race Control if it was aware of any issue or irregularity with the system. Race Control reported back that it raised the matter with the Official Timekeeper and was reassured that there were no issues.]

2. Relevance

In its written submission, Alpine argued that the new element was relevant in that it directly related to the speed of Car 10 in the Pit Lane

The Stewards determine that this meets the standard of “relevant”.

3. New Element

The information concerning the inaccurate distance measurement was provided by FOM on Wednesday June 10, therefore was “new” and unavailable to the Stewards at the time of the two decisions referred to in Documents 73 and 75 (June 7).

Conclusion: Both the first and second petitions meet the required standards for a Right of Review in accordance with Article 14.1.1 of the FIA International Sporting Code.

Accordingly Part 2 of the Hearing will be conducted into both matters referred to in Documents 73 and 75. With the agreement of the parties, both Hearings will be conducted concurrently.

Part 1 of the Hearing adjourned at 1310hrs CEST and will resume at 1320 hrs CEST

Competitors are reminded that, in accordance with Article 14.3 of the FIA International Sporting Code, Decisions 3 and 4 **are not subject to appeal**.

Garry Connelly

Derek Warwick

The Stewards

Tanja Geilhausen

Jean-François Calmes