



FIVB

Disciplinary Panel

Decision

In the matter of
Mr. Daniel KONCAL
(Slovakia)

9 February 2016

THE FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL

Constituted in accordance with Article 8.1.2
of the FIVB Medical and Anti-Doping Regulations 2015
and composed by

Ms. Margaret Ann Fleming, Chair	(Scotland) Disciplinary Panel Vice-Chair
Mr. Mounir Ben Slimane	(Tunisia) Disciplinary Panel Member
Prof. Dr. Roald Bahr	(Norway) Medical Commission Member

at the hearing which took place via telephone conference
on 25 November 2015, 6 pm Swiss Time, heard the case identified as n. 3555665:

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. On 29 October 2015, the FIVB was notified by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in Rome, Italy regarding an Adverse Analytical Finding for the A-sample 3555665, which contained the prohibited substance 19-norandrosterone (“Norandrosterone”) in a concentration of 2.7 ng/ml.
2. The above-mentioned urine sample was taken in-competition on 9 October 2015 in Busto Arisizio, Italy during the 2015 CEV Men’s European Championships (“Event”) and belongs to the athlete Mr. Daniel KONCAL (Slovakia, born 16.09.1982; “Athlete”).
3. After having received a copy of the doping control form from the Confédération Européenne de Volleyball (“CEV”), the FIVB contacted the Slovak Volleyball Federation (“SVF”) on 2 November 2015 to inform the Athlete that he was provisionally suspended with immediate effect and that he had the right to request the analysis of the B sample and to attend the opening thereof.
4. On the same day, the Athlete responded to the letter submitting in essence the following:
 - He requested an analysis of his B sample;
 - He was not doping but forgot to include some supplements that he was taking during the tournament, which he provided to the FIVB in his submission; and

- He had a fever on the day of the test but reported all of the medication that he was taking for that.
5. By email dated 3 November 2015, the FIVB:
 - acknowledged receipt of his email and his request to have his B sample opened;
 - requested that he confirm whether he wished to be present at the opening and analysis of the B sample; and
 - took note of the pictures and submission made regarding the supplements that he took, which would be forwarded to the FIVB Disciplinary Panel.
 6. On the same day, the Athlete confirmed that he did not wish to be present at the opening and analysis of the B sample.
 7. By letter dated 16 November 2015, the FIVB informed the Athlete that the B sample analysis was positive and requested that the Athlete inform the FIVB as to whether he wanted an in-person hearing or a teleconference hearing.
 8. On the same day, the Athlete confirmed that he would like a hearing by teleconference. He also requested that a member of the SVF be allowed to attend the hearing. The Athlete additionally asked several questions about the results management process and what kind of research and information that he needed to prove in his submissions to the FIVB.
 9. By email dated 20 November 2015, the Athlete requested confirmation that the hearing would be held on the date provided in the letter and additional information about the teleconference. Additionally, the Athlete stated that he would be providing additional documentation before the hearing.
 10. On the same day, the FIVB acknowledged receipt of the Athlete's email and informed him that it would provide him with an agenda for the hearing as well as a list of participants in a subsequent email. FIVB also requested that the Athlete inform the FIVB as to whom would join him on the teleconference and provided him with general information about the teleconference.
 11. By email dated 24 November 2015, the FIVB requested that the hearing time be moved from 6:45 PM (CET) to 6 PM (CET).

12. On the same day, the Athlete's attorney, JUDr. Ing. Miroslav Chlipala, PhD., provided a statement on behalf of the Athlete as well as three Annexes. In essence, the Athlete's statement submitted the following:

- The Athlete expressed deep regret for the positive test;
- The Athlete did not contest the results of the tests or the fact that the positive test constituted an anti-doping rule violation and confirmed that the prohibited substance was present in an amount that was 0.1 ng/mL greater than the threshold of 2.5 ng/mL;
- Rather, the Athlete contended that the facts and circumstances of his case showed that the Athlete's final sanction should be substantially reduced under Articles 10.5 and 10.6 of the 2015 FIVB Medical and Anti-Doping Regulations ("MADR");
- In particular, the Athlete noted the following facts and circumstances:
 - He was informed by the SVF that he would be tested either leading up to or during the Event. He had only one experience with anti-doping testing before, approximately six years ago, and he had just recently finished two modules of the FIVB anti-doping internet education program: one before the European Games in Baku, Azerbaijan and one prior to the Event;
 - After thoroughly analysing all of the ways that the prohibited substance could have entered his body, the Athlete determined that the only way that this could have happened was due to a contaminated supplement. He explained that he had been taking a supplement, NUTREND Kre-Alkalin 1500, which was officially endorsed by the Slovak and Czech Olympic teams; however, after running out of NUTREND Kre-Alkalin 1500, he went to the store to purchase more on 1 October 2015 but they were out of stock. Based on the recommendation of the store clerk, he purchased a similar supplement, Kre-Active ("Supplement"). The Athlete contended that the clerk did not warn him of possible contamination, the box did not

provide any kind of warning, and, since he bought it at a standard supplement store, he did not see any reason to check the Supplement. The Athlete argued that the Supplement was contaminated, and, in support of his argument, he included an article in which 14.8% of similar supplements tested contained anabolic steroids not declared on the label;

- The Athlete claimed that he failed to list the Supplement on the Doping Control Form because of his inexperience with the anti-doping process, a language barrier regarding the explanation of how to fill out the Doping Control Form, and his fever. He stated that he thought he was only supposed to declare medications, not supplements; and
- He was genuinely surprised when the B sample analysis results were positive as well and, thus, started to consider how the prohibited substance entered his body;
- Based on these circumstances, the Athlete contended that it was clear that 1) he did not act intentionally or with an intent to cheat; 2) he had not acted with gross negligence; and 3) he had provided sufficient evidence and support to the FIVB Disciplinary Panel;
- The Athlete also wished to reiterate that he wanted the SVF to participate in the proceedings and stated that he was offering his cooperation to the SVF and the Slovak Anti-Doping Agency to educate, guide and warn other athletes;
- The Athlete further noted that 1) this was his first offense; 2) that the age of the Athlete meant that a long period of ineligibility would mean that the Athlete's career would be practically over; and 3) the Athlete had not participated in an official competition since he was provisionally suspended by the FIVB;
- Thus, the Athlete requested that the FIVB Disciplinary Panel impose a reprimand or a sanction of a short period of ineligibility based on the Athlete's anti-doping rule violation. Additionally, the Athlete requested that any period

of ineligibility start from the date of the sample collection, i.e. 9 October 2015.

13. The Athlete's attorney also confirmed that the hearing would take place at 6 PM and that he, the Athlete, and Mr. Marek Prokes from the SVF would be attending.

14. On 25 November 2015, the hearing via telephone conference was attended –aside from the FIVB Disciplinary Panel– by the FIVB Medical and Anti-Doping Manager Mrs. Nadège Veintimilla, the FIVB Legal Advisor Mr. Andreas Zagklis and the FIVB Legal Affairs Manager Mr. Stephen Bock, the Athlete, the Athlete's attorney, and Mr. Prokes from the SVF.

15. During the hearing, the Athlete's attorney first reiterated the contents of his written statement but made two short amendments. First, he noted that the threshold limit was barely exceeded in the adverse analytical finding. Second, the fault of the Athlete was not based on a breach of his duties but was limited to his lack of due care. Subsequently, the members of the FIVB Disciplinary Panel and the FIVB Legal Advisor asked the Athlete some questions, which revealed the following information:

- The Athlete paid for the Supplement in cash and did not have a receipt but was willing to go to the store to obtain a receipt;
- The Athlete began taking 2 tablets per day starting on 1 October 2015 and stopped after he received the letter from the FIVB concerning his positive test;
- The Athlete confirmed that he normally used the Nutrend product but had to ask for a similar product because the Nutrend product was out of stock at the store. The clerk recommended the Supplement, and he did not inform the SVF or anyone else about taking the Supplement because he thought the contents were the same;
- The Athlete confirmed that he used the Supplement while with the national team and that the Athlete used it during the Event in Italy, including the day of the doping control. He also stated that the national team did not have a team doctor; it just had a physiotherapist.
- The Athlete stated that the only research that he conducted before he received the letter confirming the positive test of his A sample was that he

checked the label of the Supplement. After receiving the letter, he researched the Supplement on the internet.

