

MOTORSPORT SOUTH AFRICA

IN THE COURT OF ENQUIRY 1294

In the matter of:

MOTORSPORT SOUTH AFRICA

and

(1) TROY SNYMAN (Licence No. 03011 / Race No. 21)

(2) JOHN DUVILL

(3) RONALD VENTER

(4) GARY LENNON

(5) CHERYL ADAMS

(6) TINUS SNYMAN

**Supplementary Ruling Concerning Telemetry and Confirmation of
Penalty – Troy Snyman**

Introduction

1. This supplementary ruling concerns the telemetry material placed before the Court following the Court's direction that Kart #21 be inspected and that the Mychron data be extracted and analysed, with particular attention to brake-application data on the final lap of Heat 2. In its reasoned judgment dated 22 June 2026, the Court found Troy Snyman guilty on Charge 1 but imposed the licence suspension provisionally because the kart had not yet been inspected and the Mychron data had not yet been extracted.

2. The Court expressly reserved the right to reconsider the penalty if the inspection revealed genuine mechanical failure consistent with Troy Snyman's brake-failure defence. The question now before the Court is therefore narrow: whether the telemetry material discloses a genuine mechanical failure consistent with that defence, such that the provisional penalty should be revisited.

Background

3. At the hearing, Troy Snyman's evidence was that, after contact with Kart #31 on Lap 1, his kart became unpredictable and that he struggled to control it for the remaining laps. He denied that the final-lap contact with Kart #31 was deliberate, premeditated, or retaliatory, and stated that he was braking but that the brakes did not respond. When asked directly whether his case was that brake failure prevented him from slowing sufficiently to avoid contact with Jack Moore, he answered in the affirmative.
4. The Court's original finding was that the evidence established deliberate conduct notwithstanding the absence, at that stage, of a mechanical inspection or extracted Mychron analysis. The Court relied, among other matters, on consistent eyewitness evidence, the evidence that Troy Snyman was a lap down, the evidence that he slowed, allowed Jack Moore to pass, and then accelerated, and the evidence concerning his performance and lap pace after the alleged earlier damage. The Court nevertheless directed that the kart be inspected and that the Mychron data be extracted and analysed in fairness to the competitor and to test the brake-failure defence.

The Inspection and results thereof

5. The inspection was carried out by Alistair Pringle and Sparky Bright (Chairman – Circuit & Event Safety/Technical Panel) on 10 July 2026. No objections were raised by any of the parties concerning the technical inspectors. Mr Snyman declined to attend the inspection.
6. The report concerning the inspection is attached as Annexure SR1 hereto.
7. The inspection results and videos were duly circulated to all parties concerned.
8. The Court notes that no issues were found with the braking system of the kart.
9. The Court notes the irregularities with the front bumper of the kart and takes note of the opinion of the technical delegates *“that these modifications were intended to increase the retention force of the front bumper mounting system, thereby making it more difficult for the front bumper to dislodge following contact. Such a modification has the potential to prevent the activation of the front bumper displacement system and the subsequent imposition of a nose cone penalty in terms of the MSA Karting Regulations”*.

The Telemetry Material

10. The telemetry trace now before the Court is marked “Annexure 21 - Data Trace” and identifies the red trace as the incident lap, while the other colours represent other laps from the same race. The trace records “time 0:30.203”, “dist 723.2 [m]”, and “lap 14 [00.47.208]”. The trace contains two principal panels, namely a speed trace and an RPM trace.

11. The annotation on the trace records “No issue with brakes”. The same trace records “Impact throttle release = 24.5 meters later than normal”. The trace further records “Normal Throttle Release”, “Lock up of rear brake”, and “Impact”.

The inspection – video recordings

12. No evidence from the recordings suggests tampering with the kart.

13. The video recordings show the kart being inspected in detail with steering, accelerator cable, braking system and brake fluid reservoirs being checked.

14. No issues were found with the braking system.

15. No issues were found with the kart save the depressed nose cone and front bumper.

16. The Court observes that the front bumper and its mounting brackets were irregularly modified and the front bumper has been confiscated as it cannot be returned to within the acceptable specifications.

