

WORLD RUGBY

IN THE MATTER OF THE REGULATIONS RELATING TO THE GAME

AND

IN THE MATTER OF ALLEGED DOPING OFFENCES BY **AARON DAVIS** (UNITED STATES OF AMERICA) CONTRARY TO REGULATION 21

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A DECISION OF A JUDICIAL COMMITTEE DATED 27 NOVEMBER 2017

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A REFERRAL TO A POST-HEARING REVIEW BODY APPOINTED PURSUANT TO REGULATION 21.8.2.1:

POST-HEARING REVIEW BODY

Tim Gresson	(New Zealand) (Chair)
Stephen Drymer	(Canada)
Dr Stephen Targett	(Qatar)

Attendances

The Player

Howard Jacobs (Attorney)

World Rugby

David Casserly	(Counsel)
Ross Wenzel	(Solicitor)
Ben Rutherford	(Senior Legal Counsel and Integrity Unit Manager)
David Ho	(Anti-Doping Science and Results Manager)

Hearing

Conducted on the papers

Written submissions World Rugby (2 February 2018 and 29 May 2018), the Player (14 May 2018)

DECISION AND REASONS

Introduction

1. This is an application brought by Aaron Davis ("the Player") for the review of a decision dated 27 November 2017 ("the decision") of the Judicial Committee ("JC") consisting of Hon Graeme Mew, Dr Margo Mountjoy and Nicholas Stewart QC in which the JC determined the Player committed an anti-doping rule

violation (“ADRV”). As a result a period of ineligibility of four years was imposed commencing on 16 March 2017 and ending at midnight on 15 March 2021.

2. On 4 December 2017, pursuant to World Rugby Regulation 21.13.8, the Player filed his request for a Post-Hearing Review to refer the sanction imposed by the JC to a Post-Hearing Review Body (“PHRB”). As a result this PHRB was appointed by the Chairman of World Rugby’s Anti-Doping Judicial Panel to conduct the review.
3. In bringing the application for review the Player’s Attorney indicated there would not be a need for the taking of any additional evidence and a further hearing would not be required to receive oral submissions. Accordingly the hearing has been conducted on the basis of written submissions being filed and exchanged.

Decision - Summary

4. In the reasons provided, we unanimously agree with the JC’s decision. We find that the Player has not established the decision should be varied or overturned. In short, the Player’s case is rejected by us.

Background Facts

5. The Player is a North American athlete who transitioned from playing gridiron football (“football”) to rugby union. Commencing in 2015 he trained with the USA National Sevens and Fifteen Squads. In 2016 he signed with the Ohio Aviators of Pro Rugby North America. During the hearing, the JC indicated the Player referred to being “*passionate about rugby*”, he wanted to be “*the best rugby player*” and to “*grow the game in the United States*”. Further, the Player stated he “*never took any shortcuts*”, and “*would not do anything which would hurt the game*”.
6. The Player indicated he was familiar with anti-doping rules and processes. He was first tested when he was 18 years old playing college football. In total, he was tested six times before the present occasion. He has not previously had an Adverse Analytical Finding (“AAF”) for any substance.
7. Since 2010 or 2011, the Player had been using two supplements. The first was a multivitamin/multi-mineral supplement called Universal Nutrition Animal Pak (“Animal Pak”). “Animal Pak” comes in individually wrapped “packets” containing eleven different tablets. It is a well-known multivitamin containing

“standard” vitamins and minerals. When he first began using Animal Pak, he purchased it from a retailer of nutritional supplements. Subsequently, he purchased the product in a Walmart or at a vitamin store. The Player stated he had used it on a daily basis and that he followed the “*suggested use*” recommendations of one to two packets per day. When questioned during the hearing he could not recall whether he had used the “Animal Pak” on the six previous occasions when he was drug tested. The Player stated he did “*not think*” to declare “Animal Pak” on his Doping Control form as he was in “*a bit of a hurry*”¹. However he included Animal Pak on the list of supplements he provided to USA rugby.

