

Anti-Doping Hearing Panel
of the
International Biathlon Union

Decision
in the matter of
IBU v. Mr. Eduard Latypov

The Anti-Doping Hearing Panel, according to Article 8.1.3 IBU Anti-Doping Rules, in the composition of Christoph Vedder, Professor of Law, Munich, Germany (Chair), Wolfgang Schobersberger, Professor of Sports Medicine, Innsbruck, Austria, and Markus Manninen, Attorney-at-Law, Helsinki, Finland heard the case of the IBU v. Mr. Eduard Latypov and, having duly deliberated the facts and the law, renders the following decision:

I. Statement of Facts

1

Mr. Eduard Latypov (the "Athlete"), an athlete under the jurisdiction of the Russian Biathlon Union ("RBU"), was submitted to an in-competition doping control initiated by the International Biathlon Union ("IBU") on February 14, 2016 in Osrblie, Slovakia.

2

The Athlete's A sample A 3859933 was received by the WADA accredited laboratory in Seibersdorf, Austria on the same day and analysed during the following days. The analysis revealed the presence of meldonium. The Seibersdorf laboratory informed the IBU of the Adverse Analytical Finding ("AAF") via ADAMS on March 7, 2016. The Documentation Package was sent to IBU under letter dated March 11, 2016.

3

By letter of March 8, 2016 IBU notified the RBU and the Athlete of an AAF in the form of the finding of meldonium in his A-sample. The Athlete was provisionally suspended pending the ADHP's decision.

4

By the said letter of March 8, 2016 the Athlete and the RBU were further notified of:

- the result of the analysis not being consistent with an applicable TUE
- the initial review conducted by the IBU not showing any apparent departure from the WADA International Standards for Testing and for Laboratories ("ISL")
- the initiation, by the IBU, of the result management process for a possible Anti-Doping Rule Violation ("ADRV") in the sense of Article 2.1. IBU ADR
- the right to request the analysis of the B-sample or, failing such request, that the B-sample analysis may be deemed waived
- the costs of the B-sample analysis and the opportunity of the Athlete and/or her representatives as well as representatives of the RBU to attend the B-sample analysis.

The Athlete was given the opportunity to submit a statement no later than March 22, 2016.

5

By letter dated March 18, 2016 the Athlete provided the information that he *"stopped taking the substance on November 5th, 2015 ..."*.

6

By letter of April 14, 2016, the RBU, on behalf of the Athlete, waived his right to the B-sample

analysis and, with reference to the "Notice-Meldonium" issued by WADA on April 11, 2016 requested to consider the Athlete's case "a *non-violation of the respected anti-doping rules*".

7

By letter of April 18, 2016 the IBU Secretary General referred the matter to the ADHP. By the same letter the IBU, based upon the Notice-Meldonium, requested the ADHP to lift the provisional suspension, according to Article 7.11.3.1 IBU ADR and to suspend the proceedings until the results of the study on meldonium commissioned by WADA become known.

8

On April 20, 2016, according to Article 8.1.3 IBU ADR, the particular Panel to hear the Athlete's case was established.

II. Proceedings before the Anti-Doping Hearing Panel

1. The IBU ADHP

9

According to Article 8 IBU ADR, the ADHP is the competent body to decide whether or not, in a given case, an ADRV was committed. According to Article 47 of the IBU Constitution and Article 8.2.2 IBU ADR, the decisions of the ADHP may be appealed directly to the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland.

10

Although the ADHP is part of the institutional framework of the IBU and renders, in matters of alleged ADRVs, the final decision for the IBU, it acts in complete independence. As Article 8.1.2 IBU ADR states "(e)ach panel member must be otherwise independent of the IBU". The Panel members appointed for the pending case have no prior involvement with the case.

2. The Proceedings before the Panel and the Submissions of the Parties

11

By letter of April 20, 2016 the Panel invited the Athlete and the RBU to submit a statement on IBU's requests no later than April 29, 2016

12

In reply, under letter of April 28, 2016, the Athlete submitted a statement which was already made on March 23, 2016. The Athlete explained that he

"was taking Kardionat (Meldonium) in accordance with the recommendation of a therapist since October 14, 2015" upon the diagnosis of "myocardial degeneration due to physical stress (DMFP) 1-2 degree. Defatigation".

He further declared:

"On November 5th, 2015 upon receiving the information from the Team doctor on prohibition of Meldonium from January 1st, 2016 I immediately stopped taking the abovementioned medication. I took no medication containing meldonium since November 5th, 2015."

RBU and the Athlete further contended that

"the content of Meldonium in his A-sample is many times lower than the minimum tolerable amount stipulated by WADA which clearly supports the point described in his statement, and proves him innocent."

