

IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT BY THE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS INTEGRITY AGENCY UNDER THE 2023 TENNIS ANTI-DOPING PROGRAMME

Before:

Olivier Ducrey (Chair)
Helle Qvortrup Bachmann
Abigail Gauci

BETWEEN:

International Tennis Integrity Agency

Anti-Doping Organisation

and

Vladislav Ivanov

Respondent

DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

A. INTRODUCTION

1. This is the final decision of the Independent Tribunal appointed pursuant to the 2023 Tennis Anti-Doping Programme (“TADP”) to determine a charge brought on 27 April 2023 (“the Notice”) by the International Tennis Integrity Agency (“ITIA”) – an independent body established by the international governing bodies of tennis to promote, encourage, and safeguard the integrity of professional tennis worldwide – against Mr Vladislav Ivanov (“the Player”), a Russian tennis player who was ranked 998 (in Singles) at the time of the Notice.

2. The Player has been charged with an Anti-Doping Rule Violation (“ADRV”) under Article 2.3 of the TADP as a result of his selection for Sample collection on 14 September 2022, during the WTT M15 event held in Casablanca, Morocco (the “Tournament”).
3. The Player does not, and indeed cannot, dispute that he did not provide a sample immediately after having been notified of his selection for doping control. However, he argues inter alia to have been authorised, at least implicitly, to go to his hotel, take a shower, and come back later to provide a sample.
4. The Player has not been provisionally suspended.
5. The Independent Tribunal is grateful to both Parties and their counsel for their helpful written and oral submissions, and for their collaboration in the management of these proceedings.

B. JURISDICTION

6. In accordance with Article 1.5 of the 2023 TADP (effective from 1 January 2023), any case brought after 1 January 2023 based on conduct which took place prior to 1 January 2023 will be governed by the substantive rules in force at the time of the conduct. The relevant TADP in force at the time that the incident took place was the 2022 TADP, effective from 1 January 2022. As such, the relevant substantive rules are contained in the 2022 TADP and procedural matters in these proceedings will be governed by the 2023 TADP.
7. The ITIA has charged the Player with a violation of Article 2.3 of the TADP, which states that the following is an ADRV:

“2.3 A Player evading Sample collection; or refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection without compelling justification after notification by a duly authorised Person.”

8. In accordance with Article 1.2.6 of the TADP, the TADP applies to:

“1.2.6.1 all Players and Player Support Personnel who are members of or registered with the ITF, or any National Association, or any member or affiliate organisation of any National Association;

1.2.6.2 all Players entered in or participating in such capacity in Events, Competitions, and/or other activities organised, convened, authorised or recognised by the ITF or any National Association or any member or affiliate organisation of any National Association, wherever held, and all Player Support Personnel supporting such Players' participation;

1.2.6.3 all Players who have an ATP or WTA ranking (including any 'protected' or 'special' ranking) in the [relevant] calendar year..."

9. Through his registration with the Russian Tennis Federation and his participation in "Competitions and/or other activities organised, convened, authorised or recognised by the ITF", the Player is bound by the TADP and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Independent Tribunal.

C. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

10. The main facts can be summarised as follows:

- a) The Player completed an anti-doping education program put in place by the ITIA in July 2022.
- b) The Player participated in the Tournament on 14 September 2022.
- c) Two weeks before the Tournament, the Player participated in a tournament in Egypt where he submitted to an anti-doping Sample collection.
- d) On 14 September 2022, the Player lost his match 7-6, 6-3. The Player was unhappy at the end of the match during which he broke his rackets and received a code violation.
- e) Mohammed Aissaoui, who acted as the Doping Control Officer ("DCO") at the Tournament, had randomly selected the loser of that match to provide an anti-doping sample.
- f) Khalil Zerbouhi, who was the chaperone ("the Chaperone") assigned by the DCO to approach the loser of the match to notify and commence the anti-doping process,

approached the Player. The Chaperone presented himself and asked the Player to follow him to proceed with the Sample collection.