8. The second supplement the Player also used was called “Ruck Science Twitch Faster” (“Twitch Faster”). “Twitch Faster” was described to the JC as a “*pre-workout drink mix made specifically for rugby players by a nutritional supplement company that specializes in creating premium nutrition products for rugby players*”². The Player also did not disclose the use of “Twitch Faster” on his Doping Control Form.
9. In his evidence the Player acknowledged he had not consulted USADA’s “*Supplement 411*” website or World Rugby’s “*Keep Rugby Clean*” website to research the supplements he was using. Further, when the Player switched from playing football to rugby, he did not check to see whether there were any differences between football and rugby anti-doping regimes.³
10. On 1 April 2016, the Player was included on the Registered Testing Pool of the United States Anti-Doping Agency (USADA).
11. On 30 January 2017 the Player provided a urine sample during an Out-of-Competition Doping Control carried out by the USAD on behalf of World Rugby. The analysis of the sample as reported on 7 March 2017 - by the WADA-accredited Salt Lake City laboratory (“SMRTL”) indicated the presence of 19-norandrosterone (19NA); thus returning an AAF.
12. 19NA is listed as a metabolite or isomer in S.1.1b (Endogenous Anabolic Androgenic Steroids) of the Prohibited List 2017 set out in Schedule 2 to World

¹ *Ibid*, at [31]

² *Ibid*, at [32]

³ *Ibid*, at [34]

Rugby Regulation 21 (the Regulations). It is not a Specified Substance and its Use is prohibited at all times. It was not disputed the 19NA in the Player's sample had an exogenous origin.

13. A preliminary review of the case was undertaken in accordance with Regulation 21.7.2, following which the Player was notified, via USA Rugby (the Union). On 16 March 2017 it was alleged that he had committed an ADRV.
14. Having been formally notified by the Union an ADRV was alleged against him, the Player was provisionally suspended under Regulation 21.7.9 and 21.7.10 with effect from 16 March 2017 pending the outcome of his case. The Player was also informed of his right, pursuant to Regulation 21.7.3, to have the "B" sample (which was provided by him at the time he was tested) analysed.
15. On 24 March 2017, the Union confirmed the Player wished to have his "B" sample tested. Due to a series of technical issues, the testing of the "B" sample took place at SMRTL, but not until 1 May 2017. Subsequently, the "B" sample was reported as confirming the AAF on 11 May 2017.
16. The Player informed World Rugby he wished to have a hearing, and the JC was appointed.
17. At the hearing the Player did not dispute the AAF and admitted the presence of 19NA constituted an anti-doping rule violation (ADVR) under Regulation 21.2.1 of the Regulations.
18. On 27 November 2017, the JC issued its decision.

Relevant Anti-Doping Regulations

19. As a result of the Player's acceptance of the AAF, World Rugby satisfied the burden of establishing the Player committed an Anti-Doping Rule Violation ("ADRV"), namely the presence in the Player's sample of the Prohibited 19NA.
20. In relation to the sanction imposed by the JC Regulation 21.10.2 provides:

21.10.2 **Ineligibility for Presence, Use or Attempted Use, or Possession of a Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method**
The period of Ineligibility for a violation of Regulations 21.2.1 (Presence), 21.2.2 (Use or Attempted Use) or 21.2.6

(Possession) shall be as follows, subject to potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Regulations 21.10.4, 21.10.5 or 21.10.6

21.10.2.1 The period of Ineligibility shall be four years where:

21.10.2.1.1 The anti-doping rule violation does not involve a Specified Substance, unless the Player or Other Person can establish that the anti-doping rule violation was not intentional.

21. The term "*intentional*" is defined in Regulation 21.10.2.3 as follows:

"the term "intentional" is meant to identify those Players who cheat. The term therefore requires the Player or other Person engaged in conduct which he or she knew constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregarded that risk".

22. Because the Player's ADRV does not involve a Specified Substance, the Player had the onus of establishing, on the balance of probability, his ADRV was not intentional. That would then lower the presumptive sanction from four years' ineligibility to two years'. Under the Regulations the Player can obtain a further reduction of the otherwise applicable sanction if he established, on the balance of probability:

- a. There was No Significant Fault or Negligence on his part and the detected Prohibited Substance came from a Contaminated Product, in which case the period of Ineligibility would, at a minimum, be a reprimand and no period of Ineligibility, and at a maximum, two years of Ineligibility, depending on the Player's degree of Fault (refer Regulation 21.10.5.1.2);
or
- b. There was No Significant Fault or Negligence, in which case the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility may be reduced based on the Player's degree of Fault, but the reduced period of Ineligibility may not be less than one-half of the period Ineligibility otherwise applicable (refer Regulation 21.10.5.2).