13

On May 2, 2016 the ADHP issued the following order:

- "1. *The Athlete's provisional suspension imposed by IBU according to Article 7.11.1.IBU ADR 2014 by letter of March 8, 2016 is lifted with immediate effect.*
2. *The proceedings are suspended until the results of the scientific study initiated by WADA are available. After the communication of the study the parties will be granted the opportunity to submit statements. Because the time-limit for the Athlete to submit a statement in defense has elapsed on March 22, 2016 no further factual evidence is permitted.*
3. *The Panel will decide whether a hearing is deemed appropriate.*
4. *The Panel reserves the right to issue a new order if appropriate."*

14

After WADA, on June 30, 2016, had released a second Notice on Meldonium, on July 11, 2016 the IBU, in the light of the new Notice, filed a submission. IBU noted that the Notice took into account recently received results from studies on the urinary excretion of meldonium and provides updated guidance for cases where athletes claim that the substance was taken before January 1, 2016. Taking into consideration the alleged period of administration of meldonium, the date of the sample collection and the concentration found in the Athlete's sample the WADA Notice would suggest that the ADRV was committed with no fault. Based on that recommendation the IBU requested *"to issue an award based on the written evidence ... "* IBU's prayers for relief are:

- "1. *to find Mr. Latypov guilty of an anti-doping rule violation (presence of a prohibited substance, Art. 2.1 ADR);*
2. *because of no fault (Art. 10.4 ADR), no period of ineligibility shall be imposed.*
3. *to annul the results of Mr. Latypov at the event of Osrbli/SVK on 14 February 2016 (Art. 10.1 ADR). "*

15

Having considered the situation after the issuance of the new WADA Notice the ADHP, by order of July 27, 2016, granted the Athlete and the RBU the opportunity to respond, no later than August 10, 2016, to IBU's submission and to declare whether they wanted to have a hearing. Furthermore, the panel stated that the order dated May 2nd, 2016 was upheld until further decision. No reply was received within the time limit set.

16

As the Panel already had informed the parties in its order dated July 27, 2016, the Panel was of the view that the dispute can be decided upon the written evidence and material before it and, therefore, the Panel decided not to hold a hearing.

III. In Law

17

The Panel considered the facts and the law as discussed in the written proceedings.

1. Applicable Law

18

The Athlete who is an athlete under the jurisdiction of the RBU is bound by the IBU ADR which, according to their introductory "Scope"

"apply to the IBU and each of its member federations. They also apply to the following athletes ... each of whom is deemed, as a condition of his/her membership, accreditation and/or participation in the sport, to have agreed to be bound by these AntiDoping Rules, and to have submitted to the authority of the IBU to enforce these AntiDoping Rules and to the jurisdiction of the hearing panels specified in Article 8 and Article 13 to hear and determine cases and appeals under these Anti-Doping Rules..."

Therefore, the IBU ADR are the law applicable to the dispute before the Panel.

19

The law applicable consists of the rules applicable at the time when the alleged ADRV was committed, i.e. on February 14, 2016. Hence, the IBU ADR 2014 as in force as of January 1, 2015 apply. They include the WADA Prohibited List which is in force at the date of the alleged ADRV, i.e. on February 14, 2016, which is the 2016 WADA Prohibited List.

2. Anti-Doping Rule Violation: presence of a prohibited substance

20

By virtue of Article 1 IBU ADR, doping is defined as the occurrence of one or more of the ADRVs set forth in Article 2 IBU ADR.

21

According to Article 2.1 IBU ADR,

"the presence of a prohibited substance or its metabolites or markers in an Athlete's sample"

constitutes an ADRV. The prohibited substances are listed in the WADA Prohibited List which, according to Article 4.1 IBU ADR, is incorporated into the IBU ADR.

22

The 2016 WADA Prohibited List, which applied at the time of the sample collection, lists "Meldonium" under S4 par. 5.3 "Hormone and Metabolic Modulators".

23

The analysis of the Athlete's A-samples performed by the Seibersdorf laboratory after February 14, 2016 shows the presence of meldonium. This analysis was conducted in conformity with the ISL.

24

In a situation where the Athlete waived the analysis of the B-sample the finding of a prohibited substance in the Athlete's A-sample, according to Article 2.1.2 IBU ADR, establishes sufficient proof of an ADRV.

25

Based upon the laboratory's documentation the IBU has discharged its burden of demonstrating the presence of a prohibited substance *"to the comfortable satisfaction"* of the Panel, according to Article 3.1 IBU ADR. According to Article 3.2.2 IBU ADR, WADA accredited laboratories are presumed to have conducted the sample analysis in accordance with the ISL. The initial review in the course of the results management conducted by the IBU did not reveal any departure from the ISL. No TUE was present.