Analysis

17. The videos and telemetry are in line with the report.

18. The telemetry does not support Troy Snyman’s brake-failure defence. The annotation “No issue with brakes” is inconsistent with a case that the brakes were incapable of operating before the impact. The annotation “Lock up of rear brake” is also inconsistent with a complete failure of braking capacity, because a rear-brake lock-up indicates that braking force was applied and that the rear brake engaged.

19. The telemetry is instead consistent with materially delayed throttle release followed by late and aggressive braking. The recorded “Impact throttle release = 24.5 meters later than normal” indicates that, on the incident lap, the throttle was released substantially later than the normal throttle-release point shown by the comparative laps. The sequence reflected on the trace is therefore not one of ordinary throttle release followed by non-responsive brakes; it is one of continued throttle application beyond the normal release point, followed by rear-brake lock-up and impact.
20. This telemetry materially corroborates the Court’s original reasoning. The Court had already found that Troy Snyman’s brake-failure defence was undermined by the evidence that he set the fastest lap on Lap 4 with the allegedly damaged kart and later slowed significantly. The Court had also found that the evidence of acceleration after allowing Jack Moore to pass was consistent with deliberate conduct and inconsistent with an inability to brake. The telemetry now provides further objective support for the conclusion that the impact was caused by driver input rather than by mechanical brake failure.
21. The Court remains mindful that telemetry must be read in context and not in isolation. However, the telemetry does not disclose any genuine mechanical failure consistent with Troy Snyman’s defence. It instead supports the conclusion previously reached by the Court that the final-lap contact was deliberate or, at minimum, the result of highly reckless and purposeful driver inputs.

Finding

22. The Court finds that the telemetry material and videos in and of themselves do not reveal genuine mechanical failure consistent with Troy Snyman's brake-failure defence. The Court further finds that the telemetry confirms that there was no issue with braking capacity, that throttle release occurred 24.5 metres later than normal, that the rear brake locked up, and that impact followed.

23. The telemetry therefore reinforces, rather than undermines, the Court's original finding that Troy Snyman deliberately drove into the rear of Kart #31 on the final lap of Heat 2 while a lap down, with the purpose of exacting retribution. There is accordingly no basis for the Court to reconsider, reduce, suspend, or set aside the provisional penalty previously imposed.

Order

Suspension

24. The provisional penalty imposed on Troy Snyman in the Court's reasoned judgment dated 22 June 2026 is confirmed as final. Troy Snyman's MSA competition licence remains suspended for a period of twelve months from the date of the original judgment, namely 22 June 2026. During that period, Troy Snyman may not participate in any MSA-sanctioned event in any capacity.

25. The exclusion from the event held under MSA Permit No. MSA-2026121 remains confirmed. All results obtained by Competitor #21 at the event held under MSA Permit No. MSA-2026121 remain expunged. Upon expiry of the suspension period, Troy Snyman's licence shall not be reinstated unless and until he has completed a

driver conduct and sportsmanship course or programme as may be prescribed or approved by MSA and has appeared before a panel designated by MSA and demonstrated an understanding of the regulations and an undertaking to comply with them.

Costs

26. As to costs, the Court records that the inspection, the extraction and analysis of the MyChron data, and the attendance of the Technical Consultant and independent scrutineer were necessary post-event scrutineering steps arising directly from paragraph 10.6 of the original judgment and the Court's powers under GCR 211. The Court does not make a costs order in the manner of civil litigation. To the extent that MSA seeks to assess or recover the regulatory costs of the inspection and related scrutineering process, those costs should be assessed by MSA under the applicable GCRs, SSRs and MSA Karting Regulations, with Appendix R, paragraph 12, note (i) providing the relevant regulatory benchmark for post-event scrutineering time, consultant involvement, travel and accommodation costs, and related expenses.

27. The Court further records, consistently with paragraph 4.53.6 of the original judgment, that the GCRs do not provide for costs in the manner of civil litigation; the present costs direction is therefore confined to the regulatory costs of the inspection and related scrutineering process contemplated by the MSA regulations.