- The Athlete still had the container of the Supplement, which had about 70 tablets in it, and could provide the FIVB with the address of the store where he purchased the Supplement.
- The Athlete's last game was on 31 October 2015.

16. The Athlete concluded the hearing by reading a statement that he had prepared for the FIVB Disciplinary Panel. In his statement, the Athlete:

- apologized for the situation and stated that he was very disappointed that he bought the Supplement;
- indicated that the prohibited substance did not influence his performance at all but, conversely, hurt him professionally because he lost several contracts for the season and doubts he will find a good contract for next season; and
- stated that he learned his lesson based on this experience and will endeavor to help others by sharing his story.

17. The Athlete, the Athlete's attorney, and the SVF all confirmed that the hearing before the FIVB Disciplinary Panel was fair and fully honoured the Athlete's right to be heard.

18. By letter dated 25 November 2015, the FIVB requested that the Athlete send the container of the Supplement that allegedly led to his positive sample to the WADA-accredited laboratory in Cologne, Germany ("Laboratory") by no later than noon on 26 November 2015 for an analysis of the tablets in the container.

19. Before noon on 26 November 2015, the Athlete sent email confirmation that he had sent the container of the Supplement to the Laboratory by courier.

20. On the same day, the FIVB contacted the Bratislava office of the international law firm, BNT Attorneys at Law, specifically the Slovakian attorney, Mgr. Vladimír Kordoš, and requested that his office send a representative to Športová výživa Nutrius in POLUS CITY CENTER, Vajnorska 100, Bratislava 831 04, Slovakia (i.e. the store that the Athlete claimed that he purchased the Supplement from) to purchase three additional containers of the Supplement to send to the Laboratory as requested by the Laboratory.

21. On 27 November 2015, a representative from Mgr. Kordoš went to the abovementioned store at 13:51 GMT+1, purchased three containers of the Supplement from the store, and mailed the three containers via courier to the Lab at 15:45 GMT+1.
22. On 30 November 2015, the Laboratory received the package containing the three containers of the Supplement purchased from Športová výživa Nutrius by Mgr. Kordoš's office.
23. On 7 December 2015, the Laboratory received the container of the Supplement sent by the Athlete.
24. On 28 December 2015, the Laboratory drafted its report on the analysis of the containers of the Supplement provided by both the Athlete and Mgr. Kordoš's office.
25. The Laboratory found that both the container of the Supplement provided by the Athlete and the three containers of the Supplement purchased from Športová výživa Nutrius by Mgr. Kordoš's office were contaminated with amounts of the anabolic androgenic steroids 19-Nor-4-androstene-3, 17-dione, 4-Androstene-3, and 17-dione. The reporting threshold level for this test was 10 ng/g.
26. On 5 January 2016, the Laboratory provided its reports to the FIVB.
27. On 6 January 2016, the FIVB informed the Athlete of the results of the Supplement containers testing and provided the Athlete with an opportunity to comment on the results by no later than 13 January 2016.
28. On 11 January 2016, the Athlete, through his attorney, filed his comments on the results of the testing of the containers of the Supplement. In his comments, the Athlete asserted the following:
 - The Athlete understood that the test revealed that the containers of the Supplement were contaminated, which led to the Athlete's adverse analytical finding;
 - In support of his position, the Athlete provided an article which allegedly stated that the addition of as little as 2.5 microg of 19-norandrostenedione to a supplement would be sufficient to lead to an adverse analytical finding;

- Consequently, the Athlete argued that the analysis confirmed 1) how the prohibited substance entered his body; 2) that he had no intention to use the prohibited substance; and 3) that he had a very low level of negligence in this case due to the fact that he bought the Supplement in a supplement store in a mall rather than through the internet from a dubious supplier or suspicious second hand supplier;
- Thus, the requirements for a reduction or suspension of a potential sanction had been fulfilled and a reduced sanction would not violate the worldwide principles against doping in sport;
- The Athlete insisted on his previous request for relief, i.e. that the FIVB Disciplinary Panel impose a reprimand or a sanction of a short period of ineligibility based on the Athlete's anti-doping violation, and, additionally, that any period of ineligibility start from the date of the sample collection, i.e. 9 October 2015.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

29. According to the WADA 2015 Prohibited List, the substance Norandrosterone is included in the category S1.1B (Endogenous AAS) and is prohibited at all times (in- and out-of-competition). In this case, the Panel notes the comment in the laboratory report for both the A and the B Samples that "[t]he mean concentration measured is 2.7 ng/mL", which is 0.2 ng/mL higher than the Decision Limit of 2.5 ng/mL. The Panel also notes that the standard uncertainty estimated for these tests was 0.16 ng/mL. Therefore, the analysis of the samples resulted in an Adverse Analytical Finding.

