

NATIONAL ANTI-DOPING PANEL

Before:

Christopher Quinlan QC

Lorraine Johnson

Dr Barry O'Driscoll

BETWEEN

UK Anti-Doping

National Anti-Doping Organisation

-and-

Craig Windsor Jnr

Respondent

IN THE MATTER OF PROCEEDINGS BROUGHT UNDER THE BRITISH BOXING BOARD OF CONTROL'S
ANTI-DOPING REGULATIONS

FINAL DECISION OF THE ANTI-DOPING TRIBUNAL

Introduction

1. This is the final decision of the Anti-Doping Tribunal ('the Tribunal') convened pursuant to Article 5.1 of the National Anti-Doping Panel Procedural Rules ('NADPPR') to hear and determine two charges brought against Craig Windsor Jnr (the Respondent) for violation of Articles 2.2 and 2.6 of the British Boxing Board of Control's ('BBBoC') Anti-Doping Rules ('ADR').

NATIONAL ANTI-DOPING PANEL

2. By Article 2.2 ADR it is an anti-doping rule violation to “use a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method” unless such use is consistent with a therapeutic use exemption (‘TUE’). The Respondent does not possess a TUE.
3. By Article 2.6 ADR it is an anti-doping rule violation to possess or use a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method.
4. The Respondent is twenty-nine years of age. He is a professional boxer, licensed by the BBBoC to participate in boxing matches under its jurisdiction. Accordingly he is bound by and required to follow the ADR.
5. United Kingdom Anti-Doping Limited (‘UKAD’) is the National Anti-Doping Organisation for the United Kingdom and is appointed by the BBBoC to enforce its ADR.
6. The Tribunal held a hearing of the charge on 17 April 2013. The hearing was attended (in addition to the Tribunal) by

... The Respondent

... Ian Duguid QC, Respondent’s Counsel

... Ian Moir, Respondent’s Solicitor

... Jonathan Taylor, Bird & Bird, UKAD’s Advocate

... Jamie Herbert, Bird & Bird

... Graham Arthur, Legal Director, UKAD

... Jason Torrance, Paralegal, UKAD

... Hannah McLean, UKAD, witness

... Jenefer Lincoln, Sport Resolutions (UK)

... Calum Wood, Sport Scotland, observing

7. This document constitutes our final reasoned decision, reached after due consideration of the evidence, submissions and Arbitral Awards placed before us.

Procedural History

8. The Respondent was charged with a doping offence by letter dated 6 March 2013. The letter set out the details of the alleged violations and a summary of the facts and the evidence relied upon by UKAD. The letter also imposed a provisional suspension with "immediate effect".

On 7 March 2013 Mr Peter Leaver QC (NADP Chairman) ruled against the Respondent's application to have the suspension provisionally imposed lifted.

9. On 21 March 2013 the Tribunal Chairman (Christopher Quinlan QC) conducted a Directions Hearing by telephone conference call. The Respondent represented himself and confirmed that he denied the charges. The Chairman issued procedural directions, which were promulgated in writing and dated 21 March 2013.

Determination of the Charges

10. By letter dated 6 March 2013 the Respondent was charged with the following three anti-doping rule violations
 - i. On a number of occasions in January 2013 he used or attempted to use oxandrolone, in violation of ADR Article 2.2.
 - ii. Sometime in December 2012 and/or January 2013 he possessed oxandrolone, in violation of ADR Article 2.6.
 - iii. On or about 9 January 2013 he possessed stanozolol in violation of ADR Article 2.2.
11. Oxandrolone and stanozolol are Prohibited Substances, both listed in S1 (Anabolic Agent) of the World Anti-Doping Code (WADC) Prohibited List. Each is an anabolic steroid.
12. At the start of the hearing the Respondent through his Counsel indicated that he wished to admit the anti-doping rule violations. In answer to questions from the Chairman he admitted the three charges. His Counsel also indicated that save in two respects, the Respondent accepted the evidence relied upon by UKAD, though not all of the inferences contended for.
13. In light of his admissions before us, we find each charge proved.
14. The sole issue for the Panel was sanction. UKAD submitted the facts merited a period of ineligibility of four years, namely the maximum pursuant to ADR 10.6. The Respondent accepted the period of ineligibility would be at least two years but submitted it need not be as long as four.