23. Because of the definition of the word "*intentional*" as provided by Regulation 21.10.2.3, factually there is no room for the application of either of these grounds for reduction or elimination if the Player under Regulation 21.10.2.1 is unable to establish the ADRV was not intentional.

The JC's Decision

24. Prior to the hearing, which was conducted in two stages, written material (including written submissions and briefs of evidence) was filed on behalf of the Player and World Rugby. Oral evidence (which included cross-examination of the Player and witnesses) was adduced at the hearing. Upon reviewing all the evidential material and submissions which were placed before the JC, we are satisfied the hearing process adopted by the JC was fair and appropriate.
25. The JC's decision was notified to parties on 28 November 2017. The JC provided detailed reasons in relation to its conclusions on the issues which required determination. The JC rejected the explanation by the Player the source of the 19NA was ingestion of the "Animal Pak" nutritional (or rather, "bodybuilding"⁴) supplement. Thus, it accepted World Rugby's submission the Player had failed to establish on the balance of probability the ADRV was not intentional.
26. Further, the JC determined the Player failed to establish there was no significant fault or negligence on his part. Even if the Player had established on the balance of probability the "Animal Pak" was contaminated with 19NA, the JC determined the use of the product "*courted the risk of an ADRV*". The Player had been afforded opportunities on a number of occasions to check the products he was using and to seek proper advice. In this respect the Player had "*failed to exercise extreme caution regarding the use of nutritional supplements as expressly advised by Regulation 21.4.8.1*".
27. The JC, having decided the Player had not established the ADRV was unintentional, imposed the prescribed sanction of four years Ineligibility. As a result of its findings, the JC determined it was not necessary for it to consider whether the sanction should be reduced due to a lack of significant fault or negligence because of the Player's use of a contaminated product.

The Review

28. Under Regulations 21.13.8.5 and 21.13.7 the PHRB may determine the basis on which the review will proceed and has a discretion to rehear the whole, or any

⁴ A label for the Animal Pak product states:

"Born from the needs and desires of professional bodybuilders ... Animal Pak also represents a group of products that have stood the test of time ... where it counts most... The gym and the stage ... Animal Pak has been the choice for hardnosed, uncompromising strength athletes all over the world ... formulated for competitive and world-class bodybuilders and powerlifters ... fundamental nutritional framework for any lifter serious about iron warfare ..."

WARNING: Not intended for use by those under the age of 18. This is a potent bodybuilding supplement ..."

part, of the evidence given before the JC. It also has wide powers in its discretion, under Regulation 21.13.8.6, 21.13.8.8 and 21.13.8.9 to receive further evidence and to call on experts for specialist advice.

29. Under Regulation 21.13.8.11, the Player bears "*the burden of proving that the decision being challenged should be overturned or varied*", except where the PHRB decides to hear the entire case *de novo*, which was not requested. On the basis of the Player's indication we did not consider it necessary or appropriate to rehear any evidence or receive any new evidence or expert advice. In determining the application we have considered the written submissions of the parties in addition to the written material and oral evidence which was considered by the JC.

Grounds for Review

30. The grounds for the Player's request are:
- a. *The Judicial Committee's finding at par. 76 of the Decision that the [Athlete] has not established that the doping rule violation was not intentional was inconsistent with the facts generally, and inconsistent with the Judicial Committee's finding at par. 71 of the Decision that it remained possible that the positive test was caused by a contaminated supplement.*
 - b. *The Judicial Committee's finding at par. 73-76 of the Decision that Mr. Davis' violation of the anti-doping rules would properly be found to be intentional even accepting that it had been caused by a contaminated supplement is inconsistent with Art. 21.10.5.1.2 of the World Rugby Anti-Doping Code, and is unsupported by any cases ever decided by the Court of Arbitration for Sport.*
 - c. *The Judicial Committee's finding at par. 79-94 of the Decision that there were not substantial delays in the proceeding that were not attributable to the [Athlete] is inconsistent with the facts, even as set forth in the Decision.*
 - d. *"The Judicial Committee's finding at par. 96 of the Decision that "the [Athlete] engaged in conduct which he knew constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and manifestly disregarded that risk" is wholly unsupported by the facts of the case."*
31. We consider each ground in turn.