30. According to Article 2.1 of the FIVB Medical & Anti-Doping Regulations 2015 ("FIVB MADR"), the presence of a prohibited substance in an athlete's bodily specimen constitutes an anti-doping rule violation, sanctioned as per Article 10 of the FIVB MADR.

31. The above-mentioned sample (Nr. 3555665) belongs to the Athlete.

32. No Therapeutic Use Exemption exists in this case, as per Article 4.4 of the FIVB MADR.

33. The Athlete has not contested that an anti-doping rule violation has occurred. Rather, he seeks to have his sanction reduced because he claims his anti-doping rule violation was not intentional. The Panel notes that the Athlete tested positive for Norandrosterone, which is considered a Category S1 substance.
34. According to Article 4.2.2 of the FIVB MADR, all prohibited substances are deemed specified substances except substances in the classes of anabolic agents and hormones and those stimulants and hormone antagonists and modulators so identified on the Prohibited List. Category S1 is the category for anabolic agents and, consequently, the prohibited substance in the case at hand (Norandrosterone) is not considered a Specified Substance.
35. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the period of ineligibility for a violation of Article 2.1 FIVB MADR concerning a non-specified substance shall be as follows:
- four (4) years when the anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance, unless the Athlete can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional (Article 10.2.1.1 FIVB MADR);
 - two (2) years if the Athlete can establish that the anti-doping violation was not intentional (Article 10.2.2 FIVB MADR).
36. Additionally, the Athlete contends that his anti-doping rule violation was not intentional because the Supplement was contaminated. Consequently, the Panel must also look at Article 10.5.1.2 FIVB MADR, which deals with Contaminated Products and states the following:
- “In cases where the Athlete or other Person can establish No Significant Fault or Negligence and that the detected Prohibited Substance came from a Contaminated Product, then the period of Ineligibility shall be, at a minimum, a reprimand, and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, two years Ineligibility, depending on the Athlete’s degree of fault.”*
37. The FIVB MADR define a Contaminated Product as *“A product that contains a Prohibited Substance that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search.”* Additionally, the FIVB MADR define No Significant Fault or Negligence as follows:

“The Athlete or other Person's establishing that his or her Fault or negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for No Fault or negligence, was not significant in relationship to the anti-doping rule violation. Except in the case of a Minor, for any violation of Article 2.1, the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system.”

38. With this framework in mind, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel will now examine whether the Athlete is entitled to a reduced sanction because the facts and circumstances of this case demonstrate that his anti-doping rule violation was not intentional due to the consumption of a Contaminated Product.
39. The Athlete contends that the Supplement was contaminated with Norandrosterone and that is why his anti-doping rule violation occurred. He claims that he was in no way attempting to affect his sporting performance and had no idea that he was taking the substance until he received the letter informing him that his A Sample had tested positive for a Prohibited Substance.
40. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel first notes the following facts and circumstances that hint at the possibility of a Contaminated Product. First, the Athlete tested positive for an amount that is barely above the qualitative threshold. The Athlete's test revealed Norandrosterone at a level of 2.7 ng/mL, which when accounting for the standard uncertainty estimated (0.16 ng/mL), could have been as little as 0.84 ng/mL above the qualitative threshold. Additionally, the Athlete switched products from a product endorsed by two Olympic Committees, which are aware of the strict anti-doping guidelines found within the Olympic Movement, to a product that was suggested by a store clerk, who is unaware of those guidelines. Third, the Athlete provided a scientific article demonstrating that approximately 15 percent of non-hormonal nutritional supplements, such as the Supplement, contain anabolic agents not mentioned on the label. The Panel would like to highlight that all of these facts taken together are insufficient in and of themselves to prove that the Athlete took a Contaminated Product; however, based on the above facts and circumstances, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel at least was willing to consider some additional testing to determine whether or not the Athlete consumed a Contaminated Product.