- g) It is undisputed that the Player heard his request and understood the role of the Chaperone.
- h) However, the Player did not provide a sample at that moment. Instead, he returned to his hotel, showered, changed his clothes, drank a lot of water, and ate some watermelon.
- i) In the meantime, the Chaperon explained to the DCO what happened with the Player.
- j) The DCO contacted Mohamed Ghassoub (“the Tournament Supervisor”) to ask for his assistance.
- k) The Tournament Supervisor phoned the official hotel for the Tournament and left a message with the hotel’s reception, instructing the Player to immediately return to the Tournament site.
- l) The Player returned to the Tournament site (it is not established whether he received the message left at reception) about two and a half hours after he had received notification from the Chaperone. The Player did not present himself directly at the anti-doping testing centre, as he first watched a match of friends and had discussions with third parties.
- m) The Player then went to the anti-doping testing centre and provided his Sample (with the assistance of a different chaperone). The Player’s Sample was analysed by a WADA-accredited laboratory and did not return any Adverse Analytical Findings (“AAF”).

D. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

11. On 17 March 2023, the ITIA sent the Player a formal Pre-Charge Notice, stating that he may have committed an ADRV under Article 2.3 of the TADP during the Tournament. The

Player was given the opportunity to respond and was advised of the Consequences of the ADRV.

12. The Player denied the possible ADRV and stated, “...*I didn’t said nothing bad to [Mr Zerbouhi], and it’s not my fault that he don’t follow me to the hotel*”. He then stressed that he later returned to the Tournament site and provided the Sample.

13. On 27 April 2023, the ITIA issued the Notice of Charge to the Player with the above breach of the TADP Programme. The Player responded on 11 May 2023 stating that he requested a hearing of this matter before the Independent Tribunal.

14. On 29 June 2023, Mr Olivier Ducrey was appointed by the Chair of the Independent Panel, to Chair this matter. On 27 July 2023, Ms Helle Qvortrup Bachmann and Ms Abigail Gauci were appointed to the Independent Tribunal.

15. A hearing took place on 14 November 2023.

E. POSITION OF THE PARTIES

16. Although the evidence and arguments are summarised here (and not set out in full), all evidence has been considered by the Independent Tribunal.

17. The position of the ITIA can be summarised as follows:

- a) The Player undertook an anti-doping educational program recently before the Tournament.
- b) The Player submitted to an anti-doping test two weeks before, which followed the same process.
- c) The Player understood that he was selected for an anti-doping test and acknowledged the fact that the Chaperone, Mr Zerbouhi, was there to start the process.

- d) According to the Chaperone, the Player shouted at him, threw the paperwork to the ground and rushed off. The Player went directly to his hotel.
- e) The Player provided no reason for refusing or failing to submit to a sample collection. He simply decided not to comply with his anti-doping obligations.
- f) The Player was fully aware of the process and of the consequences and decided not to submit to the sample collection when asked.

18. The position of the Player can be summarised as follows:

- a) The Player accepts that shortly after his match on 14 September 2022, he was notified of his selection to provide an In-Competition urine sample.
- b) The Player disputes that he refused to provide a sample to a male he now knows to be Khalil Zerbouhi, albeit he does accept that Mr Zerbouhi identified himself as an ITF Chaperone.
- c) Instead of refusing to provide a sample, the Player asserts that he said that he would provide a sample but that he wanted to take a shower first. In response, the Chaperone said something to the effect of *“okay but you should come back”*.
- d) The Player returned to his hotel room, where he took a shower, ate some fruit, and drank some water. He then returned to the Tournament site and provided the Sample.
- e) At no point did the Player refuse to provide a sample. Instead, he made a request for a short delay before providing the same, a request which he genuinely believed to have been granted.
- f) With the knowledge that he has now, the Player accepts that this request was inappropriate, but he did not realise this at the time.
- g) In any event, the Player genuinely believed that he had been given permission to return to his hotel room for a short time, so long as he immediately returned thereafter to provide the Sample. It is acknowledged that the Chaperone may not

have authorised this, but the Player genuinely believed that he had (possibly due to difficulties in communication between the two of them).

- h) In terms of compelling justification for his actions, the Player argues that he believed that his actions had been authorised.
- i) The Player added that:
 - i. The matters set out above amount to exceptional circumstances and justify a reduction in the period of Ineligibility.
 - ii. Mr Ivanov's degree of Fault is at the lower end of the scale.
 - iii. Any wrongdoing on Mr Ivanov's part was not intentional.

