

DECISION OF THE FIM INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL

Sitting in the following composition:

Mr Robert HOFSTETTER (Chairman)
Mr Marek MALECKI
Mr František SCHULMANN

in the case:

Championship: *2025 FIM Trial World Championship*

Event: *2025 Trial des Nations held on 20-21 September 2025 in Tolmezzo (Italy)-IMN 301/01*

Case concerns: *The Appeal lodged on behalf of the Federazione Motociclistica Italiana, against the decision taken by the FIM Referee on 21 September 2025, during the FIM Trial des Nations, rejecting its Protest against an incorrect score attribution in Section 12 of the first lap.*

Hearing of 7 November 2025

Decision of 20 November 2025

* * *

ATTENDEES AT THE HEARING OF THE FIM INTERNATIONAL COURT OF APPEAL, 7 NOVEMBER 2025 IN MIES, SWITZERLAND

APPELLANT: FEDERAZIONE MOTOCICLISTICA ITALIANA

Mr Matteo BENCIOLINI *Lawyer*

RESPONDENT: REAL FEDERACIÓN MOTOCICLISTA ESPAÑOLA

Mr Rafael NÚÑEZ FORNEIRO *Secretary General*

WITNESSES

Called by the Federazione Motociclistica Italiana:

Mr Evaristo PAOLUCCI *Chief Section Observer
(via videoconference)*

Mr Danilo GALEAZZI *Clerk of the Course
(via videoconference)*

Called by the Real Federación Motociclista Española:

Mr David RODGERS *FIM Referee
(via videoconference)*

Mr Jordi PRAT *Member of the FIM Trial Commission
(via videoconference)*

EXPERTS

None

ALSO ATTENDING

Mr Jean-Christophe BREILLAT *CAI Secretary General*

* * *

1. The International Court of Appeal (the “Court” or the “CAI”), which comprised Mr Robert Hofstetter (Switzerland), who was designated President of the Panel, Mr Marek Malecki (Poland) and Mr František Schulmann (Czech Republic), held a hearing at the Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme, Route de Suisse 11, 1295 Mies (Switzerland), on Friday, 7 November 2025.
2. Nobody challenged the composition of the Court or submitted a request for the recusal of any of the judges.
3. Prior to the hearing, the Court received and considered submissions and attachments thereto made by the Federazione Motociclistica Italiana (the “Appellant” or the “FMI”) and the Real Federación Motociclista Española (the “Respondent” or the “RFME”),

all of them collectively referred to as the “Parties”.
4. At the hearing on 7 November 2025, the Parties set out oral arguments and addressed the questions asked by the Court.
5. The hearing took place in English, although, as requested by Mr Evaristo Paolucci, the assistance of two interpreters from Italian to English and vice versa was arranged for the latter by the Secretariat of the Court.
6. None of the Parties raised any objections, in relation to the manner in which the proceedings and the hearing were conducted before the Court, notably concerning the respect of the adversarial principle or the simultaneous interpretation and declared that they were satisfied about this.

I. JURISDICTION

7. Pursuant to Articles 3.2.4.1 and 4.3.5 of the 2025 FIM Disciplinary Code (the “Code”), the Court is competent and has jurisdiction to hear by way of appeals the decisions taken by the first appeal bodies present at a FIM meeting and listed by Article 3.a of the Code, subject to the specific provisions of the discipline regulations.
8. In the present case, the applicable regulations of the discipline are the 2025 FIM Trial Regulations (the “Regulations”).
9. Article 4.30 (“*Protests and Appeals*”), par. 11 and 12, of the Regulations reads as follows:

“11. Any natural or legal person, holder of a FIM licence, who is directly prejudiced following a decision taken by the Referee during a meeting under the authority of the FIM has the right to present an appeal against this decision.

12. This appeal against the decision of the FIM Referee may be made to the International Court of Appeal (CAI). This written appeal must be presented 5 days at latest after the notification of the decision according to the FIM Disciplinary Code. The Deposit for the appeal is of 1.320€.”
10. In the framework of the present procedure, the Appellant brought an appeal (the “Appeal”) against the decision taken by the FIM Referee on 21 September 2025 (the “FIM Referee’s Decision”), during the FIM Trial des Nations, whereby the latter decided on 21 September 2025 (19:14 CEST) to reject a protest (the “Protest”) lodged by the FMI concerning an alleged incorrect score attribution to one of the riders of the Italian Women’s Team, namely Ms Andrea Sofia Rabino.
11. The jurisdiction of the Court was not challenged by the Parties.
12. The Court also finds that the appeal has been brought in conformity with the procedural requirements as set by Article 5.2.1 of the Code, in particular in consideration of the time limit to appeal and the payment of the appeal deposit.
13. The Courts then considers the Appeal admissible.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

