

DECISION of the FEI TRIBUNAL

dated 17 December 2020

(FEI Case number: FEI 2019/RF01-Federico Arias)

FEI Tribunal Hearing Panel:

Mr Martin Gibbs

FEI Tribunal Reference: C20-0052

Horse/Passport: QALWARO/106KD36/CRC

Person Responsible/ID/NF: Federico Arias /10027922/CRC

Owner/ID/NF: Gary Guzowski/10006456/CRC

Event/ID: CSI1*- La Caraña (CRC)

Date of Event: 27-30 March 2019

EAD Rule Violation: Article 2.3, Evading, Refusing or Failing to submit to
Sample Collection

I. Summary of the Facts:

1. Memorandum of case: By Legal Department.

2. Case file: The FEI Tribunal duly took into consideration all evidence, submissions and documents presented in the case file and during the hearing, as also made available by and to the PR.

3. Hearing: 3 December 2020 at 2.30 pm (Central European Time by videoconference (via Cisco WebEx).

Present

- The FEI Tribunal Panel
- Ms. Hilary Forde, FEI Tribunal Clerk

PR:

- Mr. Federico Arias

For the FEI:

- Ms. Anna Thorstenson, Legal Counsel
- Ms. Ana Kricej, Junior Legal Counsel

II. Factual background

- 1.** Mr Federico Arias (FEI ID 10027922), the Person Responsible ("**the PR**"), is a FEI registered show jumping rider.
- 2.** The Horse's registered owner in the FEI database at the time of the Event was Mr. Gary Guzowski ("**the Owner**") (FEI ID 10006456).
- 3.** The Fédération Equestre Internationale ("**the FEI**" together with the PR, "**the Parties**"), is the sole IOC recognised international federation for equestrian sport. The FEI is the governing body of the FEI equestrian disciplines (Dressage, Jumping, Eventing, Driving, Endurance, Vaulting, Reining, Para-Equestrian).
- 4.** The PR participated, with the Horse QALWARO (FEI ID 106KD36), in the event CSI1*-Club Hípico, La Caraña, Costa Rica on 27-30 March 2019 ("**the Event**").
- 5.** On 30 March 2019, once the competition was finished, the Horse was selected for anti-doping control and required to attend the testing area by the Testing Veterinarian. However, after the Horse entered the testing box

at around 4.30pm and the testing procedure started as normal, disagreements ensued and the PR and the Owner removed the Horse and refused to submit it to sample collection.

- 6.** The FEI Officials from the Event reported the PR for Evading, Refusing or Failing to Submit to Sample Collection which is an Equine Anti-Doping Rule Violation pursuant to Article 2.3 of the FEI's Equine Anti-Doping and Controlled Medications Regulations (the "**EADCMR**").
- 7.** Pursuant to Article 2.3.3 of the EADCMR the rider of the Horse is the PR for the Horse and remains responsible for the Horse at all times. He is therefore responsible for bringing the Horse to the sample collection and remains responsible for the Horse throughout the Sample collection process.
- 8.** On 11 June 2019, the FEI Legal Department officially notified the PR and the Equestrian Federation of Costa Rica (the "**CRC-NF**"), of a violation of Article 2.3 (Refusal to Submit to Sample Collection) for evading, refusing, or failing to submit to Sample Collection at the Event and the potential consequences (the "**Notification Letter**").
- 9.** The Notification Letter included notice that the PR was provisionally suspended as at the 11 June 2019 in accordance with Article 7.4.2. of the FEI's Equine Anti-Doping Regulations.
- 10.** Finally, the notification letter informed the PR of his right to a Preliminary Hearing with the FEI Tribunal, where he would be able to present all explanations necessary for the FEI Tribunal to assess whether the provisional suspensions shall be lifted or maintained.
- 11.** The PR did not request a Preliminary Hearing with the FEI Tribunal.

II. Procedural background in front of the FEI Tribunal

- 12.** By email dated 15 October 2020, the FEI submitted its Response to the FEI Tribunal and made a request for the appointment of a Hearing Panel. They also informed the FEI Tribunal that the PR had requested that an oral hearing be held in this case.
- 13.** On 22 October 2020, the Parties were informed of the nominated Hearing Panel appointed to address this case and afforded the opportunity to submit objections to the constitution of the named panel.
- 14.** On 22 October 2020, the FEI informed the FEI Tribunal they had no objections regarding the composition of the Hearing Panel.