26

The Athlete, in his statement dated March 23, 2016 which was submitted on April 28, 2016 did not challenge the finding of meldonium nor did he claim that a departure from the ISL occurred which reasonably could have caused the AAF actually detected.

27

Therefore, the presence of meldonium, which is a prohibited substance listed under S4 par. 5.3 of the 2016 WADA Prohibited List, in the Athlete's A-sample has been proven. According to Article 2.1.1 IBU ADR no intent, fault, negligence, or knowing use is required in order to constitute an ADRV. Therefore, the elements of an ADRV under Article 2.1 IBU ADR are met.

28

By virtue of the 2016 WADA Prohibited List, the presence of meldonium is prohibited by law from the first day of the effectiveness of the new list, i.e. January 1, 2016. The applicable rules do not explicitly or implicitly provide for a transitional period after January 1, 2016 for the ongoing effects of the administration of substances which were not on the list prior to the end of 2015. Furthermore, following the information issued by WADA on September 29, 2015 the athletes were informed about the inclusion of meldonium into the List.

29

Although the Athlete claims to have followed the rules and considers himself "*innocent*" he admitted to have taken Kardionat which contains meldonium. The WADA Meldonium Notice of June 30, 2016 starts out from the fact that the finding of meldonium after January 1, 2016 constitutes an ADRV.

30

Based on the foregoing the Panel concludes that the mere presence of meldonium found in the Athlete's A-sample collected on February 14, 2016 constitutes an ADRV in the sense of Article 2.1 IBU ADR in conjunction with the 2016 Prohibited List. The time of the administration of meldonium is irrelevant in this respect.

2. Determination of the Sanction

a. Regular sanction

31

For a first ADRV in the form of the presence of a non-specific prohibited substance Article 10.2.1 in conjunction with Article 10.2.1.1 IBU ADR provides for a regular sanction of a four-years period of ineligibility "*unless the athlete ... can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.*" Then the sanction would be a two-years ineligibility. The doping offence under consideration is the Athlete's first ADRV.

32

The issue of intent was not raised by the Parties. Moreover, the Panel will not proceed to examine the matter as the question of whether a four-years or a two-years period of ineligibility applies is moot because, of what will be determined below in relation to "no fault", the ineligibility period to be imposed upon the Athlete will be eliminated irrespective of its original length.

b. Elimination or Reduction of the Sanction for no fault or negligence

33

According to Article 10.2 IBU ADR the regular period of ineligibility to be imposed for an ADRV under Article 2.1 IBU ADR is "*subject to potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Art. 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6.*"

34

If an athlete establishes by a balance of probability, as required by Article 3.1 IBU ADR, that, due to exceptional circumstances, he or she bears no fault or negligence Article 10.2 in conjunction with Article 10.4 IBU ADR allows to eliminate the period of ineligibility otherwise applicable. Although the Athlete did not specifically claim that he bears no fault or negligence the Panel, against the background of the Meldonium Notice of June 30, 2016 and in fairness

to the Athlete, applies Article 10.4 IBU ADR in the present dispute.

35

According to the definition of "No fault or negligence" in Appendix 1 to the IBU ADR it is required that the athlete establishes "*how the prohibited substance entered his or her body*". The Athlete identified Kardionat as the substance which contained the prohibited substance and explained how the substance entered his body. Therefore, the first requirement of Article 10.4 IBU ADR is met.

36

The Athlete claims that the finding of meldonium in his sample collected on February 14, 2016 is the consequence of the administration of Kardionat, following the recommendation by a therapist, from October 14 until November 5, 2015, i.e. at a time when meldonium was not yet forbidden by the 2016 WADA Prohibited List. This defence contends that, first, traces of meldonium taken prior to November 5, 2015 still remained in his body on February 14, 2016 and, second, he actually stopped the administration of Kardionat because meldonium was included in the 2016 WADA Prohibited List from January 1, 2016.

37

An assumption that substances can be taken "legally" until the entry into force of the Prohibited List which lists them would not find any ground in the applicable anti-doping rules. The fact that a substance is not listed is not to be understood as a kind of silent positive list which allows its administration until the new list comes into effect notwithstanding the ongoing effects of the administration. Instead, the ADRV is constituted by the mere presence, i.e. the possible effects, of a substance in the athlete's body.