41. Furthermore, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel looked at the potential ramifications of the decision before it. If the FIVB Disciplinary Panel found that the Supplement was not contaminated, then, in principle, the Athlete would be subject to a four year ban under the FIVB MADR. The Athlete is currently 33 years old, and, thus, a four year ban could mean that the Athlete could not play again until he is 37 years old, which could effectively end his career. Given the potential career-ending consequences of this decision, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel decided that it wanted to make sure that the Athlete did not consume a Contaminated Product before issuing a decision that could end his career. Consequently, it decided to engage in additional testing of the Supplement taken by the Athlete.
42. The FIVB consulted with Prof. Dr. Geyer from the Laboratory to come up with a testing procedure that would ensure unadulterated results. Upon Prof. Dr. Geyer's recommendation, the FIVB requested that the Athlete provide the container of Supplements that the alleged contaminated supplement came from, and the FIVB purchased three additional, factory-sealed containers of the Supplement from the same Bratislava store that the Athlete frequented. Consequently, the FIVB provided the Laboratory with both the container in question and containers that could not have been tampered with because they were still factory-sealed. The FIVB also ensured that Mgr. Kordoš's office maintained a chain of custody log during the time that it handled the unopened containers of the Supplement. Given the procedure in place, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel is convinced that the results from the Laboratory's tests of the Supplement can be completely trusted.
43. The Laboratory's test results revealed that the Athlete's container of the Supplement as well as the three containers of the Supplement provided by the FIVB from the same store were contaminated with anabolic agents, specifically 19-Nor-4-androstene-3, 17-dione, 4-Androstene-3, 17-dione. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel finds that these tests confirm the Athlete's account of the events as described in his statement to the FIVB Disciplinary Panel, i.e. that the substance entered his body due to the consumption of the Supplement, which was contaminated. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel also notes that none of these substances were listed on the Supplement's label or could be found in a reasonable internet search. As a result,

Article. 10.5.1.2 FIVB MADR applies to this case. Therefore, it holds that the Athlete's anti-doping rule violation was unintentional because it was due to the consumption of a Contaminated Product.

44. Based on the above determination, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel must now determine what the sanction should be. As described in Article 10.5.1.2 FIVB MADR, the sanction for an anti-doping rule violation can range from a reprimand with no period of ineligibility and a two (2) year period of ineligibility based on the Athlete's degree of fault.
45. In looking at the Athlete's degree of fault, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel must examine the actions taken by the Athlete. Previous FIVB jurisprudence states that the FIVB Disciplinary Panel should focus on circumstances that influence an Athlete's duty of care, such as the level of the Athlete, age of the Athlete, anti-doping education, organized versus unorganized volleyball environment, whether or not the Athlete researched the product, etc. when looking at an Athlete's degree of fault for purposes of a reduction of sanction (*see FIVB Disciplinary Panel Decision In the matter of Ms. Lucia Paz LOZANO LORENZINI, para. 19*)
46. Examining these circumstances in the present case, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel first notes that, based on publicly available information, the Player has been a professional volleyball player for twelve years. In the last six years, he has gone through doping control one other time. Additionally, in his submission, he confirmed that he has recently finished two anti-doping modules, both in 2015, one before the European Games in Baku, Azerbaijan and one prior to the Event, and the FIVB Medical Department confirmed that he received a certificate from the FIVB stating that he had completed the FIVB Anti-Doping Programme. Based on this information, the FIVB finds that the Athlete was fairly experienced and should have been educated about the danger of contamination in supplements. Consequently, the Athlete should have been well aware of his duty of care when consuming a supplement, especially one recommended to him by a store clerk not familiar with the anti-doping obligations of a professional athlete.
47. Regarding this duty of care, the Court of Arbitration for Sport has noted the following:

“Nevertheless, the Panel considers that the arguments exposed by the Appellant to require the reduction of the period of ineligibility must be analysed in the light of the normative standard of “duty of care” which is claimable of all athletes regarding substances that they freely decide to ingest. In this regard, as one of the main principles in the context of anti-doping control in sport, it is abundantly clear that all athletes must be extremely careful with the food contents, fluids, and in general, with any products that he or she may ingest, either for nutrition or therapeutic purposes, as they may contain some substance identified on the WADA Prohibited List. As has been expressly established by CAS jurisprudence: “In each case, the Athlete’s fault is measured against the fundamental duty which he or she owes under the Program and the WADC to do everything in his or her power to avoid ingesting a Prohibited Substance. (CAS 2011/A/2518)” (CAS 2013/A/3431, para. 59).