- 15.** On 2 November 2020, the PR also confirmed he had no objection to the composition of the Hearing Panel. He also attached a letter containing his reply to the FEI's response, which included a request that the FEI Tribunal reconsider the fine to be imposed due to his difficult financial circumstances and the impact of the COVID 19 pandemic.
- 16.** On 3 November, the FEI Tribunal confirmed with the Parties that a virtual hearing was scheduled for the 3 December 2020 at 2.30 pm (Central European Time GMT+1), by videoconference (via Cisco WebEx).
- 17.** That hearing took place on 3 December, starting at 2.30pm Central European Time and concluding at 3.15pm Central European Time.

III. Considering

A. Articles of the Statutes/Regulations which are, *inter alia*, applicable:

Statutes 24th edition, effective 19 November 2019 ("**Statutes**"), Arts. 1.5, 38 and 39.

General Regulations, 24th edition, 1 January 2020, Arts. 118, 143.1, 159, 164, 165 and 167 ("**GRs**").

Internal Regulations of the FEI Tribunal, 3rd Edition, 2 March 2018 ("**IRs**").

FEI Equine Anti-Doping and Controlled Medication Regulations ("**EADCMRs**"), 2nd edition, changes effective 1 January 2020. The EADCM Regulations are comprised of the equine anti-doping rules (the "EAD Rules") in the first half and the equine controlled medication rules (the "ECM Rules") in the second half.

FEI Equine Anti-Doping Rules ("EAD Rules"), 2nd edition, changes effective January 1st, 2020.

Veterinary Regulations ("**VRs**"), 14th edition 2018, effective 1 January 2020, Art. 1068 and seq.

FEI Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse.

B. Person Responsible: Mr Federico Arias.

C. Justification for sanction:

GRs Art. 143.1: "Medication Control and Anti-Doping provisions are stated in the Anti-Doping Rules for Human Athletes (ADRHA), in

conjunction with The World Anti-Doping Code, and in the Equine Anti-Doping and Controlled Medication Regulations (EADCM Regulations).”

GRs Art. 118.3: “The Person Responsible shall be the Athlete who rides, vaults or drives the Horse during an Event, but the Owner and other Support Personnel including but not limited to grooms and veterinarians may be regarded as additional Persons Responsible if they are present at the Event or have made a relevant Decision about the Horse. In vaulting, the lunger shall be an additional Person Responsible.”

EAD Rules Art. 2.3: “Evading, Refusing or Failing to submit to Sample Collection”.

EAD Rules Art. 2.3.1: “Evading Sample collection, or without compelling justification, refusing or failing to submit to Sample collection after Notification (in accordance with the FEI Veterinary Regulations) or to comply with all Sampling procedure requirements including signing the Sampling form or otherwise evading Sample collection”.

EAD Rules Art. 2.3.2: “It is each Person Responsible’s personal duty to ensure that if the Horse with/on which they competed or will compete is selected for Sampling and a notification of Sampling in accordance with the FEI Veterinary Regulations has taken place, such Horse is submitted to Sample collection and that all Sampling procedure requirements are met”.

EAD Rules Art. 2.3.3: “Accordingly, although it is permissible for the Person Responsible to delegate the submission and supervision of the Horse to a third party, the Person Responsible remains responsible for the Horse throughout the Sample collection process and for:

(i) any evasion of Sample collection; and/or

(ii) any refusal or failure, without compelling justification, to submit the Horse to Sample collection; and/or

(iii) any failure to comply with any or all of the Sampling procedure requirements, including signing the Sampling form”.

EAD Rules Art. 2.3.4: “It is not necessary to demonstrate intent, fault, negligence or knowledge in relation to any delegation relating to the Sampling process or to the acts of a relevant third party in order to establish an EAD Rule violation under this Article 2.3”.