The facts

15. The facts are unusual. The charges are not based on any analytical finding/s or the Respondent being found in possession of Prohibited Substances. Rather, the proceedings were brought against him based upon what he now accepts to be admissions in messages he sent using his *Facebook* account.
16. The admissions were made in messages sent electronically from the *Facebook* account 'Craig Windsor Jnr' to another person, known for the purposes of this Award as 'AB'. AB was an athlete. In the recent past he was declared ineligible for a significant period following an adverse analytical finding. His evidence in this case was given by way of a witness statement. He also gave live evidence on an issue we consider to be peripheral. He gave that evidence in the hope it will be assessed (by UKAD) as "substantial assistance" for the purposes of ADR 10.5.3 and so result in a reduction of his period of ineligibility. In those circumstances UKAD invited us not to disclose his identity in this (or any other) public document. The Respondent did not object. For good reasons (both in principle, and for reasons specific to these proceedings) we are persuaded it is right to do so. His true identity was not kept from the Respondent, those who act for him and the Tribunal.
17. A few may be unfamiliar with the concept of *Facebook*. *Facebook* is an online social networking service. Users must register before using the site, after which they may create a personal profile. It enables them to store personal details and register or 'add' other users as 'friends'. It has a messaging facility whereby the user is able to send message via his/her personal profile to a 'friend' (subject to privacy settings).
18. AB has two legitimate *Facebook* accounts. One is a personal account, the other his "fan page" (as he called it). He first received a message (via *Facebook*) from the Respondent in June 2012. The message came from the Respondent's *Facebook* account in the name of "Craig Windsor Jnr". In November/December of last year AB was informed by UKAD that in order for his ineligibility period to be reduced he would need to provide information to UKAD which led to the "discovery of one or more anti-doping violations by others". Thereafter he contacted the Respondent using the *Facebook* message facility in the hope he might make admissions. This hope was based on earlier such communications in which the Respondent, he said, talked about prohibited substances.
19. AB contacted the Respondent by private *Facebook* message on 15 December 2012. He received a response and thereafter and up to and including 10 January 2013 they exchanged messages via that medium. By his admissions before us the Respondent accepts that he sent those messages from his *Facebook* account. It follows from his admitting the charges that the content of those messages was true. The Panel was provided with a paginated bundle of screenshots of the said conversations, exhibited to AB's witness statement.