14. The 2025 Trial des Nations is a National Team's Trial Event which took place on 20-21 September 2025 in Tolmezzo, Italy (the "Event").
15. During the Event, the Parties entered respectively one women team, the FMI's team being composed of Ms Andrea Sofia Rabino (the "Rider No. 104"), Ms Alessia Bachetta (the "Rider No. 105") and Ms Martina Gallieni (the "Rider No. 106").
16. To the extent that it is applicable to the Event, Article 4.24.3, par. 4, of the Regulations, reads in particular as follows:
- "1. The winner of the Competition will be the one who has accumulated the most "Championship Points" by adding up the points from Race 1 and Race 2.
[...]
4. The classification of the Team will be as follows:*
- The addition of penalty points, according to Art. "Penalty Points" the two best results of each team in a Section will represent the result of the Team in the Section.*
 - The sum of the points of the Team of each Section will represent the total penalties of the Team in the Sections of the Competition.*
 - To this total will be added all penalty points, according to Art. "Penalty Points" of all the riders of the Team who participated in the Competition.
[...]"*
17. Mr Evaristo Paolucci was the Chief Section Observer of Section 12 (the "Chief Section Observer").
18. According to the final classification of the Event, the Italian Team scored "0" and "5" penalties points in Section 12, meaning that, as the two best results of each team in a Section will represent the result of the Team in the Section, the penalty of the third rider would be a "5".
19. The FMI found that this allocation of score was incorrect as their three riders had scored respectively "0" (Rider No. 104), "5" (Rider No. 105) and "0" (Rider No. 106) on Section 12 according to the assessment of the penalty points made by the Chief Section Observer. The

FMI then lodged the Protest before Mr David Rodgers, the FIM Referee, who rejected it. This is the contested decision.

20. As a consequence, the Italian and Spanish teams were tied at first place of the overall final classification with both 54 points in total. Then, pursuant to Article 4.25.2, par. 3 of the Regulations (par. specific to the Event), which reads “*[i]n the case of ties, between two or more teams, the results of all Riders on the team count; the team with the greatest number of 0 points will be the winner. If the tie remains, the greatest number of 1 point, then 2 points, then 3 points will be taken into consideration*”, the Spanish women team was declared winner of the 2025 Trial des Nations, having scored the greatest number of 0 points.

III. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE COURT

21. On 26 September 2025 (13:33 CEST), the Appellant brought its Appeal to the Court and, after having acknowledged receipt of the said Appeal, the Secretariat of the Court informed the Appellant that it was granted 10 days (i.e. until 6 October 2025), to submit their full grounds for appeal.
22. On 26 September 2025, the Secretariat of the Court invited the FIM to take part in the proceedings, if it so wished.
23. On 30 September 2025, the Secretariat of the Court invited the RFME to take part in the proceedings, if it so wished.
24. On 3 October 2025 (13:54 CEST), the FIM notified to the Court its intention not to take part in the proceedings.
25. On 5 October 2025 (20:06 CEST), the FMI notified to the Court its full grounds for appeal and annexes related thereto
26. On 7 October 2025 (13:53 CEST), the RFME notified to the Court its intention to take part in the proceedings.
27. On 10 October 2025, the Secretariat of the Court summoned the witnesses called by the FMI:

- Mr Danilo Galeazzi (Clerk of the Course), asking also him to provide the Court with an official copy of the minutes of the relevant meetings of the International Jury, FIM Referee and of the Race Direction,
 - Mr Evaristo Paolucci (Chief Section Observer), asking also him to provide the Court with the manual back-up system for Section 12, or at least the extracts that concern the women Italian riders (No. 104, No. 105 and No. 106).
28. On 22 October 2025, the RFME notified to the Court its written observations and annexes related thereto.
29. On 22 October 2025, the Chief Section Observer confirmed his attendance at the hearing and informed the Court that the manual back-up system for Section 12 was given to an FIM official, as a standard procedure. Then, on the same day, the Secretariat of the Court requested from the FIM Trial Commission to be provided with the manual back-up system of Mr Evaristo Paolucci. On the same day, the FIM Trial Commission replied that the manual back-up system had been destroyed after the official publication of the results.
30. On 22 October 2025, the Clerk of the Course confirmed his attendance at the hearing and sent to the Court the relevant documents in his possession.
31. On 23 October 2025, the Secretariat of the Court summoned the witnesses called by the RFME:
- Mr David Rodgers (Referee), indicating him that he will be strictly asked to only testify concerning the factual background within his knowledge and by no means shall he be allowed to express an opinion, i.e. to motivate and explain his decision currently under appeal,
 - Mr Jodi Prat (Member of the FIM Trial Commission).
32. On 27 October 2025, Mr David Rodgers confirmed his attendance at the hearing and subsequently sent on 28 October 2025 his reports and supporting documentation.
33. On 30 October 2025, the FMI notified to the Court a motion to exclude Mr David Rodgers from the list of witnesses called by the RFME.