28. The costs of that process are to be assessed with reference to Appendix R (2026 fees), paragraph 12, note (i), as a benchmark, which provides that, in deciding

costs, the Court shall take into account the time involved in necessary post-event scrutineering, nominally assessed at R500.00 per hour per scrutineer, the involvement of MSA consultants at the same rate, the costs incurred by fellow competitors who may be subject to the appeal, and all travel and accommodation costs incurred in connection with the hearing. The invoices before the Court comprise Invoice 2414 in the amount of R6,500.00 for 13 hours taken for the inspection and report at R500.00 per hour, and Invoice 2413 in the amount of R491.00 for travel from home to airport and return, together with airport parking, resulting in an invoiced subtotal of R6,991.00 before inclusion of any air-ticket costs. The Court further records that Mr Sparky Bright's invoices have been forwarded to the MSA Karting and Circuit Racing Sporting Coordinator, and that the air-ticket costs must be obtained from that coordinator and included in the final account. The final account shall be dealt with by MSA in accordance with the applicable GCRs, SSRs and MSA Karting Regulations.

29. This supplementary ruling is to be read together with, and forms part of, the Court's reasoned judgment in COE 1294.

DATED at Pretoria on this 16th day of July 2026.



ALEXIS APOSTOLIDIS

COURT PRESIDENT — COURT OF ENQUIRY

COURT MEMBER: MR LEON HILL — CONCURRING

COURT MEMBER: MR CLAUDIO PIAZZA MUSSO — CONCURRING

FINDINGS OF THE TECHICAL INSPECTION AS ORDERED IN COURT OF ENQUIRY
(COE)1294



Compiled by: Sparky Bright

Date: 10 July 2026



sport, arts & culture
Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

1. Present:

- Sparky Bright - Independent Scrutineer & Chairman of MSA Technical Panel - MSA Lic #44631
- Alistair Pringle – Event Technical Consultant (TC) – MSA Lic # 13844
- Jack Moore – Competitor
- James Moore – Father of Competitor

***Note:** It should be noted that the Snyman family nominated Mr. Tinus Snyman, the father of Troy Snyman, to represent them during the inspection.*

On the morning of the inspection, the Motorsport South Africa (MSA) Karting and Circuit Racing Sporting Coordinator informed the undersigned that Mr. Tinus Snyman would no longer be attending the inspection. This notification followed the receipt of an email from Mrs. Snyman, Troy Snyman's mother, advising that Mr. Tinus Snyman would not be present to represent the family during the inspection and that the family entrusted Mr. Bright to carry out the inspection in their absence.

Accordingly, no representative of the Snyman family was present during the inspection.

2. Date of Inspection:

9 July 2026

3. Introduction

Following COE 1294 it was instructed under point 10.6 as laid out in the extract below

MSA is directed to arrange for the inspection of Kart #21 and the extraction of the Mychron data within 21 days of the date of this judgment, subject to the following conditions:

- a) The inspection shall be conducted by the Technical Consultant (Mr Alistair Pringle) and an independent scrutineer appointed by MSA who was not involved in the event;
- b) The independent scrutineer must be present at all times when the kart is accessed. All access and acts performed in relation to the kart must be recorded in writing with photos where appropriate, including the movement of the kart and the computer, should these be sent elsewhere for analysis;
- c) The inspection shall take place in the presence of Troy Snyman or his nominated representative, and a representative of the Moore family if they wish to attend;
- d) The Mychron data shall be extracted and analysed, with particular attention to brake application data on the final lap of Heat 2;
- e) A written report shall be provided to the Court within 7 days of the inspection;
- f) The chain of custody compromise shall be noted in the report, and the inspecting officials shall record any evidence of tampering;
- g) The kart and Mychron digital dash shall thereafter be returned to the competitor.



sport, arts & culture
Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

4. Inspection and findings

See Annexures 7 to 10

a. Wrapping and sealing of Kart and its components.

Upon arrival, the wrapping and sealing applied to the kart and its relevant components were thoroughly inspected. It was confirmed by the TC Mr. Pringle that all wrapping and seals corresponded with the descriptions and photographs contained in the Technical Consultants reports submitted to Motorsport South Africa (MSA) following the event.