**First Proposition – Contamination
The Source of the 19NA**

32. The Player claimed the “Animal Pak” was the source of the 19NA.
33. The JC heard evidence from the following witnesses. The JC’s findings in respect of their evidence is briefly summarised as follows⁵:
- a. Mr Chad Lewis, Vice-President Regulatory Affairs & Quality, Universal Nutrition, of New Brunswick, NJ, United States:
- “Animal Pak” is manufactured by Universal Nutrition.
 - Universal Nutrition does not make or use any products with 19-norsteroids or any other steroids.
 - There are no steroids within its production facility.
 - “Animal Pak” containers are sealed at Universal Nutrition’s facility before they are shipped out to retailers for resale.
 - Universal Nutrition purchases ingredients from around the world.
 - Universal Nutrition does not routinely screen or test all of its ingredients.
 - He was not aware of any batch of “*Animal Pak*” having ever tested positive for a 19-norsteroid.
- b. Mr Paul Scott, founder of KorvaLabs Inc⁶:
- Mr Scott founded KorvaLabs Inc in 2014.
 - KorvaLabs is not currently accredited by any recognised accreditation body.
 - Mr Scott does not hold any postgraduate scientific qualifications.
 - KorvaLabs is an analytical chemistry laboratory specifically focussing on sports anti-doping and clinical testing. It uses testing methods of gas chromatography mass spectrometry “GC/MS” and liquid chromatography mass spectrometry processes “LC/MS/MS”. Both are techniques used in making specific detections of materials in a combined state.
 - KorvaLabs tested “Animal Pak” and the “Twitch Faster” supplements.
 - “Twitch Faster” supplement yielded no unusual results.

⁵ *Ibid*, at [36] to [58]

⁶ *Ibid*, at [40] to [46]

- The “Animal Pak” testing produced a non-specific result. Testing of the “Animal Pak” revealed a small, but non-background peak at approximately 4.4 minutes (close to the retention time range for other 19-Nor compounds/nor-steroids) which share transitions of 19-norandrostenediol.
 - Mr Scott drew the following conclusions from the above result:
 - It was indicative of the possibility of the presence of a 19-nor-steroid which could metabolise to 19NA.
 - The small, non-background peak probably represented a 19-nor-steroid which could metabolize to 19-Norandrosterone.
 - If an athlete regularly consumed the Animal Pak supplement from the same canister which was tested at KorvaLabs, the athlete would most likely have some 19-Norandrosterone in his urine.
 - It confirmed there are over-the-counter nutritional supplements which could cause an “AAF” for 19-Norandrosterone.
 - Therefore, he disagreed with Professor Ayotte’s conclusion that the most likely source of the Player’s “AAF” was by way of an injection or oral administration of nandrolone a few days before his sample was obtained. His view was if “Animal Pak” was taken regularly, the Player would have some 19NA present in his urine.
- c. Professor Christiane Ayotte, Professor at INRS and Director of its WADA-accredited Doping Control Laboratory (in Montreal) since 1991⁷:
- Professor Ayotte holds a Ph.D in organic chemistry.
 - She is the current President of the World Association of Anti-Doping Scientists and is also a member of the WADA Laboratory Expert Group.
 - She has contributed or directed research work on the detection of nandrolone metabolites by GC/MS and on the development of a GC/C/IRMS method for determining the origin of urinary 19NA.
 - She rejected Mr Scott’s evidence as to the possibility the consumption of “Animal Pak” had caused the “AAF”.
 - She concluded the presence of 19NA in the Player’s urine sample *“was probably due to an injection a few months before the collection of the sample of nandrolone decanoate from a preparation similar to ones that her laboratory had tested”*.