34. On 31 October 2025, the President of the Panel issued his Procedural decision No.1, whereby the FMI's motion for excluding Mr David Rodgers from the list of witnesses was dismissed and Mr Rodgers was confirmed as a witness called by the RFME, under the strict condition that the latter will only testify concerning the factual background within his knowledge, and by no means shall he be allowed to express an opinion, i.e. to motivate and explain his decision currently under appeal.
35. On 31 October 2025, Mr Jordi Prat confirmed his attendance at the hearing.
36. On 5 November 2025, Mr Evaristo Paolucci requested the assistance of an interpreter from Italian to English and vice versa, which was arranged by the Secretariat of the Court.
37. Prior to the hearing and after having received various requests from the Parties and some of their witnesses, the President of the Panel decided that it was considered essential in this case that representatives of the Parties be physically present at the hearing. However, when it comes to witnesses, they were authorized to attend the hearing remotely.

IV. REQUESTS AND SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

38. The Appellant requests:
 - (i) the recognition of the Chief Section Observer's statement of fact for Section 12 of the first lap, whereby riders no. 104 (Ms Andrea Sofia Rabino) and no. 106 (Ms Martina Gallieni) incurred "0" penalty points, and only rider no. 105 (Ms Alessia Bacchetta) incurred "5" penalty points;
 - (ii) correction of the Official Classification of the Event to reflect the above determination, in accordance with Art. 4.24.3 of the Regulations, which requires the inclusion of the two best results of each Team in each Section;
 - (iii) the adoption of any further measures necessary to ensure that the classification fully respects the principles of transparency and the integrity of competition.

39. The arguments of the Appellant are in essence as follows:

- (i) The assessment on the penalty points by the Chief Section Observer is a statement of fact according to Article 4.17.2.2 of the Regulations and is, therefore, uncontestable, binding and conclusive;
- (ii) The absence of fault is also a statement of fact which must have the same binding character;
- (iii) There was an obvious discrepancy between the findings of the Chief Section Observer of Section 12, according to whom the Rider No. 104 had scored “0”, and the electronic system which showed a “5” for the latter;
- (iv) That discrepancy should have been corrected by the FIM Referee in the framework of the Protest lodged by the FMI;
- (v) The FIM Referee refused to check the back-up manual system of Section 12;
- (vi) Article 4.23 of the Regulations implies that, as there is a “dispute” about the allocation of penalty points in the final classification, the use of the manual back-up system manually recorded by the Chief Section Observer was the only way to solve it, especially since the Chief Section Observer confirmed to the Referee the said discrepancy;
- (vii) The Clerk of the Course highlighted during the TrialGP Meeting No. 2 “the discrepancy between the penalty points assigned by the Chief Observer (of Section 12) and the scores published online and on the podium truck screen (electronic results)”;
- (viii) The serious breach of the Regulations led the Clerk of the Course not to validate the final results, as he refused to sign the final results sheet;
- (ix) The principle of the integrity of competitions has been violated, as the malfunction of the main scoring system and/or an operational error committed after the unappealable decision of the Chief Section Observer created a situation of undeniable uncertainty;
- (x) A human communication error in the management of the results cannot override, challenge or negate what was formally attested by the Chief Observer of Section 12 during the Event as an established statement of fact;

- (xi) The fact that the manual back-up system has been destroyed by the FIM constitutes a breach of duty;
- (xii) The refusal of the protest by the FIM Referee, without a thorough examination of the backup system and after summoning the Chief Observer, who confirmed the alleged scoring discrepancy, constitutes a breach of the procedural safeguards expressly embedded in the Regulations and erodes trust in the integrity of the adjudication process.