20. The relevant messages are extracted and reproduced in Appendix 1 to this Award. Oxandrolone is referred to as "anavar". Stanozolol as "stanzol". In a message sent at 00.04 on 10 January he stated, "*iv got 20 ml of stanzol in a box as well*". During the correspondence he repeatedly admitted using oxandrolone. By way of example, on 15 December 2012 at 00.32 "*anavar is good*"; at 00.46 "*I been hitting hard and working hard it makes arms big but*"; at 00.07 on 24 December, "*I did anvar there makes u stronger not put weight on makes u hard*"; and at 00.43 on 13 January, "*I took anvar and it was away in a day I could run...*" and at "*this will be first pro fight on gear*".
21. The Respondent now accepts those messages are clear and unequivocal admissions of possession of two anabolic steroids and the use of one, oxandrolone.
22. On 10 January 2013 AB went to the UKAD with the messages. UKAD began investigating the Respondent. Attempts were made to take a urine sample from him on 24 to 26 January 2013. He could not be found at what UKAD understood to be his home address in Coatbridge, North Lanarkshire. UKAD's initial case was that he deliberately avoided being tested. The Respondent's case was that he was training in Birmingham. UKAD did not pursue before us that aspect of its case and we ignore it.
23. The Respondent did not accept one further aspect of UKAD's case. He did not accept responsibility for the 'recent' message on a *Facebook* account in the name of 'AB' which he said was a fake account. He denied posting the message which read, "*Look Charlene tell Craig I am sorry, I've been banned...and im [sic] just trying to get my career back on track...it was never my intention for the UKAD to take it this far, I thought they would drop it when they didnt [sic] get any more evidence. Again I am very sorry for any trouble I have caused Craig and your family...God bless and I hope everything works out alright [sic] for him*".
24. We heard from AB on this issue. Mr Duguid QC questioned him. There is no direct evidence that the Respondent sent or caused that message to be sent. We are not satisfied to the requisite standard that the Respondent was responsible, either directly or indirectly for that message. We disregard that aspect of UKAD's case.
25. Ms Hannah McLean, Acting Head of Case Management, wrote to the Respondent on 21 February giving him formal notice that UKAD was investigating him for potential anti-doping rule violations. The letter was couriered and signed for the following day at 08.30. The Respondent called her at 09.47 the same day protesting his innocence and denying that he used or possessed any banned substance. He was adamant that he did not use the Internet, including *Facebook*. At about 11.00 the same morning his former partner Charlene Mortimer telephoned Ms McLean and told her she was responsible for the 'offending' messages.

She said she was the Respondent's partner for seven years before they separated three years ago. She said she set up the *Facebook* account and used it, pretending to be the Respondent. She later swore that account to be true in an affidavit served on the Respondent's behalf.

Sanction

26. The Respondent was notified of the charges at the same time. Accordingly they are to be treated as a single anti-doping rule violation (Article 10.7.4).

27. Article 10.2 of the ADR provides-

"For an Anti-Doping Rule Violation under Article 2.1 (Presence of Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers), Article 2.2 (Use or Attempted Use of Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method) or Article 2.6 (Possession of Prohibited Substances and/or Prohibited Method) that is the Participant's first violation, a period of Ineligibility of two years shall be imposed, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of ineligibility (as specified in Article 10.4 and/or Article 10.5) or the conditions for increasing the period of Ineligibility (as specified in Article 10.6) are met."

28. This is the Respondent's first violation.

29. Article 10.6 ADR provides -

"10.6.1 if the NADO establishes in an individual case involving an Anti-Doping Rule Violation other than under Article 2.7 (Trafficking or Attempted Trafficking) or Article 2.8 (administration or attempted administration) that aggravating circumstances are present that justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard period, then the period of Ineligibility otherwise applicable shall be increased up to a maximum of four years, unless the Participant can prove to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel that he/she did not knowingly commit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation.

10.6.2 A Participant can avoid the application of Article 10.6.1 by admitting his/her Anti-Doping Rule Violation promptly after being confronted with it by the NADO."

30. In this instance the standard period is two years. The Respondent did not suggest (nor could he) that he did not knowingly commit the anti-doping rule violation. The Respondent did not make a prompt admission after being confronted by UKAD.

31. The commentary to Article 10.6 of WADC provides some examples of aggravating circumstances that might justify the imposition of a period of ineligibility greater than the standard period. They include committing the anti-doping rule violation as part of a doping plan or scheme, either as part of a conspiracy or of individually; use or possession of multiple substances; and the athlete or individual engaged in deceptive or obstructing conduct to avoid the detection of adjudication of an anti-doping rule violation. Further ADR 10.7.4a states that multiple violations that cannot be charged separately "*may be considered as a factor in determining aggravated circumstances under Article 10.6*"¹.