F. WITNESS STATEMENTS

19. The position of ITIA is supported by the three following witness statements dated 13 September 2023 which can be summarised as follows:

1. KHALIL ZERBOUHI (Chaperone)

- a) *"I was recruited to be a Chaperone by the Doping Control Officer, Mohamed Aissaoui, who requested that I attend the M15 tournament in Casablanca, Morocco, for two days from 14 September 2022. I had never worked as a Chaperone at a tennis tournament before this tournament.*
- b) *My role as a Chaperone involves notifying players of their obligation to provide samples, escorting players from the moment I notify them to the testing centre on the tournament site at which they provide their samples and then witnessing the providing of those samples.*
- c) *Mr Aissaoui provided me with the relevant information and training that I needed to carry out my role. He explained that my role as a Chaperone was to find players after*

they had come off court following a match and tell them that they have been summoned for an anti-doping test. I would have to tell the player that they needed to provide a sample for that test. The words I had to use were something like “you have been selected to do a doping test, please follow me”. I also received training about how to hand paperwork to a player, show them that the documents had their name on it and where they were required to sign the documents I provided, which they would do to confirm that they knew they had been asked to provide a sample.

- d) After notifying the player that they had been selected, I was required to stay with the player until the player attended the testing centre to give their sample. The player should never be out of my sight during that process to make sure that the sample from the player is provided correctly. As part of that, I also had to ensure that a player did not leave the tournament site although I could not physically prevent that from happening.*
- e) I was also provided with a uniform to wear, which was a light blue polo shirt, and a badge showing my name and role. I was also trained on how to respect social distances to ensure that I did not get too close to players, and I was also told to wear a mask.*
- f) On 14 September 2022, Mr Ivanov was playing in a match against Mario Mansilla Diez. I was asked by Mr Aissaoui to notify Mr Ivanov that he had been selected for an anti-doping test and to escort him from the court to the testing centre.*
- g) I approached Mr Ivanov after his match and said to him something like “my name is Khalil from the ITF and you have been selected to do a doping test, please follow me”. I also explained that I was a Chaperone and indicated my badge. Mr Ivanov ignored me at first, but I told him face-to-face that he was required for the test. It was clear that I was a Chaperone because I was wearing a badge with my name and role on it and had a pile of paperwork for him to sign. He saw me and saw the paperwork that I was holding. Mr Ivanov heard what I was saying, and he understood me.*
- h) I showed Mr Ivanov the paperwork that I needed him to sign, which had his name on it. It was clear that, after he saw his name on the documents, he did not want to sign them. I still handed him the documents to sign, as I was trained to do, and Mr Ivanov*

took them from my hand and threw them on the ground and physically pushed me away. He also started shouting at me in a different language, which I think was Russian, and was swearing at me (which I know because I speak a little Russian after I once accompanied the Moroccan team to Russia). He did not speak to me in English.

i) I bent down to pick up the documents that he had pushed to the ground and, when I looked up, he was rushing towards the car park away from me, walking quickly. I tried to follow him and tried to explain that he must provide a sample or he might be punished. The whole incident lasted around three minutes in total.

j) Since Mr Ivanov reacted aggressively to me, and was bigger and stronger than me, I was scared that he might physically assault me His reaction meant that I also did not have an opportunity to inform Mr Ivanov of:

(i) His rights under the anti-doping rules, such as his right to have someone accompany him to the test or ask any questions he wanted.

(ii) His responsibilities under the anti-doping rules, such as that he was required to permit me to stay with him and watch his movements until the sample had been provided. I am always clear about this as other players have asked me previously about whether they need me to stay with them and I have always said that I must do so.

(iii) Other practical information that might be helpful to a player such as how the testing process works or the location of the testing centre.

(iv) The consequences of his failure to comply with my notification for him to do an anti-doping test. I tried to inform Mr Ivanov of this and I think he heard me as he turned to look at me.

k) I understand from the ITIA that Mr Ivanov says he told me that he needed to go back to his room (either in the changing room or in the hotel) to change his clothes. That did not happen. I also understand that Mr Ivanov claims that he told me he would come back to give his test in one hour and I agreed. Again, that did not happen. Even

if he had asked, I would not have agreed as that would have meant breaking the rule about Mr Ivanov not being out of my sight until the sample had been provided.