40. The Respondent ask to dismiss the Appellant's appeal and uphold the Referee's Decision to reject the Protest.

41. The arguments of the Respondent are in essence as follows:

- (i) The Appellant is trying to re-referee a World Championship by means of video recordings;
- (ii) The electronic results will in all cases take precedence over any other system, which will be used solely as a back-up;
- (iii) The appellant seeks the improper application of Article 4.23.1 of the Regulations, as it reads that the manual back-up system will only be used in case of missing or corrupt data in relation to the electronic device;
- (iv) The manual system can only be used as a safeguard in the event of a failure of the electronic system, which was not the case here;
- (v) As for the electronic scoring system, the Tablet Operator displays the score and the pilot himself/herself validates it and gives his/her approval;
- (vi) The only true intention of the Appellant is to modify the score by means of unofficial videos and therefore to re-referee once the competition has concluded, which would set a serious precedent, causing a distortion of the competition, and which has never happened before;
- (vii) The witnesses called by the Appellant have a direct relationship with the FMI and, consequently, a direct interest in the case.

42. The above summary of the Parties' arguments is not necessarily exhaustive. However, the Court carefully examined all of the Parties' written submissions and the arguments contained

therein, as well as the arguments expressed orally during the hearing, even if they are not explicitly referred to in this decision.

V. ASSESSMENTS BY THE COURT

A. Applicable regulations

43. The applicable regulations relevant to the present case are:
- (i) the 2025 FIM Disciplinary Code;
 - (ii) the 2025 FIM Trial Regulations;
 - (iii) on a supplementary basis, the Swiss law.

B. Procedural issue, *in limine litis*

44. *In limine litis*, in its written submissions and during the hearing, the Respondent seemed to question some potential conflict of interests concerning Mr Paolucci (Chief Section Observer) and Mr Galeazzi (Clerk of the Course), witnesses called by the Appellant, as they would “*have a direct relationship with the Italian Federation and, consequently, a direct interest in the case*”
45. At the hearing, when questioned by the Respondent, both Mr Paolucci and Mr Galeazzi answered that they were FMI license-holders.
46. On this issue, the Court notes that nothing in the Regulations prevents a Chief Section Observer or a Clerk of the Course to be of the same nationality or to have a license issued by the same national federation than the riders or teams entered in the event.
47. Besides, the Respondent does not put forward any concrete or tangible element that could question the integrity of Mr Paolucci or Mr Galeazzi.
48. As a consequence, the mere fact they are both license-holders of the FMI is not sufficient for the Court to set aside their testimonies.

C. On the substance

a. On the binding nature of the penalty points allocated by the Chief Section Observer

49. It is undisputed that par. 8 of Article 4.17.2.2 of the Regulations provides that any “[p]enalty awarded by the Section Observer shall be deemed a statement of fact”.
50. As a consequence, the Court stresses that it is not possible to review or, to quote the Respondent, “*to re-referee*” afterwards, be it by means of a protest or an appeal, the assessments made on site by the Chief Section Observer.
51. Therefore, no evidence such as photographs, testimonies, videos, etc., are relevant before the Court if their purpose is to change or even to comfort the decisions of a Chief Section Observer.
52. In the present case, the FMI submitted three videos that would allegedly prove that its three riders have made performances that are equivalent respectively to “0”, “5” and “0” penalty points and that, in any case, could corroborate what was written on the manual back-up sheet of Section 12.
53. But, as stated above, these videos are irrelevant insofar as they tend to be substituted to the eyes of the Chief Section Observer to evaluate the performances of the riders and shall therefore be set aside by the Court.
54. Eventually, the Court confirms the binding nature of the assessments made on site by the Chief Section Observer as they are statements of fact.

b. On the merits

55. To the understanding of the Court and according in particular to Articles 4.17.2 and 4.23 of the Regulations, the process is as follows:
- (i) After each rider’s passage, the Chief Section Observer notes in writing and according to the findings he/she made, on the manual back-up sheet, the penalty score allocated to the rider;

- (ii) Then the score is orally communicated by the Chief Section Observer to a Tablet Operator equipped with a portable electronic device (a tablet), who is responsible for entering the said score into the electronic scoring system that is subsequently used to determine the general classification;
- (iii) The rider is shown his/her score by the Tablet Operator on the tablet. The rider must tap on that tablet with his/her official electronic tag before exiting the area;
- (iv) At the end of each lap, a FIM official takes the manual back-up sheet for the considered section.

56. Besides, pursuant to Article 5.17 of the Regulations, “[a]fter the Event, the Chief Section Observers must remain available until the deadlines for protests/appeals have expired”.