No evidence of tampering, interference, or damage to the wrapping or seals was identified. All wrapping and seals remained intact and in the same condition and position as when the kart was secured at the conclusion of the event by the appointed Technical Consultant (TC), who confirmed that the wrapping and seals were unchanged.

b. Braking System

See Annexures 12 to 19

The following components of the braking system were inspected:

- **Brake Pedal:** All mounting and securing components were present and correctly fitted. The brake pedal was found to be fully operational.
- **Brake Rod (between the brake pedal and the master cylinders):** All components were present, correctly secured, and found to be in good working order. The brake rod operated as intended.
- **Brake Safety Cable (between the brake pedal and the master cylinders):** The safety cable was present, correctly installed, securely attached, and fully operational. Its purpose is to maintain braking capability in the event of a brake rod failure, and it was confirmed to be capable of performing this intended safety function.
- **Brake Master Cylinders:** Both master cylinders were securely mounted, showed no signs of damage, defects, or fluid leakage, and were found to be fully operational.
- **Brake Fluid Reservoirs:** The reservoirs were correctly closed and sealed. The brake fluid level was found to be correct, and the visible condition of the fluid was satisfactory, with no signs of contamination by dirt, water, or any other foreign matter.
- **Brake Lines (between the master cylinders and brake caliper):** All brake lines were found to be in good condition, correctly routed, securely mounted, and free from damage, wear, or evidence of fluid leaks.
- **Brake Pads:** The brake pads were correctly installed and securely retained. They were found to be in good condition, with only normal and limited wear evident.
- **Brake Caliper:** The brake caliper was securely mounted, free from defects or fluid leaks, and found to be fully operational.
- **Brake Disc and Disc Carrier:** The brake disc and carrier were found to be in good condition and securely mounted. The key locating the brake disc carrier on the rear axle and preventing rotation between the disc and axle was present and correctly fitted.



sport, arts & culture
Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Following the visual inspection, the braking system was functionally tested by rotating the rear axle manually while applying pressure to the brake pedal. The braking system operated effectively, bringing the axle to an immediate stop. Continuous pressure was then applied to the brake pedal for approximately one (1) minute to assess the integrity of the hydraulic system. No loss of pedal pressure, hydraulic leakage, or indication of brake fade was observed during this test. The braking system remained fully functional throughout the inspection.

c. Throttle/Accelerator.

- **Accelerator Pedal and all it related components** – The accelerator pedal was inspected and functionally tested to ensure that it operated freely throughout its full range of movement. All mounting and securing components were present and correctly fitted. The pedal returned automatically to the closed position under spring tension when released, with no evidence of sticking, binding, or restricted movement.

d. Steering and Front Upright components

See Annexure 12

- **Uprights:** These components were thoroughly inspected and found to be securely mounted and in good working condition. All camber and caster adjustment washers were correctly fitted and securely fastened. The kingpins were secure, with no signs of wear, damage, or excessive movement. The uprights were securely mounted and exhibited no visible signs of damage, wear, or deformation.
- **Steering Tie Rods:** These were inspected and found to be securely mounted and in good condition, with no signs of damage, bending, or excessive wear.
- **Rod Ends:** These were inspected and found to be in good condition, with no signs of excessive wear or free play. They were securely attached to the steering tie rods, and all securing devices were correctly fitted.
- **Steering Colum:** This was inspected and found to be operating smoothly and correctly. The steering column was securely mounted and in good condition, with no signs of damage, excessive wear, or abnormal movement.

e. Rear Axle, Bearing and components

See Annexures 17 to 18

- **Rear Axel:** Upon inspection the axel was found to be in good condition
- **Rear Wheel Hubs:** The rear wheel hubs were thoroughly inspected and found to be securely mounted and in good condition. The locating keys were present, correctly fitted, and securely retained, with no signs of damage or abnormal wear.
- **Rear Wheel Bearing:** The two (2) outer axle bearings were thoroughly inspected and found to be securely mounted and in good condition, with no signs of wear or damage. The centre bearing carrier was found to be free to move on the chassis, which is the normal configuration for a kart to allow chassis flex, and no abnormalities were identified.



sport, arts & culture
Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

- f. **Rear Tyres** – These were thoroughly inspected and found to be in good condition, with no evidence of flat spots, abnormal wear, cuts, or other visible damage.

See Annexure 11

- g. **Engine** – The engine was thoroughly inspected and found to be securely and correctly mounted. The drive chain was correctly aligned and adjusted to the appropriate tension.