- l) Once Mr Ivanov left the tournament site. I immediately informed Mr Aissaoui about what happened and asked for his help. I also told him that the Chair Umpire, who was nearby at the time, may have seen what happened as he saw me talking with Mr Ivanov. I prepared a short report summarizing what had happened and provided that to Mr Aissaoui, who I understand then passed that information on to the ITIA. ...*
- m) Mr Ivanov's behaviour had a negative effect on me. Because of the way he acted towards me, and since it was the first time I had to notify a player of being selected for an anti-doping test at this event, I was scared of having to notify other players. I did carry out my Chaperone duties with around six or seven other players at the same tournament and had no problems as they were all very nice."*

2. MOHAMMED AISSAOUI (DCO)

- a) "As a DCO, I am responsible for the urine and blood sample collection from athletes as part of the anti-doping programmes managed by the different federations. I often work as a DCO at tennis tournaments in Morocco. I am trained and authorised by IDTM and have responsibility for the coordination and management of anti-doping sample collection either at events or in Out-of-Competition settings.*
- b) IDTM is instructed by the federations of the relevant sports, which are IDTM's clients. In tennis, IDTM is instructed and authorised by the ITIA to carry out anti-doping sample collections. Once IDTM has been instructed by a client, my supervisor will contact me to ask if I am available to accept that particular anti-doping 'mission order'.*
- c) On the first day of a competition, I meet with the chaperones who have been assigned to that competition. In some cases, chaperones are provided by the competition organisers and in others I am asked to supply my own chaperones. IDTM are led by the relevant federation's preference on this.*
- d) I have a pool of potential chaperones that I can bring with me to competitions. I have a contact in Morocco who is able to suggest to me people locally who speak English and who are happy to carry out the role of chaperone when I am acting as a DCO in*

Morocco. This means that when I am asked to provide my own chaperones, through my contact, I explain the role, ask the potential chaperones if they would like to accept the role and, if they do, I bring them with me to the competition. For the M15 tournament in Casablanca, Morocco, taking place between 11 and 18 September 2022, I was asked to bring my own chaperones.

- e) On the first day of the tournament, I met with the chaperones and gave them an hour or so of training on how to carry out their role effectively. That training included how to notify players that are required to give samples, going through their script for the notification, what they should do if something happens that is not on the script (like reporting to me where a player refuses to give a sample) and how to accompany players to their anti-doping tests. When training the chaperones, I follow the instructions that the ITIA gives to us. I also liaised with the Tournament Director to provide accreditation to the chaperones for the time that they are working.*
- f) As to the Casablanca tournament, the ITIA provided instructions that we were to sample a certain number of randomly selected players and gave us the total number of players who were to be tested on each day. We then decided, at random, which matches we would select for testing and also decided whether it was the winner or the loser of those matches that should be selected for testing. This meant that we did not select specific players to be tested.*
- g) On 14 September 2022, during the tournament, Mr Ivanov was playing in a match against a Spanish player on Court 7. For this match, we had decided it was the loser of the match who would be tested. We therefore did not know if it would be Mr Ivanov or his opponent who would be required to give a urine sample on that day. As the loser of the match, Mr Ivanov was selected at random to be a player who was required to give a urine sample.*
- h) I randomly assigned Khalil Zerbouhi to be the Chaperone for Mr Ivanov's sample collection. I was aware that it was Mr Zerbouhi's first time acting as a chaperone but had provided him with training on how to carry out his role. Mr Zerbouhi was therefore aware of the script for the notification and what he should do if a player refused to go with him to give a sample.*

- i) *After the match, I understand from Mr Zerbouhi that he approached Mr Ivanov, asked him to provide a urine sample and Mr Ivanov refused to do so. Mr Zerbouhi came to report the incident to me after the incident and told me that Mr Ivanov had refused to go with him to give a sample and acted aggressively and abusively towards him, shouting at him and pushing the paperwork he was holding to the ground. Mr Zerbouhi told me that Mr Ivanov left the venue. Mr Zerbouhi also told me that he did not get an opportunity to inform Mr Ivanov of the consequences if he failed to provide a sample.*
- j) *I informed the tournament supervisor, Mohamed Ghassoub, of what had taken place and asked him for help. The tournament supervisor said that he would contact the hotel in which Mr Ivanov was staying to check if he was there and to ask him to return to the site. He also said that Mr Ivanov would probably return to the tournament site because he would need to collect his prize money.*
- k) *Later that day, in the afternoon, Mr Ivanov returned to the tournament site. The tournament supervisor informed me that he had asked Mr Ivanov to report to me so that he could provide a sample. The tournament supervisor asked if I would take the sample from Mr Ivanov, which I agreed to do. I also spoke to my supervisor at IDTM who told me that was the correct approach. I asked another chaperone to accompany me to the testing centre, but I cannot recall who this was. A short time later, Mr Ivanov did arrive at the testing centre to give his sample.*
- l) *When Mr Ivanov arrived, I asked him what had happened that morning. Mr Ivanov said he was sorry for not taking the test when he was asked to do so by Mr Zerbouhi. He said he lost his match and broke two rackets in doing so which meant he did not really understand what he was doing after the match. I told him that he could provide his sample today but said that he should keep in mind that there may be consequences from his refusal to go with Mr Zerbouhi. Mr Ivanov said sorry a lot (I think about ten times), which I understood to be him saying sorry for not doing the test and also for being aggressive with Mr Zerbouhi. He seemed very embarrassed (as he was red in the face) and my impression was that he could not believe what he had done.*