57. According to the Respondent, quoting par. 5 of Article 4.23 of the Regulations, “[t]he Rider is responsible for knowing his submitted electronic recorded penalty in each section by the Tablet Operator”, which means that if a rider has not protested immediately after having been shown his/her penalty on the tablet of the Tablet Operator, then the said penalty shall be deemed final and irrevocable.

58. The Court does not subscribe to this point of view as, firstly, the above quoted provisions do not expressly state that without a remark from the rider immediately when he/she is shown his/her score on the tablet, then that score is final and, secondly, Article 4.17.2.2, par. 9, provides that “[w]hen an error occurs on the scoring system and the Rider has already left without correction the Observer shall then submit this information to FIM Timekeeping/Results Service immediately after the incident. In all circumstances this information must be submitted before the FIM Referee and Clerk of the Course have signed the provisional results”. Such provision would simply have no signification if the simple fact, for a rider, to have left the area without correction would have meant that his/her score is final.

59. Indeed, Article 4.23 of the Regulations provides remedies in case of a problem about the allocation of penalty points, as it reads, for its relevant parts:

“[...]

2. The electronic recording of scores will be made by a Tablet Operator at each section.

3. These electronic results will be retained to establish the official results, under reserve of their validation by the Race Direction.

4. *The electronic results will in all cases take precedence over any other system, which will be used solely as a back-up.*

[...]

4.23.1 *Scoring system – Back-Up*

1. *A manual system will be put in place by the FIM to constitute a back-up.*

It must be under the management and responsibility of the Chief Section Observer. This back-up system will only be used in case of missing or corrupt data in relation to the electronic device.

2. *In the event of a malfunction and/or dispute, it is this backup system which will prevail to validate the penalties of the Section.”*

60. In view of these provisions, the Court is of the opinion that, by principle, the electronic results that are the aggregation of all individual scores entered in the tablet manipulated by the Tablet Operators should be considered as the official results, under the condition that they are validated by the Race Direction which, pursuant to Article 5.4 of the Regulations, “*is composed by the FIM Championship Manager, the FMNR Clerk of the Course and the FIM CTRs*”.
61. In the present case, the provisional final classification of the Event has been only signed by the Referee, but not by the Clerk of the Course who, according to the sentence hand-written by the Referee on the results sheet, “*refused to sign results*”, which was confirmed during the hearing by Mr Galeazzi, Clerk of the Course.
62. Therefore, until the outcome of the procedure before the Court, the final classification of the Event is still provisional.
63. That being clarified, the Court must now decide whether the Appellant is right in claiming that Article 4.23 offers a way to remedy the communication error that happened between the Chief Section Observer and the Tablet Operator, which ultimately resulted in a wrong allocation of score for the Italian Rider No. 104, who should have got a “0” instead of a “5” as allegedly wrongly entered in the electronic scoring system or, on the contrary, if the arguments put forward by the Respondent, which in essence are that Article 4.23 does not permit to review the scores once entered in the electronic scoring system unless there are some specific circumstances which are not present here, are correct.

64. The Appellant argues that due to the Protest lodged before the FIM Referee, there is a “dispute” as required by Article 4.23.1, par. 2, then *“it is this backup system which will prevail to validate the penalties of the Section”*.
65. The Respondent does not share the Appellant’s views and opposes that par. 2 of Article 4.23.1 must not be read alone, but together with par. 1, with which it constitutes a complete provision concerning the use of the manual back-up system. Then the Respondent refers to par.1 which reads that *“[t]his back-up system will only be used in case of missing or corrupt data in relation to the electronic device”*. Hence, as, according to the Respondent, there was no missing nor corrupt data in the electronic scoring system, the recourse to the manual back-up system shall not be used and, therefore, the scores as reflected by the electronic scoring system shall be considered as final and binding.
66. During the hearing, the FIM Referee, witness called by the Respondent, testified that during the Event, the electronic scoring system was the official scoring system and that the manual back-up system sheets should only be used in case of a malfunction of the electronic system which, according to his recollection over the last 2 or 3 seasons, never happened. He emphasised that during the Event the electronic system worked very well and that he did not experience any malfunction in that regard. According to him and when specifically asked by the Court on this point, he added that even if a malfunction should in principle only refer to an electronic issue, it can also come from a wrong communication, but added that, in that case, the problem needs to be quickly brought to the attention of the Referee by the Chief Section Observer. He eventually confirmed that the copy of the manual back-up system for Section 12 that he had sent to the Court, and was then served on the Parties, was a copy of the original one that had been brought to his attention at the moment of the Protest on the day of the Event, but that he disregarded it as there was no malfunction of the electronic scoring system.
67. During the hearing, the Chief Section Observer, witness called by the Appellant, confirmed that at the end of the lap in question, the allocation of penalty for the Italian riders was as follows: Rider No. 104 “0 point”, Rider No. 105 “5 points” and Rider No. 106 “0 point”. At the time of the Protest, as the Clerk of the Course asked him why there was a discrepancy with the score of “5 points” allocated to Rider No. 104, he replied that the FIM Referee should have a look at the manual back-up sheet. He added that when a rider is shown his/her score on the tablet, he/she does not necessarily check his/her score recorded elsewhere.