IV. The Parties’ Submissions

A. The Submissions of the PR

- 18.** On 15 June 2019, four days after the date of the FEI Notification Letter, the PR submitted a letter to the FEI explaining the reasons for refusal to submit for sample collection on 30 March 2019 and provided details of the circumstances which led to the violation of Article 2.3 of the EADCMR. At the outset of his letter the PR apologised to the FEI for refusing the sampling of his Horse at the Event and accepted full responsibility for the mishandling of the situation, "First and foremost, I would like to apologise to the FEI for refusing the sampling of my horse at the CSI and I accept full responsibility for the mishandling of the situation".
- 19.** In summary, the PR alleges the following reasons (in his letter to the FEI Legal Department dated 15 June 2019), for how the situation arose which led to the EADCMR violation:
- that stable conditions did not comply with most of the conditions required by the FEI regulations regarding stable security and stewarding at international events;
 - that access to the stables were not controlled and restrictions were not in place for people entering and exiting the stables;
 - that Stewards were only present on the showgrounds until 9pm, after which there was a security guard employed by the Organising Committee who had no training in FEI procedures;
 - that the CRC-NF have discriminated against him in the past.
- 20.** He further explained that on the last day of the competition when the request to submit to sample collection was issued, it was unexpected and also that in hindsight he should have retired the Horse before the competition started.
- 21.** Having regard to the issues of access and stable security the PR said that he had reason to believe that someone may have maliciously intervened with his Horse and for that reason he refused the sample collection.
- 22.** He said he deeply regretted his actions and wished to cooperate with the FEI.

B. The Response of the FEI

- 23.** The FEI's main submissions are the following:

By virtue of refusing to submit the Horse to sample collection, an apparent

violation of Article 2.3 of the EAD Rules has occurred and this violation has been corroborated by the reports from the FEI Officials attending the Event which can be summarised as follows:

- a) The Foreign Judge Report: The president of the Ground Jury stated in this report that he issued a yellow warning card to the PR for refusing to give permission to the Testing Veterinarian to collect a urine sample from the Horse and for the PR's argumentative behaviour towards the officials present. The officials stated that the PR together with the Owner accused the Testing Technician of potential sample tampering and complained about the security of the stables.
- b) The Testing Veterinarian Report: The Testing Veterinarian stated that the PR refused to have the Horse tested.
- c) The Testing Technician Report: The Testing Technician stated that they escorted the Horse to the testing area and the Horse entered the testing box at 4.30pm. The testing kit was shown to the PR and the procedure started normally. Shortly after this, the Owner arrived and made strong objections about the facilities and security of the Event, particularly at night. The Testing Technician stated that the PR said he had not expected testing at the Event and despite having the consequences of refusing the test explained to him, he and the Owner took the Horse out of the testing box and left the venue. The Testing Technician also pointed out that the Owner was part of the organising committee of the Event.
- d) Veterinarian Delegate Report: The Veterinarian Delegate stated that on the last day of the Event, two horses were selected for testing and the testing area was set up for anti-doping control. He reported that when he entered the testing area, the Testing Veterinarian and the Testing Technician were already there with the Horse and the groom. Shortly after, the Owner of the Horse arrived and 'started a big commotion, saying that he was not going to allow his horse to be tested'. The PR and Owner both argued that anybody could have accessed the testing area to dope their Horse. Eventually they took the Horse out of the compound and left the venue grounds. The Veterinarian Delegate also confirmed that the Owner was a part of the organising committee of the Event.
- e) Steward's Report: The report of the Assistant Steward also confirmed the difficulties encountered by Event officials when proceeding to test the Horse and that when the Testing Veterinarian commenced the sampling process, the Owner protested against the testing of the Horse and complained about the security of the stables. She also reported that the PR said to the Testing Technician that because she did not like

him, she might alter the test result and she confirmed that after continued arguments about the testing process the Horse was taken out of the testing area and left the venue grounds. The Assistant Steward reported that the officials were very surprised by the criticisms of security at the Event by the Owner because in his capacity as a member of the Event organising committee he had in fact hired the security.

- 24.** The FEI submitted the reports above as evidence of the refusal to submit to sample collection at the Event by the PR and as evidence that in fact no breaches of FEI rules occurred at the Event in terms of stable security or other conditions as claimed by the PR. Further supporting evidence was submitted by the FEI consisting of transcripts of emails from members of the organising committee and FEI officials at the Event confirming that appropriate security measures were in place and the Event was run in accordance with all applicable FEI Rules.
- 25.** The FEI emphasised that Evading, Refusing or Failing to submit the Horse to Sample Collection is a very serious offence, and the FEI has a zero-tolerance for such intentional behaviour from a registered FEI Athlete.
- 26.** In their submissions, the FEI referred to CAS case law on these matters which clarifies that in order to apply any reduction of the standard sanction, compelling justification must be established by supported evidence.¹ In the case Maxim Simona Raula v. RADA, the Sole arbitrator did not find any compelling justification, despite that the Athlete claimed she had to attend to her ill father:

*** Quote***

"All the evidentiary documents and statements show the Athlete in fact fled the training camp with the aim of evading sample collection.... This said, the Sole Arbitrator must determine whether there was any compelling justification for the Athlete to evade sample collection. The Athlete herself has not given any reason why she evaded the test as she has argued that she was not aware of the test. One reason for her not to take part in the doping control could be that her father was so ill that she could not leave him alone. The evidence provided by the Athlete in this matter has not proven that her father's illness was so severe that she could not leave him for one or two days or that he could not get some help from a neighbour or someone else while the Athlete went back to the training camp to carry out the test. Moreover, the factual scenario as presented by the Athlete leaves doubt as to whether she indeed travelled to see her

¹ For human athletes.

father and whether she met with his doctor on an emergency basis, as indicated and as one would expect under the alleged situation. With this background, the Sole Arbitrator cannot find any compelling justification for the Athlete to evade Sample Collection.”²

End Quote

27. The FEI also referred to the Troicki case³ wherein it was found that:

*** Quote***

"the Panel has found that the Athlete was informed by Dr Gorodilova that he could face sanctions if he did not take the test and was told by her that it was not the DCO's decision as to whether there would be consequences if he failed to provide a blood sample. Objectively therefore, in the circumstances, the Athlete did not have a compelling justification to forego the test and his subjective interpretation of the events which led to the misunderstanding cannot amount to a compelling justification. The Panel therefore finds that the Athlete committed a doping offence under Article 2.3 of the Programme."

End Quote

- 28.** The FEI argued that the PR's refusal to submit to sample collection was clearly intentional and there are very few refusal cases where the standard 2 years sanction has been reduced based on compelling circumstances pursuant to Article 2.3 EAD rule violations. In this respect, they highlighted the case of CCES v Boyle SDRCC DT 07-0058 (31 May 2007) it was stated that even if an athlete was taken "*suddenly, violently and horribly ill while training*" there would not be compelling justification for not providing a sample collection. To be compelling, it was said, the refusal would have to be "*unavoidable*".
- 29.** The FEI therefore concluded that the PR's conduct was intentional, and he had failed to establish any compelling circumstances for the refusal of sample collection for the Horse.
- 30.** The FEI stated that in terms of the degree of Fault and Negligence for the rule violation, the starting point of any evaluation is the "personal duty" of the PR following from Article 2.3 of the EAD Rules "It is each PR's personal duty to ensure that if the Horse on which they competed is selected for Sampling and a notification of Sampling in accordance with the FEI Veterinary Regulations has taken place, such Horse is submitted

²Arbitration CAS 2014/A/3668 Maxim Simona Raula v. Romanian National Anti-Doping Agency (RADA), award of 4 June 2015, para 48.

³ CAS 2013/A/3279 paras. 9.13-9.17.

to Sample collection and that all Sampling procedure requirements are met.” They furthered that although it is permissible for the PR to delegate the submission and supervision of the Horse to a third party, the PR remains responsible for the Horse throughout the Sample collection process and for any evasion of Sample collection; and/or any refusal or failure, without compelling justification, to submit the Horse to Sample collection; and/or any failure to comply with any or all of the Sampling procedure requirements, including signing the Sampling form.

- 31.** In addition, the FEI stated that it is not necessary to demonstrate intent, fault, negligence, or knowledge in relation to any delegation relating to the Sampling process or to the acts of a relevant third party in order to establish an EAD Rule violation under this Article 2.3. Therefore, it is the PR’s personal duty to ensure that the Horse with which he competed that was selected for Sampling is submitted to Sample collection and that all Sampling procedure requirements are met.
- 32.** Furthermore, the FEI argued that none of the mitigating factors for his behaviour submitted by the PR provided compelling justification that would release the PR from his obligation to submit the Horse to sample collection.
- 33.** The FEI submitted that in accordance with Article 10.3.1 of the EAD Rules for a violation of Article 2.3 Evading, Refusing to submit to sample collection, the period of Ineligibility shall be two years, unless Articles 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6 of the EAD Rules are applicable. The FEI argued that the provisions in Articles 10.4 and 10.5 of the EAD Rules no (significant) fault and negligence cannot apply in a case of refusal to submit to sample collection, since the act per se is being at fault for the rule violation.
- 34.** The FEI then reasoned that the only remaining article to any potential reduction of the standard 2 years sanction is therefore the provision of prompt admission which the PR had indeed demonstrated. They noted that the PR promptly admitted the violation and provided his explanations within a week from the notification and such actions meet the requirements for prompt admission to apply. In accordance with Art 10.6.3 of the EAD Rules, which states that the standard ineligibility period of two (2) years can be reduced to a minimum one half, depending on the seriousness of the violation and the PR’s degree of fault. ⁴

