

**Reasons for Decision of the
National Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee**

Anti-Doping Singapore
vs
SG-4547 , **Bodybuilding**

Reasons for the Decision issued on 6th August 2012
in respect of **SG-4547**

1. Mr **SG-4547** ("the Athlete") is a 21-year old bodybuilding athlete from Singapore.
2. On [...] 2012, the Athlete participated in the [...] [...] This event was sanctioned and organised by the Singapore Bodybuilding and Fitness Federation ("SBBF"), the National Sports Association for the sport of Bodybuilding in Singapore.
3. Anti-Doping Singapore ("ADS"), the National Anti-Doping Organisation for Singapore, conducted In-Competition doping control tests at this event.
4. The Athlete, along with seven others, was selected for In-Competition doping control testing and doping control procedures were carried out according to the requirements of the World Anti-Doping Agency's ("WADA") International Standards for Testing. The Athlete's sample (Code # 2568083) was shipped by DHL Express (S) Pte Ltd the next day to the WADA-accredited laboratory, National Dope Testing Laboratory ("NDTL") in New Delhi, India for analysis.
5. The test results for the Athlete's A Sample reported by the NDTL on 17th July 2012, showed the following Prohibited Substances under the WADA 2012 Prohibited List:
 - Class S1: 3-OH-Stanozolol (Metabolite of Stanozolol)
 - Class S1: Clenbuterol
 - Class S4: Letrozole metabolite
 - Class S5: Furosemide
 - Class S5: Hydrochlorthiazide
 - Class S5: Chlorthiazide
 - Class S5: Spironolactone / Canrenone
6. On 25th July 2012, the Athlete was notified via registered mail and electronic mail of the Adverse Analytical Finding on his A Sample, and possible violation of Article 2.1 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules for the Presence of a Prohibited Substance or its Metabolites or Markers in an Athlete's Sample. The notice also informed the Athlete of his right to have his B Sample analysed to confirm the A Sample results, and to submit an approved Therapeutic Use Exemption ("TUE") or a retroactive TUE application for consideration.
7. In accordance with Article 8.3.1 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules, the matter was referred to the National Anti-Doping Disciplinary Committee ("NADC") for adjudication on 26th July 2012.

8. By the deadline of 31st July 2012, there was no response from the Athlete to the notice of Adverse Analytical Finding.
9. On 1st August 2012, the Athlete was notified via registered mail and electronic mail of the hearing on the assertion of the Anti-Doing Rule Violation, as well as the Athlete's rights to attend the hearing; respond to the asserted Anti-Doping Rule Violation and Resulting Consequences; be represented at the hearing at his own cost; present evidence; and an interpreter at the hearing. The letter also stated that the A Sample test result would be used as evidence of the Anti-Doing Rule Violation. The deadline for the Athlete to respond was 3rd August 2012.
10. By the deadline of 3rd August 2012, there was no response from the Athlete to the notice of assertion of the Anti-Doing Rule Violation.

The Panel Hearing

11. The NADC Panel hearing was duly convened on 6th August 2012 at 19:00 hours at the Singapore Sports Council Diamond Room. The Athlete did not attend the hearing. The NADC Panel confirmed that there was no expressed admission from the Athlete for the Anti-Doping Rule Violation asserted by ADS.
12. The NADC Panel's deliberations on the Athlete ended at 19:15 hours.

Decision

13. The NADC Panel ruled that the Athlete had committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation, namely Article 2.1 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules, for the Presence of Prohibited Substances or its metabolites or markers in the sample provided.
14. The NADC Panel imposed the mandatory period of two (2) years ineligibility in accordance with Article 10.2 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules. The period of ineligibility is ordered to start from 6th August 2012 in accordance with Article 10.9 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules. The written decision of the NADC Panel was issued on the same day on 6th August 2012 and sent to the Athlete on 7th August 2012.
15. In accordance with Article 10.1 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules, the NADC Panel also ruled that the Athlete shall be disqualified from the [...] [...], and all his results, medals, points and prizes shall be forfeited.

Reasons for the Decision

16. The NADC Panel was unable to establish that he bore no fault or negligence, or no significant fault or negligence with respect to the Presence of the aforesaid Prohibited Substances in his urine sample.
17. The Athlete did not adduce any TUE. As such, the NADC Panel was entitled to find he had none.
18. The presence of the combination of diuretic agents (used to increase urine output) and anabolic agents are not normally found in food or drink and for which no relevant TUE has been adduced by the Athlete, leads the NADC Panel to conclude that the presence of these Prohibited Substances had no reasonable explanation other than for doping purposes.

19. In the circumstances, the NADC Panel found no reasons for eliminating or reducing the period of ineligibility according to Article 10.5 of the ADS Anti-Doping Rules.

Recommendation

20. The NADC Panel recommends that ADS conducts regular and widespread testing of athletes from all sports. The SBBF should also be proactive in educating athletes against doping and the indiscriminate use of supplements. This is to uphold the values of fair play and for the health and well-being of athletes.

Dated

22nd August 2012



Mr Khoo Oon Soo
Chairman