

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

IOC DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

DECISION

**REGARDING ANDREY DEMANOV
BORN ON 15 JULY 1985, RUSSIAN FEDERATION, ATHLETE, WEIGHTLIFTING**

(Rule 59.2.1 of the Olympic Charter)

Pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012 (the “**Rules**”) and, in particular, Articles 1, 2, 6.3.3, 7 and 8 thereof:

I. FACTS

1. Andrey DEMANOV (hereinafter the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012 (the “**2012 Olympic Games**”).
2. On 4 August 2012, the Athlete competed in the Men’s 94 kg weightlifting event in which he ranked 4th and for which he was awarded a diploma.
3. On the same day, the Athlete was requested to provide a urine sample for a doping control (in competition). Such sample was identified with the number 2721771.
4. The A-Sample 2721771 was analysed during the 2012 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in London. Such analysis did not result in an adverse analytical finding at that time.
5. After the conclusion of the 2012 Olympic Games, all the samples collected upon the occasion of the 2012 Olympic Games were transferred to the WADA-accredited “Laboratoire suisse d’analyse du dopage” in Lausanne, Switzerland (“the **Laboratory**”) for long-term storage.
6. The IOC decided to perform further analyses on samples collected during the 2012 Olympic Games. These additional analyses were notably performed with improved analytical methods in order to possibly detect Prohibited Substances which could not be identified by the analysis performed at the time of the 2012 Olympic Games.
7. The IOC decided that the reanalysis process would be conducted as a regular A and B sample analysis, without resorting to a splitting of the B-sample.
8. The remains of the A-Sample were analysed by the Laboratory and resulted in an Adverse Analytical Finding (“**AAF**”) as it showed the presence of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance: dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol).
9. The results were reported to the IOC in accordance with Art. 6.2.1 of the Rules.
10. Further to the verifications set forth in Art. 6.2.2 of the Rules and in application of Art. 6.2.3 of the Rules, the IOC President, Mr Thomas Bach, was informed of the existence of the AAF and the essential details available concerning the case.

11. Pursuant to Art. 7.2.4 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
 - Mr Denis Oswald (Chairman, Switzerland), who is a member of the IOC Legal Affairs Commission;
 - Mrs Gunilla Lindberg (Sweden)
 - Mr Ugur Erdener (Turkey)
12. On 19 July 2016, the IOC notified the Athlete, through his NOC, of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. The IOC also informed the Athlete of his right to request the opening and analysis of the B-Sample and to attend this process, either in person and/or through a representative, which was scheduled to take place between 2 and 9 August 2016. The Athlete was also informed of his right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
13. In the same correspondence, the Athlete was advised that in the event the opening and analysis of the B-Sample were not requested, he might be deemed having waived of his right to have the B-Sample analysed.
14. The Athlete did not reply.
15. On 28 July 2016, the Athlete through his NOC was invited once again to indicate whether he would attend the opening and analysis of his B-Sample. The Athlete was advised that in the absence of an answer, the IOC might decide to conduct the process in any event in the presence of an independent witness.
16. On the same day, the NOC was required by the IOC to collaborate and to take further actions with the National Federation concerned in order to effectively communicate the communications to the Athlete.
17. The Athlete and the NOC did not reply.
18. On 8 August 2016, the IOC granted the Athlete an additional deadline until 10 August 2016 to indicate whether he accepted the AAF, whether he would attend the opening and analysis of the B-Sample, either personally and/or through a representative, and whether he requested a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
19. In the same communication, the IOC advised the Athlete that in accordance with Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules, notice to an athlete might be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC and that therefore the previous correspondences were deemed notified to him. The Athlete was further advised that in the event he did not respond, the IOC might elect not to proceed with the analysis of the B-Sample and to proceed directly to the procedure before the Disciplinary Commission based on the A-Sample analysis results only.
20. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were requested by the IOC to provide the full contact information of the Athlete. The IOC reminded the NOC of the content of Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules.
21. Neither the Athlete nor the NOC replied.
22. On 9 August 2016, the IF provided the IOC with the Athlete's email address registered in ADAMS.
23. On 10 August 2016, the Athlete directly and through his NOC was reminded once again of the content of the letter dated 8 August 2016. The IOC reminded the Athlete once again

that the disciplinary proceedings might be conducted on the A-Sample analysis results only.

24. The Athlete did not reply.
25. On 12 August 2016, the Athlete was reminded of the content of Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules and he was informed that the IOC had elected not to proceed to the opening and analysis of the B-Sample. The Athlete was advised of the possibility to present his defence in writing and/or to attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission.
26. The Athlete did not reply.
27. On 26 September 2016, the IOC invited once again the Athlete to indicate whether he would attend the hearing of the Disciplinary Commission and/or present his defence in writing. The Athlete was advised that the disciplinary proceedings would be conducted even if no reply was given to this correspondence and that in this case, the Disciplinary Commission would issue a decision on the basis of the file.
28. The Athlete did not reply.
29. On 11 October 2016, the Athlete was reminded once again of the content of Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules. The IOC informed the Athlete that the Disciplinary Commission would issue a decision on the basis of the file. The Athlete was invited to submit a written defence by 21 October 2016.
30. On the same day, the NOC and the IF were invited to submit written observations by 21 October 2016.
31. Neither the Athlete, nor the NOC and the IF replied.

II. **APPLICABLE RULES**

32. Art. 1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Application of the Code – Definition of Doping – Breach of the Rules

- 1.1 *The commission of an anti-doping rule violation is a breach of these Rules.*
- 1.2 *Subject to the specific following provisions of the Rules below, the provisions of the Code and of the International Standards apply mutatis mutandis in relation to the London Olympic Games.”*

33. Art. 2 of the Rules provides that Article 2 of the Code applies to determine anti-doping rule violations.
34. Art. 2.1 of the Code provides that the following constitutes an anti-doping rule violation:

“Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete’s Sample.

- 2.1.1 *It is each Athlete’s personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. Athletes are responsible for any Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found to be present in their Samples. 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 violation under Article 2.1.*

- 2.1.2 *Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is established by either of the following: presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in the Athlete's A Sample where the Athlete waives analysis of the B Sample and the B Sample is not analysed; or, where the Athlete's B Sample is analysed and the analysis of the Athlete's B Sample confirms the presence of the Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers found in the Athlete's A Sample.*
- 2.1.3 *Excepting those substances for which a quantitative threshold is specifically identified in the Prohibited List, the presence of any quantity of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample shall constitute an anti-doping rule violation.*
- 2.1.4 *As an exception to the general rule of Article 2.1, the Prohibited List or International Standards may establish special criteria for the evaluation of Prohibited Substances that can also be produced endogenously."*
35. Art. 2.2 of the Code provides the following constitutes an anti-doping rule violation:
- "Use or Attempted Use by an Athlete of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.*
- 2.2.1 *It is each Athlete's personal duty to ensure that no Prohibited Substance enters his or her body. 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 for Use of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method.*
- 2.2.2 *The success or failure of the Use or Attempted Use of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method is not material. It is sufficient that the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method was Used or Attempted to be Used for an anti-doping rule violation to be committed."*
36. Art. 6.2.6 of the Rules provides as follows:
- "The IOC President or a person designated by him shall promptly notify the Athlete or other Person concerned, the Athlete's or other Person's chef de mission, the International Federation concerned and a representative of the Independent Observer Program of:*
- a) *The adverse analytical finding;*
 - b) *The Athlete's right to request the analysis of the B sample or, failing such request, that the B sample may be deemed waived;*
 - c) *the scheduled date, time and place for the B Sample analysis if the Athlete chooses to request an analysis of the B Sample or if the IOC chooses to have the B sample analysed;*
 - d) *the right of the Athlete and/or the Athlete's representative to attend the B sample opening and analysis if such analysis is requested;*
 - e) *the Athlete's right to request copies of the A and B sample laboratory package, which includes information as required by the International Standard for Laboratories;*
 - f) *the anti-doping rule violation or, where applicable, instead of the information in (a) to e), the factual basis of the other anti-doping rule violation(s), and if applicable, the additional investigation that will be conducted as to whether there is an anti-doping rule violation;*
 - g) *the composition of the Disciplinary Commission.*

It shall be the responsibility of the chef de mission to inform the relevant National Anti-Doping Organisation of the Athlete.”

37. Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“Notice to an Athlete or other Person who has been accredited pursuant to the request of the NOC, may be accomplished by delivery of the notice to the NOC. Notification to the Chef de Mission or the President or the Secretary General of the NOC of the Athlete or other Person shall be deemed to be delivery of notice to the NOC.”

38. Art. 7.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“A violation of these Rules in Individual Sports in connection with Doping Control automatically leads to Disqualification of the Athlete’s results in the Competition in question, with all other consequences, including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.”

39. Art. 8.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“An anti-doping rule violation occurring or in connection with the London Olympic Games may lead to Disqualification of all the Athlete’s results obtained in the London Olympic Games with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 8.1.1.”

40. Art. 8.1.1 of the Rules provides as follows:

“If the Athlete establishes that he or she bears No Fault or Negligence for the violation, the Athlete’s results in the Competitions (for which the Athlete’s results have not been automatically Disqualified as per Article 7.1 hereof) shall not be Disqualified unless the Athlete’s results in Competitions other than the Competition in which the anti-doping rule violation occurred were likely to have been affected by the Athlete’s anti-doping rule violation.”

41. Art. 8.3 of the Rules provides as follows:

“The Consequences of Anti-Doping Rule Violations and the conduct of additional hearings as a consequence of hearings and decisions of the IOC, including with regard to the imposition of sanctions over and above those relating to the London Olympic Games, shall be managed by the relevant International Federation.”

III. DISCUSSION

42. The results of the analysis of the sample provided by the Athlete establish the presence in his sample of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, i.e. dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol).
43. The substance detected is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2012 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists under S1.
44. The Disciplinary Commission notes that the Athlete has been notified of the AAF and all subsequent communications, which were addressed to him through his NOC.
45. In accordance with Art. 6.3.3 of the Rules, this implies that notification to the Athlete is deemed to have been accomplished for all communications notified to the NOC.

46. This applies in particular to the notification of the question regarding the exercise of the right of the Athlete to request the analysis of the B-Sample. Such question was duly included in the AAF notification letter.
47. Further, notifications have also been made to an email address, which was identified by the IF as the Athlete's address. The Athlete however never responded to any mail communication.
48. The Athlete, having been duly notified, did not request the analysis of the B-Sample. Such may be deemed waived pursuant to Art. 6.2.6 lit b of the Rules.
49. Since the IOC decided not to conduct the B-Sample analysis, the analytical results are in this case solely based on the results of the A-sample.
50. Such results establish the presence of metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, i.e. dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol) in the sample, which the Athlete provided upon the occasion of the 2012 Olympic Games.
51. Based on the above results, the Disciplinary Commission finds that the Athlete has committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Code consisting in the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his bodily sample.
52. Pursuant to Art. 2.1.2 of the Code, "*Sufficient proof of an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 is indeed established by the following: presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in the Athlete's A Sample where the Athlete waives the analysis of the B Sample and the B Sample is not analysed.*"
53. In addition, the Disciplinary Commission observes that the circumstances appear to also support a finding of an anti-doping rule violation based on art. 2.2 of the Code.
54. The fact that a doping substance which is a "classical" doping substance broadly used at the time of the analysis supports this consideration.
55. There is indeed a simple and straightforward explanation for the fact that dehydrochlormethyltestosterone (turinabol) was found in the Athlete's sample, i.e. its use as doping agent for the purpose of performance enhancement.
56. The consequences of an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the Rules are limited to consequences in connection with the 2012 Olympic Games.
57. In application of Art. 7.1 and/or Art. 8.1 of the Rules, the results achieved by the Athlete during the 2012 Olympic Games shall be annulled, with all resulting consequences (notably withdrawal of medal, diploma, pin etc.).
58. In application of Art. 8.3 of the Rules, the further management of the consequences of the anti-doping rule violations and in particular the imposition of sanctions over and above those related to the 2012 Olympic Games shall be conducted by the International Weightlifting Federation ("**IWF**").

* * * * *

CONSIDERING the above, pursuant to the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad in London in 2012 and, in particular, Articles 1, 2, 6.3.3, 7 and 8 thereof

THE DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE
DECIDES

- I. The Athlete, Andrey DEMANOV:
 - (i) is found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to the IOC Anti-Doping Rules applicable to the Games of the XXX Olympiad in London in 2012 (presence, and/or use, of Prohibited Substances or its Metabolites or Markers in an athlete's bodily specimen),
 - (ii) is disqualified from the event in which he participated upon the occasion of the Olympic Games London 2012, namely the Men's 94 kg weightlifting event, in which he ranked 4th and for which he was awarded a diploma,
 - (iii) has the diploma obtained in the Men's 94 kg weightlifting event withdrawn and is ordered to return the same.
- II. The IWF is requested to modify the results of the above-mentioned event accordingly and to consider any further action within its own competence.
- III. The Russian Olympic Committee shall ensure full implementation of this decision.
- IV. The Russian Olympic Committee shall notably secure the return to the IOC, as soon as possible, of the diploma awarded in connection with the Men's 94 kg weightlifting event to the Athlete.
- V. This decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 10 November 2016

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission



Ugur Erdener



Denis Oswald, Chairman



Gunilla Lindberg