⁴ “10.6.3 Prompt Admission of an Anti-Doping Rule Violation after being Confronted with a Violation Sanctionable under Article 10.2.1 or Article 10.3.1
A Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel potentially subject to a two year sanction under Article 10.2.1 or 10.3.1 (for evading or refusing Sample Collection or Tampering with Sample Collection), by promptly admitting the asserted anti-doping rule violation after being confronted by the FEI, and also upon the approval and at the discretion the FEI, may receive a reduction in the period of Ineligibility down to a minimum

- 35.** Considering the seriousness of the offence in addition to the prompt admission of the PR, the FEI requested that the period of ineligibility imposed on the PR shall be at a minimum one (1) year in accordance with Article 10.3.1 and 10.6.3 of the EAD Rules and up to the standard two (2) years ineligibility period as provided for in Article 10.3 of the EAD Rules.
- 36.** The FEI submitted however that they appreciated the PR's cooperation and his prompt admission of the violation, and taking that into account, the 2 years standard sanction should be reduced by 2 to 4 months and that the proportionate sanction for this case ranges between twenty (20) and twenty-two (22) months period of ineligibility.
- 37.** For the reasons set out above the FEI requested the following prayers for relief:
- i. upholding the charge that the PR has violated Article 2.3 of the EAD Rules;
 - ii. imposing a period of Ineligibility in the range between twenty (20) and twenty-two (22) months on the PR, commencing on 11 June 2019, considering the already served period of provisional suspension;
 - iii. fining the PR, a fine of 3 000 CHF; and
 - iv. imposing legal costs of 1 500 CHF.

V. Hearing.

- 38.** During the hearing, the Parties had the opportunity to present their cases, submit their arguments and answer the questions posed by the Tribunal. After the Parties' submissions, the Tribunal closed the hearing and reserved its Decision. The Tribunal took into consideration in its deliberation all the evidence and the arguments presented by the Parties even if they may not all be summarised here.
- 39.** During the hearing, the Parties acknowledged that the Tribunal had respected their right to be heard and their procedural rights.
- 40.** During the hearing both Parties maintained their previous submissions.
- 41.** At the hearing, the PR, who attended the hearing without legal representation, offered further details about his conduct at the Event. He explained that on the day in question he was not feeling well and had

of one half of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility, depending on the seriousness of the violation and the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel's degree of Fault."

taken a fall from the Horse after the finish line which was indeed confirmed in the official's reports from the Event. He further explained that the call for doping control was unexpected and that he accepted that he had made the decision to refuse the test. He accepted responsibility for the mishandling of the situation and felt that he had been badly advised at the time. The Tribunal noted that the PR did not bring any evidence or witnesses to support the concerns he had previously raised about security at the Event. The Tribunal also noted the very open and cooperative manner of the PR throughout the hearing and the thanks he gave the FEI for their professionalism and assistance throughout the case.

VI. Jurisdiction

- 42.** The FEI Tribunal has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article 38 of the Statutes, Article 159 of the GRs, the EADCM Regulations, as well as Article 18 of the IRs. The PR is a member of the CRC-NF, which is a member of the FEI; therefore, the PR is bound by the EAD Rules.