Note: It should be noted that the engine is the property of the series promoter, as it forms part of the "Pool Engine" program and must be returned to the ROK Series following the completion of the inspection.

For this reason, the kart has not been released, as the Court did not grant permission for the inspection team to remove the engine. It had been anticipated that the entrant would be present, whereby the inspection team would have instructed him or her to remove the engine. Accordingly, the engine remains fitted to the kart pending the Court's further direction.

- h. **Kart Chassis**

The Chassis was visually inspected and is in good condition with no obvious damage

- i. **Aim MyChron 5 Data.**

See Annexures 1.a, b, c, d, 20 & 21

The data was downloaded, in accordance with the Court's instructions, from the data acquisition device to a laptop computer via the Wi-Fi connection.

Finding:

A detailed analysis of every lap completed during Race 2 confirms that the braking system remained fully operational throughout the race.

An overlay comparison of the data from the incident lap with the preceding laps shows that, on the approach to the corner where the incident occurred, competitor Snyman continued to accelerate for approximately **24 metres further** than on previous laps before any reduction in throttle input occurred. The engine RPM (revolutions per minute) only began to decrease after the impact had taken place.

The recorded impact speed was **102.6 km/h**. Analysis of the previous laps confirms that, at the same corner, competitor Snyman consistently entered the braking zone at speeds below **100 km/h**.

Based on the available data, there is no evidence that competitor Snyman made any attempt to reduce speed or commence braking prior to the impact at the corner where the incident occurred.

Furthermore, the braking traces recorded on the previous laps demonstrate that the braking system was functioning normally up to the established braking point immediately preceding the corner where the incident occurred.

The telemetry data files analysed are **Annextures 1a to 1d**.

Annotated screenshot of the relevant data traces, together with explanatory notes, is in **Annixture 21**.

j. Front Bumper (see COE Finding point 10.6. f)

See Annexure 3 to 6

During the inspection of the chassis, the Technical Delegates observed that the FIA Karting - homologated front bumper mounting brackets had been modified. The retaining indents at the points where the mounting brackets attach to the chassis had been filed and/or ground deeper than their original homologated profile.

It is the opinion of the Technical Delegates that these modifications were intended to increase the retention force of the front bumper mounting system, thereby making it more difficult for the front bumper to dislodge following contact. Such a modification has the potential to prevent the activation of the front bumper displacement system and the subsequent imposition of a nose cone penalty in terms of the MSA Karting Regulations.

The front bumper and its associated mounting components have been impounded by the Technical Team and will be handed to Motorsport South Africa (MSA) for retention, as the modifications are permanent and the components cannot be restored to their original FIA-homologated and compliant condition

As Chairman of the MSA Technical Panel and the appointed independent Scrutineer responsible for this inspection, it is my opinion that the Court should give due consideration to the provisions of GCR 176 and determine whether the imposition of further sanctions against both the competitor and the entrant is warranted.

The modification identified is not consistent with the FIA homologation of the front bumper mounting system and constitutes a deliberate alteration of a regulated safety component. In my opinion, this demonstrates a blatant disregard for the MSA Karting Regulations and has the potential to provide the competitor with an unfair sporting advantage by reducing the likelihood of the front bumper displacement system activating following contact with the kart ahead, thereby potentially avoiding the prescribed nose cone penalty.

5. Cost

In terms of costs to be awarded in terms of MSA Appendix R, 12, NOTE i, as per extract below

NOTES:

i. Costs – in deciding upon the question of costs, the court shall take into account the time involved with necessary post-event scrutineering, nominally assessed at R500.00 per hour per Scrutineer, possible involvement of MSA Consultants assessed at the same rate as that of Scrutineers, and costs incurred by fellow competitors who may be subject to the appeal. The court members will, in addition, take into account all travel and accommodation costs incurred in connection with the hearing and shall assess their own time related to the hearing at R500.00 per hour.

All invoices submitted by Mr. Sparky Bright have been forwarded to the Motorsport South Africa (MSA) Karting and Circuit Racing Sporting Coordinator.

The cost of the air tickets is to be obtained from the MSA Karting and Circuit Racing Sporting Coordinator for inclusion in the final account..

ENDS



sport, arts & culture
Department:
Sport, Arts and Culture
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA