

SAIDS

IN THE MATTER OF EDWARD SCHMIDT

Committee	Adv. J Lubbe SC Dr N Theron Miss W Fourie
Athlete	Edward Schmidt
Assisted by	Sonny Schmidt (Father)
Prosecutor	Adv N de Kock

[1] Introduction

Edward Schmidt (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).

On 08 September 2012 the athlete provided a urine sample (2725310) during an in-competition test. The said sample was analysed by the SA Doping Control Laboratory at the Free State University. In a report dated 21 September 2012 of the A sample, the presence of a prohibited substances was recorded and identified as Stanozolol and its metabolites as well as a metabolite of cannabis. Stanozolol is categorised under Class S1 Anabolic Agents in specific 1(a) Exogenous Anabolic Androgenic Steroids while cannabis is categorised under Class S8 on the World Anti-Doping Code 2012 Prohibited List International Standard. The Athlete, assisted by his father, indicated on 12 October 2012 that it was not necessary to analyse the "B" sample.

[2] Plea

The athlete pleaded guilty.

[3] The athlete testified and his father also handed in a written explanation of when and how the prohibited substances entered his body. The athlete is an eighteen year old learner at Grey College Bloemfontein. He has just finished his matric exams and is planning to further his studies at Free State University. He had a contract with Free State Cheetahs for 2013 but lost the contract after testing positive.

[4] The athlete explained that he is a regular social user of cannabis. It was pointed out to the athlete that the concentration of 225ng/ml was indicative of a regular user and he conceded that. With regard to the use of the steroid, he testified that he bought the pills, also known as

“Winstrol” for R250.00 from a fellow learner at Grey College Bloemfontein. He testified that it was readily available together with other substances called “Anabols” and “Debols”. He researched the pills on the internet and was fully aware that he was taking a prohibited substance. According to the information on the internet he would test negative after six months. As he thought the rugby season for him was over and his next game would only be in July 2013 he decided to use the pills to build muscles during the off season. Unfortunately for him he was called up for the last match of the season and he was selected for testing. He did not disclose on the Doping Control Form that he took the prohibited pills. He further testified that he was not aware that he could be tested out of competition. No anti-doping information was given to him at his school but he was fully aware that as rugby player he may not make use of any prohibited substances including cannabis.

[5] The athlete took an informed decision to use steroids and is a regular user of cannabis. The panel gave serious consideration to a possible increase of sanction due to the fact that the athlete used more than one prohibited substance. Due to his age and the fact that he had limited education on the dangers and use of prohibited substances and that he had no intention to enhance his performance, the panel decided not to increase the sanction.

[6] Conclusion

For the reasons set out above:

- 7.1 An anti-doping rule violation in terms of Article 2, 1 has been established.
- 7.2 The athlete shall be subjected to a period of ineligibility of two (2) years from all sport calculated from 1 October 2012 up to and including 30 September 2014.

J Lubbe SC

For and on behalf of the Committee