Mr Mark Fletcher, ITIA; and

Mr Mohammed Aissaoui, DCO and Witness

c) Secretariat to the Tribunal

d) Interpreters for the Player: Ms Anastasiya Gartsueva; and

Ms Anastasiya Khorotnova

e) Interpreters for the Witness: Mr Karim Kassimi; and

Seifeddine Jlali.

21. At the hearing, the Parties confirmed that they had no objection concerning the competence and the constitution of the Independent Tribunal.

22. The Player testified at the hearing in pertinent part as follows:

- a) He understood that he had been selected for an anti-doping test.
- b) In July 2022, he had participated in an educational program and had most notably watched a video describing the anti-doping test process.
- c) He underwent an anti-doping test in Cairo two weeks before the Tournament.
- d) He first thought that he was entitled to go to the hotel.
- e) He first said that he did not see any paper handled by the Chaperone.
- f) Then he said that he believed that he has the right not to submit at that moment to provide a sample collection because *"I did not yet sign any document"*.
- g) He testified that he did not remember asking the Chaperone for permission to go to the hotel.
- h) He understood afterwards that he had made a mistake.
- i) He acknowledged being bound by the anti-doping rules and regulations and that it is his responsibility to be familiar with the rules and proceedings, ie. the TADP.

- j) He did not hear the Chaperone warning him of the consequences of not submitting to sample collection because he was already walking away.

23. The witnesses, Mr Ghassoub, the Tournament Supervisor, and Mr Zerbouhi, the Chaperone, while called for the hearing, did not attend.

H. REGULATORY FRAMEWORK & LEGAL ANALYSIS

24. In the present case, the Independent Tribunal can list the undisputed important elements as follows:

- a) The Player was notified by an authorised person to submit a sample;
- b) The Player identified the person as a chaperone, he was aware of the role of that person and understood that he was selected to submit a sample;
- c) The Player has completed an anti-doping program shortly before the incident.
- d) The Player underwent a very similar anti-doping test process in Egypt two weeks before the incident.
- e) The Player was aware of his anti-doping obligations.
- f) The Player did not provide the Sample when asked to do so by the Chaperone.

25. The main question to be addressed is if the Player legitimately believed that he was entitled or authorised to delay the provision of the Sample.

26. The Independent Tribunal notes that the Player – because of the education he received regarding the ITIA's anti-doping process and the experience he gained from having been tested previously – upon being notified that he had been selected for a doping test, knew or should have known that he had to stay with the Chaperone and provide a sample, and that he had no right to delay the process by going, for instance alone to the hotel, as he did. It is the Independent Tribunal's opinion, that the testing process commenced once the Player was notified that he had been randomly selected to submit to a doping control test, and therefore the Player understood, or should have understood his obligations as a Player.

27. To try to justify his actions and legitimate the fact that it was not a “*refusal in his mind*”, as said by his counsel, but that he was allowed to go to the hotel, the Player provided different and confusing explanation:

- a) In his first interview, the Player said that he had been granted permission to go to the hotel.
- b) Then in his first response after the Notice, the Player does not refer to any permission.
- c) In his written statement to the Independent Tribunal, the Player then wrote that he genuinely believed that he had been given permission after having sought it from the Chaperone.
- d) At the hearing, the Player first started to say that he did not request the permission, he did not remember having requested permission, but explained that he thought that he simply had the right not to provide the Sample as long as he did not sign the papers. But at the same time, at the hearing, the Player said that he did not remember having seen the Chaperone holding papers.