⁷ *Ibid*, at [47] to [53]

- She could not exclude the possibility of ingestion of a supplement containing a nor-steroid a few days prior to the test.
- The presence of 9.2 ng/mL (being the amount in the Player's sample) of 19NA was a diluted sample, so the true reading was estimated at 18 ng/mL. In order to reach this level there would need to be a "*huge*" amount of steroid in the sample which would have been easily detectable and revealed more than a non-descript background peak by a full scan GL/MS analgesic

34. Consistent with the JC's overall approach, we are satisfied it carried out a careful and detailed analysis of Professor Ayotte and Mr Scott's evidence, and it was open to the JC to prefer the former's evidence for the following reasons:

- a. Professor Ayotte pointed out several inconsistencies and flaws in Mr Scott's testing and reporting, which of itself casted doubt on the accuracy of his conclusions. Essentially, she stated Mr Scott provided insufficient analytical details, his report included no information on methods used, basic analytic data was missing and no documentation report was supplied⁸.
- b. It was unknown whether KorvaLabs employed trained analysts, whether it used certified and validated methods or if it was associated with an accredited/recognized organization⁹.
- c. When Professor Ayotte tested the "Animal Pak" samples from both the Player and a store-purchased sample, no peak or steroids were detected. Professor Ayotte was unable to reproduce Mr Scott's finding of a "*small, but non-background peak*"¹⁰. There was no further attempt to identify the origin of the peak by Mr Scott and he was unable to identify a contaminant no-steroid in the "Animal Pak" to support his assertion that the peak was due to a no-steroid.
- d. There was no analytical information to support his conclusion the small peak found in the analysis by Mr Scott at 4.4 minutes was indicative of a 19-no-steroid which would metabolize into 19NA¹¹.

⁸ Report of Professor Christiane Ayotte, above, at 13

⁹ At 13

¹⁰ At 15

¹¹ At 13

- e. Neither the Montreal or SMRTL laboratories found any 19NA or other nandrolone substance in their analyses of "Animal Pak".
 - f. The absence of any laboratory reference standard to measure 19-nordehydroepiandrosterone (found in Nor-Andro-Max)¹² meant Mr Scott's theory of the small but non-background peaks he observed in the "Animal Pak" supplement being consistent with 19-nor-DHEA contamination, remained an unresolved possibility. Further, no similar background peak was revealed when testing the Nor-Andro-Max.
 - g. Mr Scott tested the supplements provided to KorvaLabs using the LC/MS/MS testing method. LC/MS/MS is not the method of choice for detecting and identifying nor-steroids in supplements. GC/MS is the method of choice¹³.
 - h. In conclusion, it was Professor Ayotte's expert opinion there was no single element to support Mr Scott's view the non-specific background peak was due to any nor-steroid in the "Animal Pak".
35. The Player referred to Professor Ayotte's concession she had not tested the "Animal Pak" for "*every nor-steroid*". However, evidentially that did not assist the Player in establishing the "Animal Pak" was the source of the 19NA which was found in his system. As World Rugby submitted Professor Ayotte's evidence was Mr Scott had been unable to detect a relevant prohibited substance in the "Animal Pak" supplement and both her laboratory and the SMRTL laboratory did not detect any trace of relevant nor-steroids in the "Animal Pak". This was despite Professor Ayotte's evidence it would require a significant (and thus easily detectable) amount of nor-steroids in the supplement in order to be able to produce the urinary concentration of 19NA detected in the Player's sample¹⁴.
36. Additionally, there was Mr Lewis' evidence that Universal Nutrition (manufacturers of Animal Pak) did not use nor-steroids and none were kept on-site in the factory. Products are sealed prior to leaving factory. While ingredients are obtained from overseas sources, there had been no adverse

¹² A banned product which contains nandrolone, and the related nor-steroid 19NA.

¹³ At 13

¹⁴ At 15

doping test result from the “Animal Pak” product which had been on the market for many years. On that basis, it was not probable there was any contamination of the “Animal Pak” at Universal Nutrition’s manufacturing premises.

37. Thus, for the foregoing reasons, we are satisfied the JC made no error in concluding that the Player failed to identify the “Animal Pak” as the origin of the 19NA.

38. The Player also submitted that even if he failed to establish the “Animal Pak” was the origin of the 19NA, on the evidence, the JC should have found his ADRV to be unintentional. In support of this submission, the Player cited the Court of Arbitration for Sports (“CAS”) cases of *Fiol v FINA*¹⁵ and *Ademi v UEFA*¹⁶. The Player submitted that his case bore “*striking similarities*” with *Ademi*. We do not consider either of these cases are of assistance to the Player for the reasons given below.