VII. The Decision

- 43.** The Tribunal is satisfied that the FEI has demonstrated through the written evidence, the further submissions from the FEI Legal Department and the PR, and the elements covered at the virtual hearing on the 3 December 2020, a violation of Article 2.3 of the EADCM Rules has been established. Furthermore, the Tribunal concludes that the conduct was clearly intentional, the PR having been reminded at the time of the consequences of not submitting the Horse for testing. Indeed, in his letter of 15 June 2019 the PR admitted to, and apologised for, the violation.
- 44.** The Tribunal agrees that the FEI has provided sufficient evidence to establish that the FEI Rules with regard to security and other relevant matters were complied with at the Event. The Tribunal also notes the points made by Event officials that the Owner was part of the event organising committee.
- 45.** The Tribunal agrees with the FEI that Evading, Refusing or Failing to Submit the Horse to Sample Collection the offence is a very serious offence. Indeed, the entire system of anti-doping and the integrity of equestrian sport relies on the cooperation of all participants in testing.
- 46.** The Tribunal notes the FEI's position that the prompt admission in this case by the PR has assisted the process and that the FEI has recommended a reduced period of ineligibility of between 20 and 22 months in accordance with Article 10.6.3 of the EAD Rules. The Tribunal agrees with the FEI that the quick admission of responsibility by the PR should be considered as prompt admission. The Tribunal also notes that

the FEI made it clear at the hearing that the PR had been cooperative and willing to take responsibility for his conduct. The Tribunal further agrees with the FEI that this cooperation and prompt admission deserve recognition when deciding on the sanction to be imposed.

- 47.** In relation to fines and costs, the Tribunal has considered the letter of 2 November 2020 from the PR to the FEI Tribunal in which he requested the fine be reduced. He explained in this letter that the suspension has resulted in a significant reduction of income and the local equestrian economy has been highly diminished by the economic conditions resulting from the Covid 19 pandemic which has further reduced his income. He is self-employed and his earnings are not stable.
- 48.** The Tribunal reviewed the PR's request to reduce the fine to be imposed in accordance with the FEI Guidelines for fines and contribution towards legal costs (dated January 2018), and took into account the cooperation of the PR with the FEI in this case and his prompt admission. The Tribunal also took into account the PR's responsive manner and willingness to take responsibility for his actions when dealing with the FEI Tribunal. Furthermore, the Tribunal noted this had been a relatively straightforward case, had not involved outside counsel or witnesses and that the Hearing had been short. In light of these factors the Tribunal decided to impose a fine one third lower than the amount requested by the FEI and to reduce his contribution to legal costs by the same proportion.

VIII. Disqualification of Results

- 49.** Since an EAD Rule has been violated, and for reasons of ensuring a level playing field, the Tribunal disqualifies the Horse and the PR combination from the competition and the entire Event, and all medals, points and prize money won must be forfeited, in accordance with Articles 9 and 10.1.2 of the EAD Rules.

IX. Sanctions

- 50.** In summary, the Tribunal imposes the following sanctions on the PR in accordance with Article 169 of the GRs and Article 10 of the EAD Rules:
 - a. upholds the charge that the PR has violated Article 2.3 of the EAD Rules;
 - b. imposes a period of Ineligibility of 20 Months on the PR. The period of the Provisional Suspension, effective from 11 June 2019 is credited against the period of Ineligibility imposed in this decision. Therefore, the PR will be ineligible until the 10 March 2021;

- c. the PR is fined in the amount of **two thousand Swiss Francs (2000 CHF)**; and
 - d. the PR will contribute **one thousand Swiss Francs (CHF 1000)** for costs that the FEI has incurred in these proceedings.
- 51.** No PR who has been declared Ineligible may, during the period of Ineligibility, participate in any capacity in a competition or activity that is authorised or organised by the FEI or any National Federation or be present at an Event (other than as a spectator) that is authorised or organised by the FEI or any National Federation, or participate in any capacity in Competitions authorised or organised by any international or national-level Event organisation (Article 10.11.1 of the EAD Rules).
- 52.** Where a PR who has been declared Ineligible, violates the prohibition against participation or attendance during Ineligibility, the results of any such participation shall be disqualified and a new period of Ineligibility equal in length up to the original period of Ineligibility shall be added to the end of the original period of Ineligibility. In addition, further sanctions may be imposed if appropriate (Article 10.11.13 of the EAD Rules).
- 53.** According to Article 168 of the GRs, the present decision is effective from the day of the written notification to the Parties concerned.
- 54.** In accordance with Article 12 of the EAD Rules, the Parties may appeal against this decision by lodging an appeal with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) within twenty-one (21) days of its receipt.

X. DECISION TO BE FORWARDED TO:

- a. The Parties: Yes**
- b. The President of the NF of the person sanctioned: Yes**
- c. The President of the Organising Committee of the Event through his NF: Yes**
- d. Any other: No**

FOR THE FEI TRIBUNAL



Mr. Martin Gibbs, One-Member Panel