

DECISION

issued by the

IRISH SPORT ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL

sitting in the following composition:

Chairperson: Mr David Casserly, Barrister
Panel Member: Dr Rachel Cullivan-Elliot, Medical Practitioner
Panel Member: Ms Margaret Corcoran, Sports Administrator
Secretary to the Panel: Ms Nicola Carroll, Barrister

in the disciplinary proceedings between

CYCLING IRELAND, Dublin, Ireland
represented by Mr Alan Daveron, Solicitor

-Claimant-

and

Athlete IS-1534, Ireland

-Respondent-

1. PARTIES

- 1.1 Cycling Ireland (the “Claimant”) is the governing body of cycling in Ireland.
- 1.2 Mr IS-1534 (the “Respondent”) is a member of [...] Cycling Club.

2. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The following paragraphs contain a factual description of the background of the present case, as agreed upon and accepted by both parties.
- 2.2 On Sunday [...] 2012, at approximately 10pm, the Respondent consumed “a pipe load” of cannabis in the company of his friends, in the social setting of his friend’s home. The Respondent is a very occasional cannabis user, who would typically consume cannabis two to three times per year.
- 2.3 On [...] 2012, the Respondent participated in the [...] cycling race.
- 2.4 On [...] 2012, during the course of [...], the Respondent was subjected to an in-competition doping control.
- 2.5 The Respondent’s urine sample was analysed by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) accredited laboratory in Köln.
- 2.6 On 26 April 2012, the Köln laboratory produced the following report in relation to the Respondent’s sample:

The sample has been analysed according to the 2012 Prohibited List of the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA). Analyses are based on accredited mass spectrometric and immunological methods.

Adverse analytical finding

Substance:

*Carboxy-THC > 15 ng/ml
(S8. Cannabinoids)*

Detection of carboxy-THC is consistent with the administration of the prohibited substance tetrahydrocannabinol (THC).

[...]

This constitutes an Adverse Analytical Finding (AAF).

- 2.7 On 3 May 2012 the Respondent admitted the use of cannabis in e-mail correspondence to the ISADDP, in the following terms:

Ms Nicola Carroll

I have received your letter today, informing me of my positive test during [...] cycle race over the [...].

I would like to admit to having used cannabis as a recreational drug and am guilty of the charge.

I did not use cannabis (or any other drug) to try and improve my sports performance in any way.

But I did make a poor lifestyle choice and admit guilt and would like to fully cooperate with the Sports Council etc

I look forward to your reply

Best Regards

IS-1534

[...], Co.[...]

3. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

3.1 By letter of 2 May 2012, the Irish Sports Council (ISC) notified the Respondent of the Adverse Analytical Finding and the consequent alleged violation of the Irish Anti-Doping Rules (hereinafter referred to as the “Rules”). In the same letter, the ISC informed the Respondent of his rights and obligations arising out of the alleged breach.

3.2 On the same date, the ISC notified the Claimant of the Adverse Analytical Finding and, *inter alia*, informed the Claimant of its obligation to present the case against the Respondent before the Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel (ISADDP), pursuant to Article 8.4.2 of the Rules.

3.3 Also on the same date, the ISC informed the Secretary of the ISADDP of the Adverse Analytical Finding.

3.4 Following receipt of the notification from the ISC, pursuant to Article 8.3.2 of the Rules, the Chairperson of the ISADDP, Mr Michael Collins SC, appointed a panel to consider this matter, constituted as follows (hereinafter referred to as the “Panel”):

Chairperson: Mr David Casserly, Barrister

Panel Member: Dr Rachel Cullivan-Elliot, Medical Practitioner

Panel Member: Ms Margaret Corcoran, Sports Administrator

3.5 By letter of 14 May 2012, the Panel issued procedural directions to the Parties. The Claimant was directed to file a written submission, with a copy to be sent to the Respondent, on or before 21 May 2012, and the Respondent was directed to file a written submission in response on or before 31 May 2012, with copy to be sent to the Claimant.

3.6 Following consultation with the Parties, the Panel fixed a hearing time and date of 5pm on 5 June 2012.

3.7 The Panel subsequently requested a copy of some documentation from the Claimant, which had been referred to in its submission, but had not been furnished to the Panel.

- 3.8 Following the filing and exchange of written submissions, an oral hearing (hereinafter referred to as the “Hearing”) was held on 5 June 2012 at Frederick House, 19 South Frederick Street, Dublin 2. In addition to the Panel, the Secretary to the ISADDP and the stenographer, the following people were in attendance at the Hearing:

Claimant: Mr Alan Daveron, Solicitor
Mr Geoff Liffey, CEO, Cycling Ireland
Mr Declan Byrne, Anti-Doping Officer, Cycling Ireland

Respondent: Mr IS-1534

Observer: Ms Siobhán Leonard, Irish Sports Council

- 3.9 In their respective written submissions, and during the course of the Hearing, both Parties expressly agreed that due to the presence of a Prohibited Substance or its metabolites or Markers in his Sample, the Respondent had committed an offence pursuant to Article 2.1 of the Rules.
- 3.10 The Parties further agreed that the substance in question was a Specified Substance as defined by the Rules.
- 3.11 The Parties further agreed that in determining the appropriate sanction to be imposed upon the Respondent, the Panel should apply Article 10 of the Rules, the first paragraph of which provides as follows:

The period of Ineligibility imposed for a first violation of Article 2.1, Article 2.2 or Article 2.6 shall be two (2) years' Ineligibility, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Articles 10.3 and 10.4, or the conditions for increasing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Article 10.5, are met.

- 3.12 The Parties further agreed that Articles 10.4, 10.5 and 10.6 were not applicable in the present case, and that the appropriate provision to be applied in order to determine the appropriate sanction in the present case was Article 10.3 of the Rules.
- 3.13 The Panel agreed with the Parties' joint contention regarding the applicability of Article 10.3, and in addition to considering their general submissions, the Panel invited the Parties to make specific oral submissions regarding the appropriate sanction to be imposed pursuant to Article 10.3,.
- 3.14 Article 10.3 provides as follows:

10.3.1 Where a Participant can establish how a Specified Substance entered his or her body or came into his or her Possession and that such Specified Substance was not intended to enhance the Athlete's sport performance or mask the Use of a performance-enhancing substance, the period of Ineligibility found in Article 10.1 shall be replaced with, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years.

10.3.2 To justify any elimination or reduction, the Participant must produce corroborating evidence in addition to his or her word which establishes to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or mask the Use of a performance enhancing substance. The Participant's degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing any reduction of the period of Ineligibility.

- 3.15 Following the completion of the Parties' oral presentations, each member of the Panel posed various questions to the Parties.
- 3.16 The Panel provided the Parties with an opportunity to file further written submissions regarding the caselaw of the International Cycling Federation (UCI) and other tribunals in similar cases, but both Parties declined this invitation.
- 3.17 The Hearing concluded on the evening of 5 June 2012.

4. PARTIES' SUBMISSIONS

4.1 - Parties' Requests for Relief

- 4.1.1 The Claimant submitted the following request for relief in its written submission of 23 May 2012:

"In view of Mr. IS-1534 timely admission (reference 10.7.2 of the Rules) and also that the substance in question was a Specified Substance (10.3 of the Rules) Cycling Ireland will be requesting a period of ineligibility of five months with effect from 04th May 2012, the date Mr. IS-1534 returned his licence".

- 4.1.2 The Claimant confirmed its request for relief during the Hearing.

- 4.1.3 The Respondent submitted the following request for relief in his written submission of 31 May 2012:

"I would ask the Panel that they decide a warning and disqualification be enough sanction, together with the stress and worry that I have caused myself and my family the last month be enough punishment for what I have done."

- 4.1.4 The Respondent confirmed his request for relief during the Hearing.

- 4.1.5 The Parties relied on the following oral and written submissions in support of their claims. The following description of the Parties' respective submissions is not intended to be a comprehensive report of all submissions made to the Panel, but rather a discussion of the most relevant parts of such submissions. The Panel has, however, considered all submissions made by the Parties before issuing the present decision.

4.2 – Claimant's Submissions

4.2.1 The Claimant made the following written submissions in support of its request for relief:

Our case is that the Cycling Ireland licence holder in question, Mr. IS-1534, was selected for a random test following [...] race on [...] 2012 in [...]. The testing was carried out by Irish Sports Council Anti-doping personnel, subsequent results indicated traces of a prohibited substance, namely, carboxy-THC, in violation of article 2.1 of the Irish Anti-Doping Rules ("the Rules"). In an email response on 03rd May 2012 to the letter from the ISC Anti-Doping Unit dated 02nd May 2012 Mr. IS-1534 has accepted the finding.

Mr. IS-1534 has not competed since the 04th May when he agreed with the CEO of Cycling Ireland, Mr. Geoff Liffey, to return his licence.

In view of Mr. IS-1534 timely admission (reference 10.7.2 of the Rules) and also that the substance in question was a Specified Substance (10.3 of the Rules) Cycling Ireland will be requesting a period of ineligibility of five months with effect from 04th May 2012, the date Mr. IS-1534 returned his licence. This is also in line with the most recent cycling cases, as published by the UCI (International Cycling Union), involving the same Specified Substance.

Mr. IS-1534 should be aware that he was committing an offence as the Cycling Ireland Yearbook, which is issued to all members, refers to the WADA list of Prohibited Substances.

4.2.2 The Claimant was requested to submit a copy of the Cycling Ireland Yearbook referred to in its submission. The Claimant provided a copy to the Panel and indicated that the relevant parts of such Yearbook were pages 35 and 37, entitled 'Anti-Doping Guidelines'.

4.2.3 The Claimant was also requested to submit a copy of the UCI caselaw that it referred to in its submission. However, the Claimant provided only a list of names and sanctions from cycling cases in 2009. It did not provide any detail regarding the facts of the cases mentioned, nor did it make any submission regarding the relevance of the cases to the present matter. As mentioned above, the Claimant was provided with an opportunity to submit an additional written submission regarding the conclusions that the Panel should draw from the caselaw it cited, but it declined the invitation to do so.

4.2.4 During the Hearing, the Claimant submitted, *inter alia*, as follows:

- A minimum suspension of five months should be imposed in this matter;
- It is very important that Cycling Ireland are seen to have zero-tolerance in relation to taking any illegal substances;
- It is important for Cycling Ireland that the integrity of the sport is protected in that it is seen that Cycling Ireland does not tolerate any breaches of the Rules;
- It is important for Cycling Ireland that there is a minimum sanction of five months as a clear signal to all members of Cycling Ireland that this is a serious matter and that it will not be tolerated by Cycling Ireland;
- By association, Cycling Ireland's reputation is damaged by the Respondent's use of cannabis;

- Cycling Ireland cannot be seen to be complicit - if a member has taken a substance that is clearly in breach of the Rules, Cycling Ireland believes that a sanction should be imposed;
- Even if used for social reasons, cannabis is a drug that is illegal to use in this jurisdiction, so Cycling Ireland cannot be seen to be lenient on matters like that, but must instead set a good example for all riders and for all potential riders and especially for the youth, that taking of illegal substances will not be tolerated;
- The Respondent has, at the earliest opportunity, admitted in taking cannabis, thereby lessening the work involved in preparing this case, and that should be taken into account by the Panel.

4.2.5 Following, and in response to, questioning from the Panel, the Claimant made the following additional submissions:

- The degree of anti-doping education provided to a typical cyclist depends on the level they compete at;
- Cycling Ireland has an education programme that includes workshops and seminars, which are targeted primarily at coaches, but not restricted to coaches;
- The Irish Sports Council produces wallet cards that are distributed to riders by placing them at some race events;
- Last winter, the Road Commission, a sub-commission of Cycling Ireland, organised two anti-doping education events for development youth riders, in [...] and [...], which each had an approximate attendance of 77 people;
- The sport of cycling has a history with anti-doping, and it is well-understood common knowledge that random testing takes place;
- At the back of every membership card that Cycling Ireland issues to its members, there is a message in relation to anti-doping;¹
- The rationale for requesting a five month suspension for the Respondent is that having considered the information it obtained in relation to other jurisdictions where this issue was dealt with, the typical sanction seemed to vary from three months to six months, and Cycling Ireland believes that five months would be appropriate. Also, it is effectively the end of the season. From the date of the incident, five months would represent a logical end of the competitive period, so increasing the sanction to seven months wouldn't make any difference;
- Having read the Respondent's submission, the Claimant is willing to accept that he was using cannabis for recreational purposes only, not for the purpose of enhancing his performance;
- The Claimant accepts the Respondent's factual account of how the cannabis was consumed and agrees that there is no requirement for further corroboration;
- Because of Cycling Ireland's extensive testing programme, all athletes competing at the Respondent's level would know that they are subject to testing;
- The Cycling Ireland Handbook is a resource that the Claimant distributes to all members, which contains the message there is an anti-doping policy and there are a set of rules that apply to all members.

4.3 – Respondent's Submissions

¹ The Panel requested that the Claimant would submit a copy of such a membership card to the Panel after the Hearing, to be included in the evidentiary record, but this was not provided.

- 4.3.1 The Respondent made the following written submissions in support of its request for relief, in his written submission of 31 May 2012:

Firstly I would like to say how sorry I am for having having broke the rules by having canibas in my system during [...] cycle race.

I will be asking the Panel to believe me when I say, I did not use the drug during, or within 5 days of the race, nor did I use the drug as a training tool for racing. I did not realise that the cannabis would have stayed in my system for so long.

I know that this is my fault for using it during the season and will never happen again.

I would ask the Panel that they decide a warning and disqualification be enough sanction, together with the stress and worry that I have caused myself and my family the last month be enough punishment for what I have done. This would be similar to the only cases I found on a web search of recent cases with cannabis. (See attachment 1).

As cannabis is not a performance improving drug and in light of recent arguments against it being on the WADA banned list(see attachment 2) and as this is the first time I have ever been in trouble, I think a ban from racing would be the wrong decision and this punishment should be saved for persons trying to cheat the sport.

I also think a ban would have a negative impact on our family business, which I run, a bicycle shop in [...], Co. [...].(web link below).

As many livelihoods depend on this income from the shop I run, I beg not to be over punished for my crime in this popular sports event.

The last thing I had in mind was a cycle race when I was smoking cannabis. I am against doping in sport as much as you and hate the thought of someone cheating against me. Just as I hate the thought of my competitors thinking I have tried to cheat. I have always raced in a fair and honest way and hope that the Panel and Cycling Ireland believe me not to be a sports cheat.

Finally I would like to thank you for giving me the time and opportunity to defend myself and again I am sorry for the trouble I have caused.

I will also be offering my apologies to the [...] race organiser, who I did not wish to disrespect either.

- 4.3.2 The Respondent's written submission was accompanied by (i) a Thesis by Michel Riemersma, entitled *High on sport: the ethically unjustified inclusion of cannabis on the anti-doping list*, and (ii) a list of names and sanctions from doping cases in cycling, similar to that which was submitted by the Claimant, but from 2007. The Respondent was also provided with an opportunity to submit an additional written submission regarding the conclusions that the Panel should draw from the caselaw he cited, but he declined the invitation to do so.

- 4.3.3 During the Hearing, the Claimant read out his written submission and further submitted the following:

- He realises his actions were ‘stupid’;
- If the rules said that if you get caught, you get a month's ban, then he would accept that no problem, but it seems that the Panel has the power to decide;
- He believes that if he is banned, it's going to send out the message that he is a cheat, and he is not a cheat;
- He is a long time member and friend of Cycling Ireland;
- He is a proud member of his club and also of Cycling Ireland;
- He would never wish to disrespect his club or Cycling Ireland.

4.3.4 Following, and in response to, questioning from the Panel, the Respondent made the following additional submissions:

- People are waiting for the ISADDP's decision to decide whether to consider the Respondent a cheat. If he is banned, people will understand that ban to have been imposed because he was cheating;
- He understands that Cycling Ireland's reputation is at stake, but his own reputation and livelihood is also at stake. He has to put his life back together again because the last month has been crazy;
- The Respondent realises it is his fault, but thinks that a month's sleepless nights is a lot of punishment;
- If he was banned, he thinks it would be awkward for customers to come into his family's bike shop, which he runs. He doesn't think people would like to shop with someone who has cheated in a race, so he believes it would affect the business;
- He believes people don't differentiate between banned substances, once someone is banned they are always regarded as a cheat;
- With regard to information and education he received, he indicated that he had access to the Cycling Ireland website and to the Cycling Ireland Handbook, but he had not looked up anti-doping on Cycling Ireland's website prior to this matter;
- He had never researched how long cannabis would stay in his system prior to this matter. He honestly believed that, like wine, the effects would wear off, and he presumed that it would then be out of his system, with no harm.

5. PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Jurisdiction of the Panel

5.1 The general jurisdiction of the ISADDP, and the specific jurisdiction of the Panel, which arises from the Respondent's membership of Cycling Ireland and which is provided for in the Irish Anti-Doping Rules, is not in dispute.

Admissibility of the Parties' Submissions

5.2 The Claimant filed its written submission one day after the prescribed time limit. Having invited the Parties to communicate their respective positions regarding the admissibility of the Claimant's submission, the Panel considered the Respondent's objection to the admissibility of the Claimant's submission. On 26 May 2012, pursuant to Article 8.6.8 of

the Rules, and having considered all the relevant circumstances, including, *inter alia*, the Respondent's admission to the anti-doping rule infraction and the essentially sanction-specific nature of the Claimant's submission, the Panel decided to admit the Claimant's submission to the file.

- 5.3 In order to avoid procedural unfairness to the Respondent, the Panel also decided to extend the time limit for the Respondent to file its submission until 1 June 2012.
- 5.4 The submission of the Respondent was filed in a timely manner and was admitted without objection.

6. SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

Introduction

- 6.1 The Panel is grateful to both Parties for their full participation in, and honest approach to, these proceedings.

Provisional Suspension

- 6.2 Article 10.7.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

10.7.3.1 If a Provisional Suspension is imposed and respected by the Athlete, then the Athlete shall receive a credit for such period of Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed.

10.7.3.2 If an Athlete voluntarily accepts a Provisional Suspension in writing and thereafter refrains from competing, the Athlete shall receive a credit for such period of voluntary Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed. A copy of the Athlete's voluntary acceptance of a Provisional Suspension shall be provided at the beginning of such period to the Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel.

10.7.3.3 No credit against a period of Ineligibility shall be given for any time period before the effective date of the Provisional Suspension or voluntary Provisional Suspension.

- 6.3 The undisputed evidence before the Panel is that the Respondent voluntarily accepted a provisional suspension on 4 May 2012.

Breach of Irish Anti-Doping Rules

- 6.4 Article 2 of the Rules provides as follows:

Each of the acts or omissions set out in Articles 2.1 to 2.8 below shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation under these Rules:

2.1.1 It is each Athlete's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. An Athlete is responsible for any Prohibited Substance or any of its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in his or her Sample. Accordingly, it is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use on the Athlete's part be demonstrated in order to establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1; nor is the Athlete's lack of intent, fault, negligence or knowledge a valid defence to an allegation that an anti-doping rule violation has been committed under Article 2.1.

2.1.2 Proof of either of the following is sufficient to establish an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 to the standard required by Article 8.4.1.

2.1.2.1 The presence of a Prohibited Substance or any of its Metabolites or Markers in the Athlete's A Sample, where the Athlete waives analysis of his or her B Sample and the B Sample is not analysed;

6.5 In light of above provisions and in light of the agreed facts of the present case and the evidence that is before the Panel, the Panel concludes that the Respondent committed an anti-doping rule violation, pursuant to Article 2 of the Rules.

Appropriate Sanction

6.6 Article 10.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

The period of Ineligibility imposed for a first violation of Article 2.1, Article 2.2 or Article 2.6 shall be two (2) years' Ineligibility, unless the conditions for eliminating or reducing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Articles 10.3 and 10.4, or the conditions for increasing the period of Ineligibility, as provided in Article 10.5, are met.

6.7 Article 10.3.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

10.3.1 Where a Participant can establish how a Specified Substance entered his or her body or came into his or her Possession and that such Specified Substance was not intended to enhance the Athlete's sport performance or mask the Use of a performance-enhancing substance, the period of Ineligibility found in Article 10.1 shall be replaced with, at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years.

6.8 In the present case, the Panel finds that the Respondent did establish how a Specified Substance entered his body and did establish that such Specified Substance was not intended to enhance his sport performance or mask the use of a performance-enhancing substance. Therefore, the Panel concludes that according to Article 10.3.1 of the Rules, the appropriate sanction to be imposed upon the Respondent is "*at a minimum, a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years*".

6.9 Article 10.3.2 of the Rules provides as follows:

10.3.2 To justify any elimination or reduction, the Participant must produce corroborating evidence in addition to his or her word which establishes to the comfortable satisfaction of the hearing panel the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or mask the Use of a performance enhancing substance. The Participant's degree of fault shall be the criterion considered in assessing any reduction of the period of Ineligibility.

- 6.10 Having considered the academic paper by Michel Riemersma that was submitted by the Respondent in support of his case (*High on sport: the ethically unjustified inclusion of cannabis on the anti-doping list*), the Panel concluded that the Respondent did produce corroborating evidence in addition to his word which established the absence of an intent to enhance sport performance or mask the use of a performance enhancing substance, to the comfortable satisfaction of the Panel. The Panel was comforted in its conclusion by the submission of the Claimant that it accepted the Respondent's contention that he had no intent to enhance his sport performance or mask the use of a performance enhancing substance.
- 6.11 The Panel has carefully considered all the Parties' submissions and all relevant aspects of the present case. The Panel found the Respondent's oral evidence to be particularly compelling. After lengthy deliberation, the Panel has concluded that a seven-week period of ineligibility constitutes an appropriate sanction in the present case.
- 6.12 Therefore, the Panel rules as follows:
- (i) pursuant to Article 9.1 of the Rules, the Respondent's results in the 2012 edition of [...] are disqualified;
 - (ii) pursuant to Article 9.3 of the Rules, any results obtained by the Respondent between [...] 2012 and [...] 2012 are disqualified;
 - (iii) pursuant to Article 10.3.1 of the Rules, the Respondent shall be deemed ineligible for a period of seven weeks.
- 6.13 As the length of the Respondent's suspension has already exceeded seven weeks (by four days), the Panel rules that no further period of ineligibility shall be served by the Respondent. The Respondent is therefore free to recover his Cycling Ireland membership card, and to recommence competition, with immediate effect.

7. COSTS

Costs of the Proceedings

- 7.1 Article 8.2.2 of the Rules provides as follows:

8.2.2 The Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel has all powers necessary for, and incidental to, the exercise of its functions except that the Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel shall not have the power to award costs save where:

8.2.2.1 the Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel has decided that a Participant did not commit the alleged anti-doping rule violation; and

8.2.2.2 the Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel considers it appropriate to award some or all of his or her costs to the Participant, having considered all the circumstances of the case.

7.2 Due to the absence in the present case of the conditions set out in Articles 8.2.2.1 and 8.2.2.2, the Panel makes no order as to costs.

ON THESE GROUNDS

The Irish Sport Anti-Doping Disciplinary Panel rules that:

1. Mr IS-1534 committed a breach of Article 2.1 of the Irish Anti-Doping Rules. However, his breach was inadvertent and it was not intended to, nor did it, provide him with an unfair advantage during the 2012 [...].
2. Any results obtained by Mr IS-1534 in the 2012 [...], or during the period between [...] 2012 and [...] 2012, are disqualified.
3. Having already served a period of ineligibility of seven weeks, Mr IS-1534 is free to recover his Cycling Ireland membership card, and to recommence competition, with immediate effect.
4. All other prayers for relief are dismissed.

Seat: Dublin

Date: 27 June 2012

THE IRISH SPORT ANTI-DOPING DISCIPLINARY PANEL



Mr David Casserly
Chairperson