32. The central issues for the Panel were:

- i. Has UKAD satisfied us that aggravating circumstances are present?
- ii. If so, whether such aggravating circumstances justify the imposition of a period of Ineligibility greater than two years; and
- iii. If so, the extent of that increased period up to a maximum of four years

33. We are satisfied (to the requisite standard) that in this instance the following aggravating circumstances are present. -

- i. The anti-doping rule violation involved the possession of multiple Prohibited Substances, namely two.
- ii. The violation involved his use of one of those Prohibited Substances over a not insignificant period of time.
- iii. This was planned doping. He took the prohibited steroids very specifically in order to help him train harder, and grow stronger and harder for a fight planned for February. The steroids were selected for those purposes, with the knowledge (important for a boxer at this weight) that they would not cause weight gain.
- iv. The Respondent admitted the anti-doping rule violation but not until the day of the hearing. And then only shortly before it was scheduled to start. In advance of the hearing he denied all matters, insisting that he did not use the internet and was not responsible for the *Facebook* messages. He claimed his erstwhile partner, Charlene Mortimer, was responsible. He swore an affidavit denying that he posted the said messages. His partner also swore an affidavit in which she asserted that she drafted all of the 'offending'

¹ See also *UKAD V Burns* (NADP) dated 10 December 2012

messages. Mr Taylor characterised that as "suborning her to commit perjury". We are not satisfied he did suborn her. However, at the very least he was complicit in a fabricated defence being compiled and advanced on his behalf. Mr Duguid QC (rightly in our view) accepted the Respondent thereby engaged in obstructive conduct, which we observe, he persisted in right up to the 'door of the hearing'. That he might have not received the best of legal advice (as was suggested on his behalf) is nothing to the point: he knew what he had done.

34. Mr Duguid QC accepted the presence of each of the above aggravating features. He submitted that following his admissions the Respondent was entitled to some diminution of what otherwise would be a period of Ineligibility of four years.
35. Mr Taylor reminded the Panel of the NADP awards in *UKAD v Ian Burns* (10 December 2012), *UKAD v Bernice Wilson* (28 September 2011) and the appeal decision dated 19 January 2012. We note that in both *Burns* and *Wilson* the athletes persisted in and advanced their false defences through a hearing. We also agree with the observation of the first instance panel in *Wilson*, "*we do not necessarily find it compelling to compare individual features of individual case with one another, and whilst consistency in decision making is important, one tribunal may (within reason) legitimately take a different view from another*"².
36. Insofar as there is any assistance on the application of WADC 10.6 Mr Taylor (helpfully) invited us to CAS 2012/IA/2773 *IAAF v SEGAS & Kokkinariou*. We agree with the observations of that CAS Panel, namely that the imposition of an increased ineligibility period is at the discretion of the relevant body and that a single aggravating circumstance might justify the maximum period while multiple examples might justify a lesser period.
37. We are satisfied to the requisite standard that such aggravating factors "justify" a period of Ineligibility greater than the standard period of two years. The issue is to what period we impose in addition to two years properly to reflect those aggravating circumstances. This was a bad case of doping. It was a course of deliberate cheating to obtain an unfair advantage before and during a licensed fight. When challenged by UKAD he sought to evade responsibility with a wholly untrue case, content to hide behind the lying testimony of his former partner. However, it is to be noted that ultimately he did not persist with that dishonest defence and eventually, albeit late and when confronted with a compelling UKAD case, admitted the anti-doping rule violations. In the circumstances it is appropriate to impose an additional period of ineligibility of one year nine months, making a total period of ineligibility of three years nine months.

² paragraph 92

38. The period of ineligibility imposed on the Respondent is three years nine months.
39. In accordance with ADR Article 10.9.3 the period of ineligibility shall start on 6 March 2013, the date upon which the provisional suspension took effect.
40. UKAD accepted that the Respondent's last sanctioned fight was on 1 September 2012. Accordingly no results fall to be disqualified under the ADR.
41. The Respondent's status during the period of ineligibility is as provided in ADR Article 10.10.