68. As for the Clerk of the Course, witness called by the Appellant, he confirmed during the hearing that there was an issue regarding the assignation of scores that he talked about with the FIM Referee and the Chief Section Observer for Section 12. He also confirmed that during the Event, there was no malfunction of the electronic scoring system and that the manual back-up sheet for Section 12 was available to the FIM Referee at the time of the Protest. Besides, when asked by the Respondent whether the riders must acknowledge their results when shown on the tablet by the Tablet Operator, he replied that it was not mandatory. Eventually, he explained that he did not sign and validate the final classification because he was not in agreement with what had been done by the FIM Referee.
69. Concerning Mr Jodi Prat, witness called by the Respondent, he expressed before the Court that he was not aware of any malfunction of the electronic system during the Event. He added that there was a live scoring system where anyone could follow scores in real time. He emphasised that he never said that the final results did not reflect the scores allocated by Chief Section Observer for Section 12 and that, in any event, if the communication system could be improved, this was not a technical issue.
70. In view of the above, the Court must now interpret the sense of Article 4.23.1 of the Regulations, bearing in mind the method of interpretation of the regulations of the sport federations under Swiss law according to which *“[a]ny interpretation begins with the letter of the law (literal interpretation), but this is not decisive: it must also reflect the true scope of the provision, which also derives from its relationship with other legal provisions and its context (systematic interpretation), the objective pursued, particularly the interest protected (teleological interpretation), and the intention of the legislator as reflected in the preparatory work (historical interpretation). The judge will depart from a clear legal text if the other methods of interpretation mentioned above show that this text does not correspond in all respects to the true meaning of the provision in question and leads to results that the legislator cannot have intended, which are contrary to the sense of justice or the principle of equal treatment. In short, the Federal Court does not favour any particular method of interpretation and does not establish a hierarchy, drawing on pragmatic pluralism to seek the true meaning of the norm”* (see not. TF, 14 February 2022, 4A_406/2021, *Sun Yang vs. Agence Mondiale Antidopage & Fédération Internationale de Natation*),
71. In that respect, the Court is of the opinion that, as argued by the Appellant, the use of “and/or” in par. 2 implies that the recourse to the manual back-up system is authorised not only when

a “*malfunction*” of the electronic system occurred – which was not the case here and is undisputed – but also in case of a “*dispute*”, whatever the nature of that dispute may be.

72. Here, the simple fact that a Protest has been lodged by the Appellant, which was not successful, and subsequently followed by the Appeal before this Court means that there is a “*dispute*” in the sense of Article 4.23.1, par. 2.
73. But the Court does also acknowledge the position of the Respondent which put forward that par. 1 and par. 2 of Article 4.23.1 must be read together as a whole.
74. Turning to the wording of par. 1 of Article 4.23.1 in connection with what was found above concerning par. 2, the Court then must decide whether, within the framework of the “*dispute*” in question, one can consider that there are “*missing or corrupt data in relation to the electronic device*”.
75. As all the riders have been allocated scores, irrespective of their accuracy, the Court considers that there are no “*missing data*” in the sense of Article 4.23.1.
76. However, the Court is of the opinion that the concept of “*corrupted data*” cannot be restrained to an “*electronic corruption*”, especially if, as the Court just did, one admits that a “*malfunction*” of the electronic system is not the sole motive to have recourse to the manual back-up system, precisely in the framework of a “*dispute*” whose origin is not in the electronic system but elsewhere, such as a problem of communication between the Chief Section Observer and the Tablet Operator, like in this case.
77. As a consequence, the Court finds that the alleged wrong transmission of the score of Rider No. 104 does constitute a potential case of “*corrupted data*” within the meaning of par. 1 of Article 4.23.1.
78. The Court underlines that this interpretation is the only one that reconciles the arguments of both Parties recalled above (§ 71 and 73) with which the Court agrees and the approach of Swiss law on interpretation of sporting regulations also recalled above (§ 70).
79. As a consequence, the Court considers itself entitled to use the manual back-up system sheet of Section 12, a copy of which was provided by the FIM Referee and the content of which was acknowledged by the Chief Section Observer and the Clerk of the Course.