39. In *Fiol*, CAS held there was the possibility that in certain circumstances an athlete could establish a lack of intention without demonstrating the source of the prohibited substance. However, this is only a “*theoretical possibility*” which will be “*extremely rare*” and will only arise in the “*narrowest of corridors*”¹⁷. As World Rugby submitted:

“... the Player seeks to (mis)use a colourful analogy in Foil, relating to George Washington, in order to give the impression that the possibility for athletes to demonstrate that a violation is unintentional without establishing source is much greater than it actually is. The relevant text, which was quoted by the Player at section 2.2 of the Reply is as follows:

“Furthermore, the Panel can envisage the theoretical possibility that it might be persuaded by an athlete’s simple assertion of his innocence of intent when considering not only his demeanor, but also his character and history (it is recorded if apocryphally, that the young George Washington admitted chopping down a cherry tree because he could not tell a lie. Mutatis mutandis the Panel could find the same fidelity to the truth in the case of an athlete denying a charge of cheating).”

40. In *Ademi*, the athlete had used supplement pills which the Panel considered possibly contained banned Stanozolol. The pills were provided to him by a doctor for back pain and the athlete believed they were safe to use. This factor was relied upon by the Panel to support the finding that on a balance of

¹⁵ CAS 2016/A/4534

¹⁶ CAS 2016/A/4676

¹⁷ Refer paragraph 37 of the Award

probability the Player had no intention to cheat, even though the Panel found the athlete had failed to identify the pills as the source of the Stanazolol. While the explanation of the origin was rejected, the Panel found the Player had demonstrated the violation was not intentional.

41. We consider the present case is distinguishable from *Ademi*.
42. Firstly, the supplement in *Ademi* was analysed in an array of different laboratories, some of which were WADA-accredited with the prohibited substance only being detected in some cases. Thus there was doubt as to whether the supplement was the source of the supplement. In the present case, the "Animal Pak" was tested by Professor Ayotte and Mr Scott at a WADA-accredited facility and non-accredited facility respectively and as noted the relevant prohibited substance was not detected by either of them.
43. In *Ademi*, the Panel accepted the athlete's evidence as credible. In the present case, the JC rejected the Player's evidence. Thus, there was no uncertainty on its part whether it should accept the Player had established the origin of the 19NA. In contrast, the Panel in *Ademi* was uncertain as to whether the supplement may have been the source of the Stanazolol and, as World Rugby correctly submitted, erroneously allowed that factor to influence its determination as to whether the athletes' ADRV was unintentional.
44. In our view, the case law is well-settled on this issue. CAS cases¹⁸ clearly state it would be extremely rare and the circumstances must be truly exceptional for an athlete to demonstrate a lack of intention without establishing the source of the banned substance. Athletes will not be able to demonstrate a lack of intention solely through denials no matter how credible and a clean history. It follows a mere denial by an athlete will not suffice.
45. On the basis of the evidence before the JC, we consider there were not exceptional circumstances which could give rise to a finding of non-intentional conduct when the origin of the prohibited substance has not been identified. Further, while we are satisfied it was open to the JC to conclude Mr Scott's theory was possible, nevertheless it was improbable. A mere possibility falls below the standard of proof required for the Player to establish on a balance of

¹⁸ CAS 2-16/A/4919 WADA v/WSF & Iqbal; CAS 2016/A/4377 WADA v IWF & Alvarez, CAS 2016/A/4662 WADA v Caribbean RADO & Greaves, CAS 2016/A/4563 WADA v EGYPTADO & ElSalam.

probability there was an inadvertent contamination (and thus an absence of intention).

Second Proposition

JC's finding of intentional violation erroneous and inconsistent with case law

46. The Player submitted "*the JC's finding at paragraphs 73 to 76 of the decision that the Player's violation of the anti-doping rules would properly be found to be intentional even accepting that it had been caused by a contaminated supplement is clearly erroneous*". Further, it was not consistent with any CAS cases and the JC conflated the issue of lack of intent to violate the anti-doping rules with the issue of *No Significant Fault or Negligence*.
47. The JC stated even if Animal Pak had been the source of the 19NA, the Player failed to "*exercise extreme caution*" with regard to his use of nutritional supplements as prescribed by Regulation 21.4.8.1.¹⁹ Thus, by way of an "*obiter*" comment, the JC found the Player had failed to prove his conduct was not reckless in accordance with the second limb of the "*intentional*" definition.
48. As noted, the second proposition is based on observations made by the JC after it had made its primary finding in relation to the Player's claimed lack of intention. On this basis, as World Rugby submitted, the finding of a lack of caution to "*all intent and purposes was moot*".
49. In any event, we agree with the JC's observations that even if the Player had established the source of his "AAF" was a contaminated supplement, the Player engaged in conduct which he knew there was a significant risk that consuming nutritional supplements such as "Animal Pak" and "Twitch Faster" might result in an anti-doping rule violation.
- a. "Animal Pak" is an over-the-counter product closely associated with body-building. The product contains a large number of ingredients and the

¹⁹ Regulation 21.4.8.1 provides:

"The use of nutritional supplements by Players is a risk. In many countries regulations either do not exist or are limited in nature in relation to the manufacturing and labelling of supplements. This may lead to a supplement containing an undeclared substance that is prohibited under these Anti-Doping Rules. Nutritional supplements may not be regulated or could be contaminated or suffer from cross contamination or may not have all the ingredients listed on the product label. Players are advised to exercise extreme caution regarding the use of nutritional supplements."

packaging includes health warnings. The product has been on the market since 1983.²⁰

- b. He took USADA's Athlete Advantage online tutorial when he switched from football to rugby, and entered into the USADA testing pool. Thus, there were opportunities for him to thoroughly check the products he was using and to seek proper advice. However, he took no steps to investigate whether the products contained permissible ingredients.
 - c. He did not declare his use of the "Animal Pak" or "Twitch Faster" on his Doping Control Form; the inference being he was aware these products could have contained banned substances.
50. As to the Player's submission there was no CAS case law to support the JC's finding, we accept World Rugby's submission there are cases when CAS has applied this reasoning in circumstances where athletes were able to show contamination of supplements and/or medication with a prohibited source, but their conduct was held to have been reckless.²¹²² In *Lestan* it was held nonetheless that when an athlete manifestly disregards the obvious risk of ingesting products designed to enhance performance in a context in which the presence of prohibited substances is likely, then the athlete has made no effort to prevent an ADRV from materializing.
51. For these reasons we conclude it was open to the JC to comment the Player's use of the products without seeking professional guidance over several years was reckless in that he failed to exercise extreme caution.

**Third Proposition
Substantial delay**

52. Regulation 21.10.11.1 provides:

"Where there have been substantial delays in the hearing process or other aspects of Doping Control not attributable to the Player or other Person, World Rugby (or the Association, Union or Tournament Organiser handling the case as applicable) may start the period of Ineligibility at an earlier date commencing as early as the date of Sample collection or the date on which another anti-doping rule violation last

²⁰ Statement of Chad Lewis, Vice President Regulatory Affairs and Quality, Universal Nutrition, dated 12 July 2017 at [4].

²¹ CAS 2016/A/4609 WADA v Indian National Anti-Doping Agency & Dane Pereira.

²² CAS 2017/A/5282 WADA v IIHF & Lestan.

occurred. All competitive results achieved during the period of Ineligibility, including retroactive Ineligibility, shall be Disqualified.

53. We adopt the JC's chronology commencing at paragraph 79:

"[79] There have been a number of delays in this case. The Player was not notified of the AAF until 16 March 2017, over six weeks after he was tested. He has been provisionally suspended since that date.

[80] It took longer than usual for the Player's "B" sample to be tested because of equipment problems at SMRTL. The Player was notified of those results on 11 May 2017. It then took several more weeks – until 9 June – for a laboratory documentation pack to be put together and delivered to the Player's lawyer.

[81] By that time this JC had already been empanelled and directions given (on 9 June) in relation to disclosure, and the delivery of evidence and submissions. While there continued to be production and other issues relating to the timetable set by the JC, requiring extensions of time and further directions being granted by the JC, the matter continued to move forward and a hearing date of 21 July was set.