28. Considering the confusing explanation provided by the Player, the experience and knowledge of the Player of anti-doping obligations and processes arising from his education and past experiences, the Independent Tribunal is of the opinion that the Player knew or should have known that he was not allowed to delay the provision of the Sample and nothing should have made him legitimately think that he was authorised not to give it at that moment.

29. The Player understood the situation and took a conscious decision not to comply with the request. The Independent Tribunal believes that the Player simply decided not to provide the Sample at that moment and went directly to the hotel without permission to do so. This action corresponds to a refusal to provide a sample when asked by an authorised person to do so.

30. The Player admitted a mistake and his personal responsibility.

31. It is a fundamental aspect of the anti-doping framework that an athlete must provide a sample as soon as she / he is asked to do so.

32. In circumstances when an ADRV has been established pursuant to Article 2.3 of the TADP, the starting point is a period of Ineligibility of four years, in accordance with Article 10.3.1 of the TADP. The question is whether the Player has established that there were exceptional circumstances in this case that justify a reduction in the period of Ineligibility, as set out in Article 10.3.1.2 of the TADP.
33. No element in this case convinced the Independent Tribunal that any consent was given to the Player to leave the Tournament site and come back later to do the test.
34. The burden of proof rests upon the Player to establish, with the relevant standard of proof being “on the balance of probabilities”, that it must be more likely than not that exceptional circumstances occurred on 14 September 2022. There were no circumstances described that could be considered as rendering the anti-doping test impossible to do at that moment in time. The Independent Tribunal considers that the Player has not proven that exceptional circumstances arose, which are applicable to him and therefore, he must receive a four-year period of Ineligibility.
35. Moreover, it is the Independent Tribunal’s observation that even if the DCO had provided the necessary consent for the Player to head back to the hotel (unattended) and then return to take his test, it still should not have taken the Player just under three hours to arrive at the testing centre. It is clear that the Player did not give the necessary importance to the doping control test. From the evidence presented to the Independent Tribunal, there was no compelling justification to justify the delay, medical or otherwise.
36. The eventual provision of the Sample does not mitigate or justify the refusal to do it when initially requested. The same applies regardless of whether the analysis of the sample results in a negative test and does not result in an AAF. See *WADA v IIHF and Busch* (CAS 2008/A/1564) and *WADA v Singh and NADA* (CAS 2014/A/3868).
37. The apology or late acknowledgement of a mistake does not justify a reduction of the sanction.
38. Considering the fact that the Independent Tribunal considers that the actions of the Player resulted in a refusal to submit a sample, there is no need to examine whether the Player committed a “failure” to submit to the sample collection.

I. CONCLUSIONS

39. For the reasons set out above, the Independent Tribunal finds that:

- a. Mr Ivanov is an International-Level Player as defined in the TADP;
- b. Mr Ivanov has committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.3 of the TADP, by refusing to provide a sample when asked to do so.
- c. Mr Ivanov has not met his burden to demonstrate that his violations were justified by exceptional circumstances. The Independent Tribunal therefore imposes a period of Ineligibility of four years, starting on the date of this decision.
- d. Mr Ivanov's results obtained at the Event (namely, the WTT M15 Casablanca 2022 tournament) are disqualified (with all resulting Consequences, including forfeiture of any/all medals, titles, ranking points and Prize Money), pursuant to Articles 9.1 and 10.1 of the TADP.
- e. All further requests or prayers for relief are dismissed.

J. COSTS

40. The Independent Tribunal makes no order for costs. Therefore and in accordance with Article 8.5.4 of the TADP, the Parties will each bear their own costs.

K. RIGHT OF APPEAL

41. This decision may be appealed to the Court of Arbitration for Sport ("CAS"), located at Palais de Beaulieu Av. des Bergières 10, CH-1004 Lausanne, Switzerland (procedures@tas-cas.org), in accordance with Article 13 of the TADP.

42. Article 13.8.1.1 of the TADP sets the deadline for the Player to file an appeal to the CAS, which is 21 days from the date of receipt of this final decision.

Olivier Ducrey



Helle Qvortrup Bachmann



Abigail Gauci

London, UK

21 December 2023

1 Paternoster Lane, St Paul's London EC4M 7BQ resolve@sportresolutions.com 020 7036 1966

Company no: 03351039 Limited by guarantee in England and Wales
Sport Resolutions is the trading name of Sports Dispute Resolution Panel Limited

www.sportresolutions.com



ENABLING FAIR PLAY