38

When the many AAFs for meldonium occurred in early 2016 the athletes generally claimed that they stopped the use of that substance before January 1, 2016 and that, according to the information available at that time, meldonium would be excreted within hours or in a few days time at the latest. The explanation delivered by most athletes was that, against that expectation, small detectable dosages of meldonium would remain longer in the athletes' system. Therefore, WADA commissioned studies on the urinary excretion of meldonium which are still underway. However, for the time being WADA issued two Notices on Meldonium to assist the federations in the handling of meldonium cases.

39

The second and presently applicable Notice, dated June 30, 2016, was issued when WADA received the results from some urinary excretion studies. With this Notice WADA intends to "*provide(...) guidance regarding the Results Management and Adjudication process to be followed ... for cases where athletes claim that the substance was taken before 1 January 2016.*" WADA denotes "*this guidance (to) be helpful to all anti-doping organisations that are managing meldonium cases.*"

40

Although the Notice has no legally binding effect as such the Panel understands it as an interpretation of the applicable rules adopted with the authority of the WADA to clarify its rules which must be taken into consideration as "*guidance*" when adjudicating a meldonium case. The wording of Article 10.4 IBU ADR does not provide any positive indication of what is meant by "*no fault or negligence*". The Comment attached to Article 10.4 IBU ADR names one positive example and rules out three other situations. The only useful clarification given by the Comment is that there must be "*exceptional circumstances*". In such situation of a complete openness of a rule WADA has the inherent authority to provide clarification for the uniform application of a given rule.

41

In fairness to the Athlete and for the sake of legal certainty as well as equal treatment of the athletes concerned the Panel comes to the view that the Notice on Meldonium issued by

WADA on June 30, 2016 should apply to the case before it. IBU as the competent anti-doping organisation relied its prayers for relief on the Notice while its application is obviously beneficial to the Athlete. IBU complies with the WADA Code when it follows the "guidance" recommended by the WADA itself.

42

According to the Notice, the legal consequences of the finding of meldonium differ following the time of the sample collection and the concentration of meldonium found. The Athlete's sample was collected on February 14, 2016 and the analysis revealed a concentration of 0,2 microgram/ml which is less than 5 microgram/ml. For such situation the Notice in its first table provides:

"In the absence of other evidence of use on or after 1 January 2016, a finding of no fault may be made."

As there is no evidence that the Athlete administered Kardionat on or after January 1, 2016 the panel accepts that the Athlete bears no fault and, therefore, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility of four years will be eliminated according to Article 10.4 IBU ADR.

43

Since the value of the specific gravity of the Athlete's sample was 1.009 no correction of the concentration of meldonium measured on his sample would be in favour of the Athlete and is, hence, not necessary. Therefore, the specific gravity requirement included at the end of the Meldonium Notice is respected.

3. Disqualification of results

44

As the Athlete underwent an in-competition doping control, according to Article 9 IBU ADR, the result obtained by him in that competition, if any, is automatically disqualified with all resulting consequences such as forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes.

45

According to Article 10.8 IBU ADR which applies in- and out-of-competition

"all ... competitive results obtained from the date a positive sample was collected ..., through the commencement of any provisional suspension ..., shall, unless fairness requires otherwise, be disqualified"

Therefore, all competitive results the Athlete may have obtained from February 14 through March 8, 2016 shall be disqualified with all resulting consequences including forfeiture of any medals, points and prizes. Since the Athlete admitted to have used Kardionat after 29 September 2015 this conclusion is in line with the Notice which, for the Athlete's circumstances, provides:

"In the absence of other evidence of use after 29 September 2015, no disqualification of results."

IV. Conclusions

46

The Athlete committed an ADRV in the form of the presence of a prohibited substance, according to Article 2.1 IBU ADR.

45

Due to exceptional circumstances concerning the uncertainties with regard to the urinary excretion time of meldonium which gave rise to the Notice on Meldonium issued by WADA on June 30, 2016, the Panel, in application of that Notice, finds that the Athlete bears no

fault. Therefore, the period of ineligibility otherwise applicable will be eliminated.

46

All competitive results obtained by the Athlete, if any, from February 14 through March 8, 2016 are disqualified. All medals, points, and prizes are forfeited.

V. Decision

On these grounds the Panel decides:

1. Mr. Eduard Latypov is found guilty of an anti-doping rule violation in the form of the presence of a prohibited substance, according to Article 2.1 IBU ADR.
2. Since Mr. Eduard Latypov bears no fault the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility is eliminated, according to Article 10.4 IBU ADR.
3. All competitive results obtained by Mr. Eduard Latypov, if any, from February 14 through March 8, 2016 are disqualified with all resulting consequences for medals, points and prizes.

The Anti-Doping Hearing Panel

September 7, 2016




Christoph Vedder

Chairman of the Panel



Wolfgang Schobersberger
Member of the Panel



Markus Manninen
Member of the Panel