48. The Athlete stated that the only research conducted by him about the Supplement before he consumed it was that he looked at the label. It was only after he received confirmation of his positive test that he conducted internet research.
49. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel finds that the Athlete did not meet the required duty of care expected of Athlete’s within the sport of Volleyball. The FIVB Disciplinary Panel expects volleyball athletes to at least conduct a preliminary internet search before consuming a product or contact a competent anti-doping authority. This is especially true of a product recommended by someone that is not a medical professional and because the Athlete had been consuming a product recommended by his Olympic Committee. Unfortunately for the Athlete, he did not consult with any anti-doping professionals or authorities prior to consuming the Supplement.
50. That being said, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel notes that the Athlete might not have found any information showing that this particular supplement was contaminated had he conducted an internet search. First, the label of the Supplement did not contain any indication of a prohibited substance. Second, the container of the Supplement looked fairly identical to the product that the Athlete had been taking, which could have very easily contributed to confusion. Third, the information provided by the Athlete based on his *ex post facto* internet search dealt with non-

hormonal supplements generally, stated that a very low percentage of these supplements (approximately 15 percent) were contaminated, and did not specifically mention the Supplement. Moreover, even if he would have been suspicious after conducting an internet search, the national team did not have a team doctor that he could consult about the Supplement. These factors also affect the Athlete's duty of care and degree of fault.

51. Balancing these various factors which determine the Athlete's degree of fault, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel holds that the period of ineligibility shall be nine (9) months in accordance with the range of sanctions provided for in Article 10.5.1.2 FIVB MADR.
52. The Athlete has requested to have this period of ineligibility begin on the date of the sample collection, instead of the date of his last competition. Given that this process has been delayed while the FIVB sought additional testing of the Supplement, the FIVB Disciplinary Panel has decided to apply Article 10.11.1 FIVB MADR and finds that period of ineligibility shall start on the date of the Sample collection.

Taking all the above into consideration

THE FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL

Concludes and Decides

1. The athlete Mr. Daniel KONCAL (Slovakia) has committed an anti-doping rule violation (presence of the prohibited substance 19-norandrosterone in his bodily specimen) according to Article 2.1 of the FIVB MADR.
2. A sanction of nine (9) months of ineligibility shall be imposed on the athlete Mr. Daniel KONCAL, according to Article 10.5.1.2 FIVB MADR.
3. The period of ineligibility shall start on 9 October 2015 and end on 8 July 2016, as per Article 10.11 FIVB MADR.
4. This decision may be appealed in accordance with the attached Notice of Appeals.

Decided in Lausanne, on 9 February 2016

For the FIVB DISCIPLINARY PANEL

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Margaret Ann Fleming". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial 'M'.

Ms. Margaret Ann Fleming

Chair

NOTICE OF APPEALS

(doping cases)

An appeal may be filed against this decision exclusively before the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS), in accordance with Article 13 of the FIVB Medical and Anti-Doping Regulations 2015 (FIVB MADR) and with the provisions of the Code of Sports-Related Arbitration (see www.tas-cas.org).

The time-limit to file an appeal to CAS shall be twenty-one (21) days from the date of receipt of this decision by the appealing party.

In accordance with Article 14.7 of the FIVB MADR: “Notice to an Athlete or other Person who is a member of a National Federation may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the National Federation.”

In the event of an appeal, this decision shall remain in effect while under appeal unless the CAS orders otherwise.

The address and contact details of the CAS are the following:

Court of Arbitration for Sport
Avenue de Beaumont 2
1012 Lausanne, Switzerland
Tel: +41 21 613 50 00
Fax: +41 21 613 50 01
e-mail: info@tas-cas.org
www.tas-cas.org