80. The court notes that in that sheet, in regard of the score allocated in the “Score column” to Rider No. 104, which is “0”, there is a hand-written remark stating “*on the tablet is 5*”. During the hearing, when asked by the Respondent, it was confirmed by the FIM Referee that it was the FIM Timekeeper who wrote that comment on the said sheet.
81. Besides, during the hearing, the Chief Section Observer for Section 12 expressly confirmed that the correct score for Rider No. 104 was indeed “0”, as written on the manual back-up system sheet, and not “5” as shown by the final classification.
82. In light of the above, the Court is comfortably satisfied that the score indicated on the manual back-up system sheet must prevail over what indicates the electronic scoring system and that Rider No. 104 should have been allocated “0” instead of “5”. That is a statement of fact. Therefore, the Protest should have been upheld.
83. As a consequence, the FIM Referee’s Decision under appeal must be quashed and the Appeal upheld.

D. Costs of Procedure

84. In accordance with Article 5.2.6 of the Code, the costs of the proceedings will be awarded against the losing party, unless the Court decides otherwise.
85. In this context, the Court decides that the appeal security deposit paid by the Appellant must be returned to it in full, but that nevertheless it would not be fair to award the costs to the Respondent that is in no way responsible for the costs deriving from this procedure. As a consequence, the Court decides that the costs shall be awarded to the FIM, as the decision that has been quashed by the Court was made by one of its officials.
86. However, the extra-costs for Italian/English interpretation shall be borne by the Appellant, as Italian is not one of the official languages of the Court and that translation was required by a witness called by the Appellant.

On these grounds,

The FIM International Court of Appeal rules that:

- I. The Appeal lodged Appeal lodged on behalf of the Federazione Motociclistica Italiana, against the decision taken by the FIM Referee on 21 September 2025, during the FIM Trial des Nations, rejecting its Protest against an incorrect score attribution in Section 12 of the first lap is admissible.
- II. The appeal is upheld on the merits and the decision of the FIM Referee on 21 September 2025, during the FIM Trial des Nations, rejecting the Protest of the FMI against an incorrect score attribution in Section 12 of the first lap, is quashed.
- III. It is ordered to the relevant sporting authorities to draw, as appropriate, the consequences of this ruling.
- IV. The costs of the procedure leading to this decision are to be assessed by the CAI Secretariat and are awarded against the Fédération Internationale de Motocyclisme, saved for the specific Italian/English translation costs which are to be borne by the Appellant.
- V. The Appeal security deposit paid by the Federazione Motociclistica Italiana shall be fully reimbursed, with a deduction corresponding to the costs incurred by the Italian/English translation.

Reasoned decision pronounced and notified on 20 November 2025

On behalf of

The FIM International Court of Appeal

Robert HOFSTETTER

Chairman

Pursuant to Article 5 par.3 of the FIM Statutes and Article 75 of the Swiss Civil Code, an appeal against this decision may be lodged before the competent Tribunal of the Canton of Vaud within one month from the date of receipt of this reasoned decision of the FIM International Court of Appeal.

TOLMEZZO - ITALY
WOMEN'S WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP RESULTS

