

## SAIDS

### DISCIPLINARY HEARING

DISCIPLINARY PANEL	ADV J LUBBE SC (CHAIR)
	DR ROB COLLINS
	PROF YOGA COOPOO
ATHLETE	RAPULA SEFAMYETSO
PROSECUTOR	ADV N KOCK
PLACE OF HEARING	JOHANNESBURG
DATE OF HEARING	13 SEPTEMBER 2012

- [1] Rapula Sefamyetso (the Athlete) has been charged with an anti-doping rule violation in terms of Article 2.1 of the 2009 Anti-Doping Rules of the South African Institute for Drug Free Sport (SAIDS).
- [2] On 20 April 2012 the Athlete provided a urine sample (2634661) during an in-competition test. Upon analysis it was found that the sample contained a prohibited substance, namely the Anabolic Agent, Testosterone. Testosterone is categorized under **Class S1, Anabolic Agents**, in specific **1 (b), Endogenous** on the World Anti-Doping Code 2012 Prohibited List International Standard.
- [3] The Athlete is unrepresented and his rights were fully explained to him. He indicated that he is not guilty. It was explained to him that the strict liability rule applies and the rule was fully explained to him. He admitted that he provided a urine sample and that the proper procedure was followed to collect the sample. He did not dispute that the sample was properly sealed and dispatched to the laboratory. He further did not dispute that the sample was analysed at the laboratory and that the result of the A sample was correct.
- [4] The Athlete explained that he purchased Testoboost over the counter. He was not planning to compete at the time and purchased the substance to enhance his strength in the gymnasium. During the same week that he used the supplement he was informed by his coach to compete in a sprint event. He testified that he was informed by the seller of the product that the ingredients were all natural substances and that there was no risk using the substance. He also consulted the internet and the information was the same. He took four capsules before the event where he was requested to provide a urine sample. His time improved significantly and he came second in the event. He experienced during the event that he felt stronger and was surprised at his time. He is a first year student at the North West University in Sport Science and was exposed to the detrimental effect on drug abuse by athletes.

[5] On the evidence it is clear that an anti-doping rule violation has been established. On the evidence there is no basis to apply Article 10.5.2 of the Rules of SAIDS to reduce the prescribed sanction of two (2) years ineligibility. The Athlete is a first offender. He is twenty-four year old and has been competing in athletics for four years. He is a student at a local university and competes at provincial level. He admitted that he is aware of the importance to use only supplements and medication that are safe.

[8] The following sanction is imposed:

10.1 An anti-doping rule violation in terms of Article 2.1 of the said Rules has been established.

10.2 The Athlete shall be subjected to a period of ineligibility of two (2) years from all sport calculated from 28 June 2012 up to and including 27 June 2014.

J Lubbe SC

For and on behalf of the Panel

14 September 2012