Summary

42. For the reasons set out above, the Tribunal makes the following decision
- i. The anti-doping rule violations contrary to ADR Articles 2.2 and 2.6 have been established.
 - ii. The period of ineligibility imposed is three years nine months from 6 March 2013.

Right of Appeal

43. In accordance with ADR Article 13.4.1 the Respondent may appeal against this decision by lodging a Notice of Appeal within 21 days of receipt hereof.



Christopher Quinlan QC, Chairman

On behalf of the Tribunal

30 April 2013

APPENDIX 1

1. ADMISSIONS OF ANTI-DOPING RULE VIOLATIONS BY CRAIG WINDSOR JUNIOR

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:32	15 Dec	yes same il start it mad start of jan anavar is good i feel we yelloew tabs	
00:34	15 Dec		is that what u have been using?
00:34	15 Dec	its a hard 1 dis not put weight on eh no watter power up bad in liver been told but if only used in 6 weeks will be ok	
00:35	15 Dec		so u havnt used it yet? u still there mate?
00:38	15 Dec	yes mate a have	
00:38	15 Dec		so did u get anything out of it?
00:39	15 Dec	i feel it did bro hows ur training wit u think of stanzol jags any good u been told for a boxer	
00:40	15 Dec		i have heard they stay in ur system quite long

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:40	15 Dec	yes stanzol anavar is fast but	
00:46	15 Dec		are u using anything now?
00:46	15 Dec	not the now i try anavar there was good 1 tub i been hiting hard and working hard it makes arms big but	
00:46	15 Dec		so are u staying on anavar now?
00:47	15 Dec	yes is that a good move u feel ?	
00:47	15 Dec		should be ok mate
00:48	15 Dec	yes milkthistle u take that with it should u	
00:49	15 Dec		yeah mate thats good cleans the liver
00:49	15 Dec	yes i do that the drops	
00:49	15 Dec		so are you gonna use anavar up until the fight?
00:50	15 Dec	yes i come of it for 2 weeks then train all time as doing il take it it is good prob the best to get and is only like £50	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:55	15 Dec		yeah, so what exactly are u doing now mate? just anavar
00:56	15 Dec	... yes anavar bro out fast anything else u think i should get i dont think so eh just that	
00:57	15 Dec		no it hink thats ok
00:57	15 Dec	yes same its ahardner hardner makes u stonger	
00:57	15 Dec		did it get u stronger?
01:00	15 Dec	but i feel u have to be a strong before u take it eh yes i did bro its good stuff i get it £50 a tub yellew tabslets 60 in a tub 1 a day if u take 2 a day boom	
01:02	15 Dec		what company made the one u used?
01:02	15 Dec	il tell u the now its hear	
01:03	15 Dec		ok
01:04	15	pro chem	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
	Dec	any good ?	
01:04	15 Dec		i have heard mixed reviews mate. how many milligrams are the tabs?
01:06	15 Dec	it says 50	
01:06	15 Dec		did it help ur stamina?
01:07	15 Dec	it did yes should it ?	
01:07	15 Dec		good stuff. so u said u will use it ntil 2 weeks b4 the fight?
01:07	15 Dec	yes when u bk on im going to use it to get to top lots of guys do it i will come of it but not the now	
00:07	24 Dec	YES GOOD BRO IM SAME I DID ANVAR THERE MAKES U STRONGER NOT PUT WEIGHT ON MAKES U HARD STANZOL JAGS IS MENT TO BE GOOD AS WELL	
00:08	24 Dec		u still on anavar now?

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:09	24 Dec	not now done it last week yellow tablets it is 50mg 60 in a tub 1 a day or 2 a day take milkthisle with it	
00:10	24 Dec		you told me u would do it till ur fight in feb
00:10	24 Dec	im going bk on it run out	
00:11	24 Dec		when?
00:11	24 Dec	this week comeing ...	
00:23	24 Dec	THANKS MATE IM HOPEING THIS IS A GOOD YEAR FOR IS I WANT TO FIGHT LOTS THIS YEAR START FEB ON GEAR HA GET THE KO	
00:43	24 Dec		so u r going back on anavar next week?
00:44	24 Dec	YES HAHA	
00:42	24 Dec		and r u staying on it till the fight?
00:45	24 Dec	YES I AM BRO I WILL HAVE TO LOTS OF GUYS ARE DOING IT U KNOW IT UR SELF	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
		<p>ANY OTHER ONES OUT THERE U THINK WHAT IS BEST</p> <p>OUT THERE</p>	
00:46	24 Dec		<p>i am not too sure mate because of ur weight</p> <p>but r u happy with anavar?</p>
00:46	24 Dec	<p>YES IM A WANTED TO MOVE UP TO CRUZER</p> <p>14 STONE</p> <p>IM HARD HITER THE NOW</p> <p>IF A WENT UP ON GEAR</p> <p>I WOULD HIT HARDER</p> <p>BUT ITS A BIG JUMP GUYS WOULD SAYS WENT FROM MIDLE TO CRUZER AND LOOK GOOD</p> <p>ON GEAR EH</p>	
00:08	31 Dec	<p>...</p> <p>stanzol and anvar and is best yea andvar gives u ex power and fitnes stanzol as well</p>	
00:10	31 Dec		are you using those now mate?
00:13	31 Dec	<p>not the now bro let u know done with it the now</p> <p>just training anvar kicks in fast anyway its a fact acting</p>	
00:16	31	why are they abned in sprot becuase they	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
	Dec	make u btter at ur sport with hard training u feel they are not bad for u guys who party thats bad for u	
00:17	31 Dec		they say it gives u an unfair advantage over others who dont use
00:19	31 Dec	yes it puts weight on but ...	
00:23	31 Dec		... when are u planning on going back on anavar?
00:24	31 Dec	2 weeks time iv got 9lbs to come of first then take them with hard diet	
00:25	31 Dec		can u get those pounds off easy?
00:25	31 Dec	i feel they are bets thing out there they not bad for ur heart are they ?	
00:25	31 Dec		not that i have heard of
00:30	31 Dec	... anvar cost £60 a tub yellew tablets 1 or 2 a day	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
		...	
00:47	9 Jan	 did u start ur anavar then?
12:17	9 Jan	No yet bro ...	
23:29	9 Jan		that will be cool. when u back on anavar then mate
23:32	9 Jan	SOON MATE ...	
23:49	9 Jan		... u gonna use anavar till ur fight?
23:50	9 Jan	im going to yes soon bro let u know i have it pro chem 50mg £70 a tub makes u stronger	
23:51	9 Jan		do u have them already?
23:51	9 Jan	and fiter if train hard yes i paid them the other day got them in my house tub them	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:04	10 Jan	... iv got 20 ml of stanzol in a box as well	
00:05	10 Jan	can send u the name of it tell me if any good	
00:05	10 Jan		ok
00:05	10 Jan	2 sec alpha pharma rexogin stanzol	
00:05	10 Jan		never heard of that one bro are u gonna use that with anavar?
00:08	10 Jan	its there if a want it might ge it to my pal	
00:09	10 Jan		i see mate, so when will u finish anavar?
00:09	10 Jan	anvar dis not stop u puting weigth on it helps u cut up as well u know that anvar best	
00:12	10 Jan		so u finish anavar on the day of ur fight?
00:12	10 Jan	yes bro 60 tablets 2 a day 30 days	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
		...	
00:36	13 Jan	hows it going doing pads the now all day the moro and all week training anvar and then next week spar hard anvar	
00:37	13 Jan		did u say monday for anavar?
00:37	13 Jan	iv got bit weight this week then next anvar weights sparring feeling good i was of it for 2 or 3 week bk on it now feel good the day takes away pain of hard training i feel makes u work harder	
00:39	13 Jan		so u feel u working harder now?
00:40	13 Jan	yes bro let u know as weeks go by il be on feb march and april ...	
00:40	13 Jan		...
00:41	13 Jan	if all go to plan ...	
00:41	13 Jan		... u on now?
00:42	13 Jan	yea on now	
00:43	13 Jan		so its helping with pads and runs?
00:43	13 Jan	yes i had sore calf and was not going away i hurt it on sprints i took anvar and it was away in a day i could run eh hows that	

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
00:44	13 Jan		when was that?
00:44	13 Jan	3 days ago bro i start 2 days now il upload photos of me next week ok bro	
00:44	13 Jan		ok, u doing it till fight in feb?
00:44	13 Jan	this will be first pro fight on gear	
00:45	13 Jan		really
00:45	13 Jan	yes bro	
00:46	13 Jan		i thought u said u used b4?
00:48	13 Jan	yes in past but not as a boxer as a pro	
22:55	20 Jan		i am good bro, so ur training is going really well?
22:56	20 Jan	yes bro	
22:56	20 Jan		nice and the anavar is working well for u?
22:56	20 Jan	i love it	
22:57	20 Jan		thats good mate so u still gonna use it until fight night?
22:57	20 Jan	all way bro il go to cruzeiro in the end and be hitting 3 times harder when bigger and fit i will eat hard and train hard guys are easy at that weight i feel	
23:06	20 Jan		ok do u have an opponent for the 23rd?

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
23:07	20 Jan	yes guy called james tucker mikey healet show	
23:09	20 Jan		u gonna use anavar up to that show?
23:10	20 Jan	YES BRO LOL AND U	
23:29	20 Jan		so thats why u are using anavar right? gotta make sure u win and win big
23:36	20 Jan	yes bro win good	
23:41	23 Jan	good bro ul be ok il come of it as well soon not a everytime thing just geting my self up	
23:42	23 Jan		really u mean the anavar?
23:43	23 Jan	yes	
23:43	23 Jan		how come mate i thought u said u were gonna use it till fight night?
23:43	23 Jan	yes bro c how a go but i will come of it at 1 point cant stay on it for ever iv just started it eh i feel good and hiting hard	
23:45	23 Jan		ok bro but its going good for u?

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
23:47	23 Jan	so far so good bro what a dont like i got told its bad for the liver	
23:47	23 Jan		how long u been on it now?
23:47	23 Jan	wich means need to watch body shots but i have good body iv never been down i feel strong but dont take rish hit dont get hit ...	
23:48	23 Jan		u take milk thistle to clean liver
23:48	23 Jan	... yes i take that now mate 2 tablets a day	
23:49	23 Jan		so u dont need to worry about ur liver
23:49	23 Jan	yes milk thistle now bro 2 tablets a day	
00:11	24 Jan		... how long u been on anavar?
00:13	24 Jan	i was clean in that fight bro i was fighting under weight im better at new weight now em me bro i would say back on it few weeks	
00:14	24 Jan		yeah i mean now how long u been on anavar?
00:14	24 Jan	abt 2 month bro	
00:15	24		really i didnt know u been on it that

TIME/DATE		MESSAGES FROM 'CRAIG WINDSOR JR'	
	Jan		long mate
00:15	24 Jan	i was of it for few weeks it last 30 days a tub did 1 tub	
00:17	24 Jan		how many days u have left?
00:17	24 Jan	over 22 will upload photo next week	
00:51	24 Jan	thats good bro when u take anvar u still los weight if diet hard it make u hard and strong	
00:52	24 Jan		really?
00:52	24 Jan	yes bro ...	



Sport Resolutions (UK)
1 Salisbury Square
London EC4Y 8AE

T: +44 (0)20 7036 1966
F: +44 (0)20 7936 2602

Email: resolve@sportresolutions.co.uk
Website: www.sportresolutions.co.uk

Sport Resolutions (UK) is the trading name of The Sports Dispute Resolution Panel Limited