



FIA FORMULA 1 WORLD CHAMPIONSHIP



## 2025 CANADIAN GRAND PRIX

13 - 15 June 2025

---

<b>From</b>	The Stewards	<b>Document</b>	73
<b>To</b>	The Team Manager, Oracle Red Bull Racing	<b>Date</b>	15 June 2025
		<b>Time</b>	21:05

---

**Title** Decision - Red Bull - Protest against Car 63

**Description** Decision - Red Bull - Protest against Car 63

**Enclosed** CAN DOC 73 - Protest Decision.pdf

**Gerd Ennser** **Matthew Selley**

**Natalie Corsmit** **Enrique Bernoldi**

**Marcel Demers**

**The Stewards**



## 2025 CANADIAN GRAND PRIX

13 – 15 June 2025

---

<b>From</b>	The Stewards	<b>Document</b>	73
<b>To</b>	The Team Manager, Oracle Red Bull Racing	<b>Date</b>	15 June 2025

---

**Protest lodged by Oracle Red Bull Racing against  
Car 63 for allegedly driving erratically under Safety Car and displaying unsportsmanlike  
behaviour by complaining that Car 1 had overtaken under Safety Car conditions**

**Stewards' Decision:**

**The Protest is rejected as it is not founded.**

### **Procedure**

1. On June 15, 2025, following the publication of the Provisional Classification for the Canada Grand Prix, Oracle Red Bull Racing (“Red Bull”) filed a Protest against Car 63 (George Russell) entered by Mercedes-AMG PETRONAS F1 Team (“Mercedes”). Red Bull claimed in its protest that the driver of Car 63 had breached Article 55.5 of the FIA Formula 1 Sporting Regulations by braking unnecessarily and erratically behind the safety car. The protest further alleged that the driver of Car 63 had breached Article 12.2.1m of the FIA International Sporting Code by complaining that the driver of Car 1 had overtaken him under safety car conditions. The parties were summoned and heard. The following persons were present during the hearing:

On behalf of Red Bull: Stephen Knowles, Gianpiero Lambiase and the driver of Car 1, Max Verstappen

On behalf of Mercedes: Ron Meadows, Andrew Shovlin and the driver of Car 63, George Russell

On behalf of the FIA: Tim Malyon and Rui Marques

2. None of the parties objected to the composition of the panel of Stewards.
3. None of the parties requested the hearing of additional persons or requested conducting further investigations.

### **Admissibility**

4. The Stewards find that the Protest is admissible as all requirements of Article 13 of the FIA International Sporting Code have been fulfilled.
5. The Hearing of the Protest then proceeded.

## **The Claims of Red Bull**

6. Red Bull claimed that during a safety car deployment the driver of Car 63 had braked unnecessarily along the back straight between turns 12 and 13 as a result of which Car 1, which was following Car 63, overtook Car 63 and then dropped back behind Car 63 after Car 63 accelerated.
7. Red Bull also alleged that by complaining over team radio that Car 1 had overtaken him under safety car the driver of Car 63 had 'displayed unsportsmanlike intent'.
8. The driver of Car 1 said that he was taken by surprise by Car 63's sudden braking on the straight and had no alternative but to overtake Car 63 momentarily.
9. Red Bull tendered telemetry showing the throttle and brake applications of each Car.
10. Red Bull suggested that it could be inferred from the fact that Car 63's onboard showed the driver looking in his mirrors before he braked that he knew Car 1 was immediately behind and he braked to force Car 1 to overtake to force an infringement by Car 1.
11. Red Bull suggested that the driver of Car 63 complained about the overtake on his team radio knowing that it would be overheard by race control and in the hope that Car 1 would be investigated.
12. They also suggested that it must have been obvious to the driver of Car 63 that the race would end under safety car such that it was unnecessary for Car 63 to maintain heat in tyres and brakes.

## **Mercedes' arguments in defence:**

13. The driver of Car 63 explained that:
  - periodic braking is commonplace and to be expected during safety car deployments to ensure that temperature is maintained in tyres and brakes;
  - on the back straight he found himself catching the safety car. He pointed to in-car video which showed him gesticulating with his hand which he said was to signal to the safety car driver to speed up;
  - he braked where he did for two reasons. First to ensure he kept a gap to the safety car. Secondly, to keep temperature in his brakes and tyres;
  - he looked in his mirrors before he braked to check whether Car 1 was immediately behind and only braked after he saw that Car 1 was to the side;
  - his telemetry showed that the brake pressure he applied was 30psi which he said was not severe;
  - the driver of Car 1 ought to have anticipated that he might apply brake to keep heat in his brakes and tyres;
  - it is not the responsibility of the Car ahead to look out for the following Car in any event;
  - by pointing out to his team that Car 1 had overtaken he was not intending to provoke an investigation into Car 1;
  - he did not know that the race would definitely end under safety car.
14. Mercedes submitted that what the driver of Car 63 had said over team radio was nothing other than factual. The team lodged no complaint with race control about the Car overtaking because the position was given back by Car 1.
15. Mercedes also tendered telemetry showing brake patterns of both Car 63 and Car 1 on several laps under safety car which they said showed that the driver of Car 1 had been braking on the same straight on other laps under the safety car – which they said showed that what the driver of Car 63 was unremarkable.

## **Submissions of the FIA**

16. Mr Malyon explained that the incident had been observed by the race control team and assessed to not warrant being reported to the stewards. He said that periodic braking under safety car is typical and to be expected. He said that for this reason, race control always allows a degree of tolerance with respect to the 10 car length rule recognising that there is a need for a reasonable degree of braking and acceleration.

## **Conclusions of the Stewards**

17. Having regard to the evidence of Mr Malyon, we accept the driver of Car 63's explanation of the incident and we are satisfied that the driver of Car 63 did not drive erratically by braking where he did or to the extent he did.

18. We are not satisfied that by simply reporting to his team that Car 1 had overtaken that he engaged in unsportsmanlike conduct.

19. Even though the protest did not allege it, we are also satisfied that by braking where and when he did and to the extent he did, the driver of Car 63 did not engage in unsportsmanlike conduct.

## **Decision**

20. The Protest is rejected as it is not founded.

21. The Protest Deposit is forfeited.

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.

**Gerd Ennser**

**Matthew Selley**

**Enrique Bernoldi**

**Natalie Corsmit**

**Marcel Demers**

**The Stewards**