

INTERNATIONAL OLYMPIC COMMITTEE

DISCIPLINARY COMMISSION

DECISION

REGARDING METE BINAY

**BORN ON 19 JANUARY 1985, TURKISH FEDERATION, ATHLETE, WEIGHTLIFTER
(TURKISH OLYMPIC COMMITTEE)**

In application of the Olympic Charter and, in particular, Rule 59.2.1 thereof, and 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 OF THE CASE

1. Mete BINAY (the “**Athlete**”), participated in the Games of the XXX Olympiad, London 2012 (the “**2012 Olympic Games**”) as a team member of the Turkish Olympic Committee.
2. On 31 July 2012, the Athlete competed in the Men’s 69kg Weightlifting event, finishing 6th overall.
3. On 31 July 2012, the Athlete was requested to provide urine samples for a doping control. Such sample was identified with the number 2718733.
4. The A-Sample 2718733 was analysed during the 2012 Olympic Games by the WADA-accredited Laboratory in London. The 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 Laboratory 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 conducted 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 re-analysis 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 2718733 was analysed by the Laboratory and resulted in an Adverse Analytical Finding (“**AAF**”) as it showed the presence of Stanozolol metabolites (3'-hydroxystanozolol-O-glucuronide and 3'-hydroxy-17-epistanozolol-O-glucuronide), a Prohibited Substance (Class S1.1a – Anabolic Androgenic Steroids).
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. 6.2.5 of the Rules, the IOC President set up a Disciplinary Commission, consisting in this case of:
 - Prof. Denis Oswald, Chairman;
 - Mr. Juan Antonio Samaranch; and
 - Mr. Ingmar De Vos.
12. The IOC has delegated the implementation of the Doping Control program for the 2012 Olympic Games to the International Testing Agency (the “**ITA**”). Such delegation includes the conduct of re-analysis of the samples collected during the 2012 Olympic Games and the related results management.
13. On 6 November 2019, the ITA notified the Athlete, through the Turkish Olympic Committee (the “**NOC**”), of the above-mentioned AAF and of the institution of disciplinary proceedings to be conducted by the Disciplinary Commission. By means of an Athlete Rights Form to be completed by the Athlete, the ITA 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, and of his right to request a copy of the laboratory documentation package.
14. The Athlete was also given the possibility to refer the matter for adjudication before the Court of Arbitration for Sport in Lausanne, Switzerland, by means of an arbitration agreement.
15. On 6 November 2019, the International Weightlifting Federation (“**IWF**”) was also informed of the Athlete’s AAF notification. The ITA invited the IWF to take the necessary actions under Art. 8.3 of the Rules.
16. On 6 November 2019, the NOC informed the ITA that it had received the notification and that the Athlete would be formally notified and informed the following day, on 7 November 2019.
17. On 9 December 2019, the ITA reminded the NOC that the Athlete had not yet completed the Athlete Rights Form and respond to the arbitration agreement proposal. The ITA provided a deadline of 20 December 2019 for the Athlete to do so.
18. On 10 December 2019, the Athlete wrote to the NOC confirming that he had received the relevant correspondence between 7 November and 10 December 2019. The Athlete informed the NOC that he would not exercise his right of appeal.
19. On 13 December 2019, the NOC informed the ITA of the Athlete’s response and waiver of his rights in the procedure.
20. The matter was accordingly referred to the IOC Disciplinary Commission to issue its decision on the basis of the file.

II. APPLICABLE RULES

21. 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.”

22. Art. 2 of the Rules provides that Article 2 of the Code applies to determine anti-doping rule violations.

23. 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.”

24. 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.”

25. 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.”

26. 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.”

27. 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.”

28. 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."

29. 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**

30. The results of the analysis of the samples provided by the Athlete establish the presence in his sample of the metabolites of a Prohibited Substance, *i.e.* Stanozolol metabolites (3'-hydroxystanozolol-O-glucuronide).

31. The substance detected in the Athlete's sample is an anabolic steroid. It is listed in the WADA 2012 Prohibited List and in all subsequent lists under S1.

32. The Disciplinary Commission notes that the Athlete acknowledged receipt of the AAF Notification by his email dated 10 December 2019 received by the IOC through the NOC. According to the email dated 13 December 2019, the NOC confirmed that the Athlete had waived his rights to actively participate in these proceedings.

33. This waiver notably related to the opening and analysis of the B-Sample which was consequently not performed.

34. In accordance with Art. 2.1 of the Code, when the B-Sample analysis is waived, the result of the A-Sample analysis is sufficient to establish an anti-doping rule violation.

35. 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."*

36. Accordingly, the Athlete has to be found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.1 of the Code consisting in the presence of a Prohibited Substance in his body.

37. For the sake of completeness, the Disciplinary Commission notes that the circumstances of this case also support the finding of an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 2.2 of the Code.

38. The substance which was found in the Athlete's sample corresponds to a substance which has commonly been used as a doping substance.

39. The fact that a doping substance which is a "classical" doping substance broadly used at the time of the analysis supports this consideration.

40. The simple and straightforward explanation for the fact that Stanozolol metabolites (3'-hydroxystanozolol-O-glucuronide and 3'-hydroxy-17-epistanozolol-O-glucuronide) were found in the Athlete's sample is indeed use of a doping substance for the purpose of performance enhancement.

41. Use of this substance under the given circumstances is clearly consistent with and indicative of the intentional use of Prohibited Substances specifically ingested to deliberately improve performance.
42. The Athlete's refusal to participate in these proceedings and to provide any explanation at this stage only reinforces a corresponding inference.
43. In conclusion, the Athlete has to be found to have committed an anti-doping rule violation pursuant to Art. 1 of the Rules and both 2.1 and 2.2 of the Code.
44. Under the Rules, the applicable consequences of the anti-doping rule violation specifically relate to the 2012 Olympic Games.
45. 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.).
46. Pursuant to Art. 8.3 of the Rules the matter shall be transferred to the relevant International Federation (the IWF) for the result management in respect to further consequences, and notably sanctions, not related to the 2012 Olympic Games.

* * * * *

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, Mete BINAY:
 - (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 69 kg weightlifting event, in which he ranked 6th and for which he was awarded a diploma,
 - (iii) has the diploma obtained in the Men's 69 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 Turkish Olympic Committee shall ensure full implementation of this decision.
- IV. The Turkish Olympic Committee shall notably secure the return to the IOC, as soon as possible, of the diploma awarded in connection with the Men's 69 kg weightlifting event to the Athlete.
- V. The decision enters into force immediately.

Lausanne, 3 July 2020

In the name of the IOC Disciplinary Commission

Prof. Denis Oswald

Ingmar De Vos

Juan Antonio Samaranch