[82] The hearing started on 21 July, four and a half months after the Player was notified about the AAF. Despite a better part of a day being set aside for the hearing, it was not possible to complete the hearing in the allotted time. This was largely a function of counsel electing to undertake lengthy examinations of certain witnesses, particularly Mr. Scott. We make no criticism of this, but the parties would have known that there would then be the risk of a substantial delay before the hearing could be completed. The next date mutually convenient to the parties, counsel and the JC was not until 18 September 2017."

54. On this basis the Player submitted irrespective of whether he²³ or World Rugby were responsible for the delays, they were substantial and certainly not "*entirely normal*" as contended by World Rugby.

55. In its decision, after referring to several similar "*delay*" cases the JC did not explicitly determine whether there was substantial delay but in exercising its discretion under the Regulation it ruled the Player was not prejudiced by the delay in the testing of the Player's A sample and the subsequent delays were not unreasonable.

56. Clearly there were delays in this case and overall the processes leading up to the commencement of the hearing took longer than usual. However, we are not satisfied they were excessive. In any event, we do not consider the JC erred in exercising its discretion. Firstly, as the JC determined, given the Player was unaware of any issues arising from the sample he provided and was able to play

²³ The Player correctly discounted any notion he caused the delays and accepted World Rugby may not have been entirely responsible for them

between the date of sample collection and the date he was provisionally suspended, the Player did not suffer any prejudice.

57. Secondly, while the delays were not caused by the Player, we do not consider they were unreasonable. The disposition of the case from the notification of the AAF in March 2017 until delivery of the decision took nine months. Further, as the JC noted, both parties agreed to expedited timelines for the preparation and delivery of the notes of evidence and of pre-hearing submissions in order to have the hearing proceed as soon as practicably possible.
58. Moreover, the Player's provisional suspension (six weeks after the date of the sample collection) was factored into the overall period of suspension.
59. Accordingly, for these reasons we are satisfied the JC was correct in not back-dating the period of ineligibility.

Fourth Proposition

JC's finding of knowledge of intentional violation unsupported by facts

60. As noted in his review request, the Player contended the JC's finding that the Player had knowledge his actions constituted an anti-doping rule violation or knew his conduct risked constituting or resulting in an anti-doping rule violation was wholly unsupported by the facts. We note the Player did not make any specific submissions in relation to this ground.
61. In any event, it is our view the proposition has no tenable basis. We have already determined the JC was correct in determining that the Player failed to prove the violation was not intentional.
62. Further, for the reasons previously discussed, we are satisfied the Player's conduct, as established by the facts, supported the observation the Player engaged in conduct which he knew constituted an anti-doping rule violation; or that he knew there was a significant risk by using the products without consultation that his conduct might constitute or result in an anti-doping rule violation and he manifestly disregarded that risk.

Decision on this Review

63. The applicable sanction was therefore the four years' ineligibility imposed by the Judicial Committee. We find no ground for interference with the Judicial
-

Committee's decision of a period of ineligibility of four years from 16 March 2017 ending at midnight on 15 March 2021.

64. The decision of this Post-Hearing Review Body is to uphold the decision of the Judicial Committee delivered on 27 November 2017. The Judicial Committee decision drew attention to Regulation 21.10.12.1 and 21.10.12.2. The result is the Player will be allowed to return to training on 16 January 2021, although he will not be eligible to take part in competition until 16 March 2021.


Costs

65. By Regulation 21.13.8.14 costs associated with any proceedings before the PHRB shall ordinarily be borne by the party seeking review, in this case the Player. However, under that regulation the PHRB does have full discretion in relation to the costs. If the Player or World Rugby wish us to exercise our discretion to depart from that ordinary rule, written submissions must be submitted to the PHRB through David Ho at World Rugby by 5.00 pm GMT on 17 August 2018.

Appeal

66. Regulation 21.13.7.1 sets out the circumstances in which an appeal against this decision can be made to the Court of Arbitration for Sports (CAS) and the time limits for doing so.

DATED this 19th day of July 2018


Tim Gresson (New Zealand)
Stephen Drymer (Canada)
Dr Stephen Targett (Qatar)