OFFICIAL FINAL CLASSIFICATION

21/11/2025 - 12:35 - PAGE 1

POS	NATION/RIDERS	SECTION SCORES (2 best riders)															SCORE	TIME	LAPTIME	SCORE	TIME	RUNTIME	TOTAL		
	1 ITALY 104 RABINO Andrea sofia-Beta 105 BACCHETTA Alessia-GASGAS 106 GALLIENI Martina-Sherco	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	28	0	3:12:19	49	0	5:37:37	49	
		0	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	4	3	5									
		FMI	0	3	0	3	1	0	2	0	3	4	0	1	1	3	0	L2	21	0	2:25:18	0	1	2	3
	2 SPAIN 107 ABELLAN Berta-Scorpa 108 Pi Laia-Beta 109 HERNANDO Daniela-Beta	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	23	3	3:16:01	51	3	5:43:40	54	
		0	4	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	2	3	0									
		RFME	0	5	0	3	0	0	4	0	3	5	0	3	2	3	0	L2	28	0	2:27:39	0	1	2	3
	3 GREAT BRITAIN 101 MINTA Alice-Beta 102 ROBINSON Alicia-Beta 103 ADSHEAD Kaytlyn-Sherco	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	32	0	3:12:31	62	0	5:40:56	62	
		0	3	0	8	0	0	2	0	6	6	0	0	2	5	0									
		ACU	0	4	0	6	0	0	2	0	5	8	0	0	2	3	0	L2	30	0	2:28:25	0	1	2	3
	4 CZECH REPUBLIC 110 PECHACKOVA Denisa-TRRS 111 BUDINOVA Petra-TRRS	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	47	0	3:02:34	79	0	5:30:07	79	
		5	8	0	7	0	1	2	0	4	4	0	0	8	8	0									
		ACCR	0	6	0	6	1	1	0	0	5	3	0	0	6	4	0	L2	32	0	2:27:33	0	1	2	3
	5 FRANCE 119 AUJERES Marine-Beta 120 PENA Margaux-Electric Motion 121 SOYER Alycia-TRRS	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	48	0	3:03:10	81	0	5:25:43	81	
		0	10	1	4	0	0	7	0	6	4	0	2	6	8	0									
		FFM	0	4	1	6	0	0	1	0	5	4	0	3	5	3	1	L2	33	0	2:22:33	0	1	2	3
	6 GERMANY 113 WACHS Vivian-GASGAS 114 TER JUNG Sophia-TRRS 115 ANGST Theresa-Beta	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	50	0	3:02:11	87	0	5:30:36	87	
		1	10	0	6	0	0	3	0	6	10	0	1	7	6	0									
		DMSB	0	8	0	5	0	1	1	0	6	4	0	1	5	6	0	L2	37	0	2:28:25	0	1	2	3
	7 UNITED STATES 116 HOOVER Maddie-GASGAS 117 SWEETEN Kylee-Montesa 118 BUZZELLI Abigail-Beta	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	53	0	3:02:31	104	0	5:24:31	104	
		0	6	1	6	1	1	1	1	6	7	0	3	10	5	5									
		AMA	0	10	0	8	0	1	2	1	6	8	0	2	8	5	0	L2	51	0	2:22:00	0	1	2	3
	8 NORWAY 122 MELING Selina-Beta 123 MOI Wilde-Beta 124 HORVE Nora-Beta	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	73	0	2:58:20	135	0	5:21:19	135	
		1	10	1	6	6	2	6	0	8	10	0	3	10	8	2									
		NMF	1	8	1	10	0	0	4	2	8	6	0	2	10	8	2	L2	62	0	2:22:59	0	1	2	3
	9 AUSTRALIA 125 HARRY Alisha-Sherco 126 LUPO Jenna-TRRS	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	105	0	3:05:22	189	0	5:24:58	189	
		4	10	4	8	3	3	8	8	8	10	5	4	10	10	10									
		MA	3	8	2	8	5	2	6	5	8	8	3	4	8	8	6	L2	84	0	2:19:36	0	1	2	3
	10 SWITZERLAND 134 SCHNYDER Christy-TRRS 135 SUARD Charlotte-Sherco 136 SCALVEDI Ayleen-Montesa	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	104	12	3:26:59	197	12	5:52:52	209	
		6	10	3	10	3	1	6	1	8	10	8	10	10	10	8									
		SWISS MOTO	4	10	2	10	4	3	8	2	8	10	3	6	10	8	5	L2	93	0	2:25:53	0	1	2	3
	11 ANDORRA 131 LLADO Alexia-TRRS 132 PASCUET Ella-Sherco	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	132	4	3:18:27	258	4	6:02:06	262	
		6	10	5	10	8	8	10	5	10	10	10	10	10	10	10									
		FMA	6	10	6	10	6	10	10	4	10	10	6	10	10	10	8	L2	126	0	2:43:39	0	1	2	3
		Non-classified															SCORE	TIME	LAPTIME	SCORE	TIME	RUNTIME	TOTAL		
	DSQ CANADA 128 MCGEACHY Katie-Beta 129 LIM Alicia-TRRS 130 ROBERTS Emily-Beta	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9	S10	S11	S12	S13	S14	S15	L1	132	11	3:25:58	262	16	6:15:19	278	
		6	10	6	10	6	8	10	6	10	10	10	10	10	10	10									
		CMA	6	10	6	10	6	8	10	6	10	10	8	10	10	10	10	L2	130	5	2:49:21	0	1	2	3