

PROTEST COMMITTEE DECISION

Case No: 15 Case(s):16 & 17 Race: 3

PARTIES

Boat or Committee or Person	Class/Fleet	Represented By/Not Present
Tokoloshe		Elliot Hanson
Jiraffe		Pete Selby

WITNESSES	
Name	Boat – Committee - Role
Tom Cheney	Nifty

Valid – Yes (if 'No' use Facts Found to document this decision)

Case Introduction: (Type of hearing and one or two sentences to set the scene of the case e.g. 'A boat to boat incident at the leeward mark' or 'A request for redress for being scored OCS.')

A request for redress alleging an improper action of the protest committee in their decision in case 8 (hearing 4).

Procedural Matters: (Conflicts of Interest, parties not present, extending time limits)

Tokoloshe submitted two hearing request forms at 1100 asking the PC to consider reopening case 8. One on the basis of new evidence and the other based on significant error. As Tokoloshe was not a party to case 8 she is not entitled to request a reopening under RRS 66.2. The PC chose to consider the request as a request for redress alleging an improper action of the protest committee in accordance with RRS64.1©

Jiraffe submitted a hearing request form alleging an improper action of the PC at 1420

The full decision of case 8 was published at 0930 on 03/09/23, the last scheduled day of racing. The time limit was therefore 1000 as per 62.2(a) however the PC chose to extend the time limit to as soon as reasonably possible under RRS 62.2.

The PC decided to extend the time limit to as soon as reasonably possible.

Facts found:

In case 8 the protest committee awarded redress to Flying Jenny, Flurg and Adrenaline for race 3. Flying Jenny and Flurg had originally been scored in race 3 DNE in accordance with RRS 30.4 Adrenaline had originally been scored in race 3 as DNS. The redress awarded the three boats a score in accordance with RRS A9a which calculated as 10 points for Flying Jenny and 13 points for Flurg and Adrenaline. The redress was awarded as the PC concluded those boats scores were made significantly worse through no fault of their own by the improper actions of the RC in not postponing the start when the pin drifted significantly and then making VHF communications which were unclear.

Conclusion & Rules:

There was no improper action or omission by the PC in case 8. The requirements for redress in RRS 62.1(a) are not met.

Decision:
Redress not granted.

Request to Withdraw:	Request Approved:
-----------------------------	--------------------------

Protest Committee: Niall McLeod, Bill Wyatt, Jack Fenwick	International Jury: No
---	------------------------

Signed: _____ Date, time: 03/09/23 1513

