

I. SUMMARY OF LEGAL AUTHORITY

1. 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, 23rd edition, 1 January 2009, updates effective 1 January 2019, Arts. 118, 143.1, 161, 168 and 169 (“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 2019.

FEI Equine Anti-Doping Rules (“EAD Rules”), 2nd edition, changes effective 1 January 2019.

FEI Endurance Rules, updated 9th Edition, effective 1 February 2019

2. Person Responsible: [REDACTED]

3. **Additional Person Responsible:** Ahmed Salem Ali Bakheet AL RASHDI

4. 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.”

FEI Endurance Rules, Art. 800: “the “Trainer” is defined as the person who is in charge of the preparation of the Horse both physically and mentally for Competition. Prior to the Event, the Trainer is responsible for the conditioning

of the Horse for the Competition which involves the exercise programme, nutrition of the Horse, seeking appropriate veterinary care and the administration of therapeutic substances under veterinary advice.”

EAD Rules Art. 2.1.1: “It is each Person Responsible’s personal duty to ensure that no Banned Substance is present in the Horse’s body. Persons Responsible are responsible for any Banned Substance found to be present in their Horse’s Samples, even though their Support Personnel will be considered additionally responsible under Articles 2.2 – 2.8 below where the circumstances so warrant. It is not necessary that intent, Fault, negligence or knowing Use be demonstrated in order to establish an EAD Rule violation under Article 2.1.”

EAD Rules Art. 10.2: “The period of Ineligibility for a violation of Articles 2.1, 2.2 or 2.6 shall be as follows, subject to a potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Articles 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6, the period of Ineligibility shall be two years.

A Fine of up to CHF 15,000 shall also be imposed and appropriate legal costs.”

EAD Rules Art. 10.8.6: “Where a Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel based on the same factual circumstances is found to have committed a violation involving both (a) Controlled Medication Substance(s) or (a) Controlled Medication Method(s) under the ECM Rules and (a) Banned Substance(s) or (a) Banned Method(s) under these EAD Rules, the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel shall be considered to have committed one EAD Rule violation and the Sanction imposed shall be based on the Banned Substance or Banned Method that carries the most severe Sanction.”

II. Factual background

1. Mr. [REDACTED] the Person Responsible (the “PR”) is an endurance rider from the UAE. Mr. Ahmed Salem Ali Bakheet AL RASHDI (FEI ID: 10027984), the Additional Person Responsible (the “APR”) is an FEI registered trainer from the UAE.
2. The Fédération Equestre Internationale (the “FEI”) and together with the PR and the APR, the “Parties”), is the sole IOC recognised international federation for equestrian sport. The FEI is the governing body for the FEI equestrian disciplines of dressage, jumping, eventing, driving, endurance, vaulting, reining, and para-equestrian.

3. The PR participated with the horse [REDACTED] (the "Horse") at the CEI1* 80 in Bou Thib (UAE) on 1 and 2 November 2019 (the "Event"). The APR was the registered trainer of the Horse at the time of the Event.
4. Urine and blood samples were collected from the Horse on 2 November 2019 and sent to the FEI-approved laboratory, the Hong Kong Racing Laboratory in Sha Tin, Hong Kong (the "Laboratory") for analysis. The Horse's samples were divided into an "A sample" and "B sample" and given reference number 5587733.
5. The Laboratory's analysis of the A sample reported the presence of Strychnine, Phenylbutazone and Oxyphenbutazone in the urine.
6. Strychnine is an alkaloid and a toxic substance that causes muscular convulsion. It is used as a rodenticide and is a "**Prohibited Substance**" that is classified as a "**Banned Substance**" under the FEI's Equine Anti-Doping (the "EAD Rules") and Controlled Medication Regulations (together, the "EADCM Rules").
7. Phenylbutazone is an anti-inflammatory medication with analgesic effect and Oxyphenbutazone is a metabolite of Phenylbutazone, both of which are Prohibited Substances and classified as "**Controlled Medication Substances**" under the EADCM Rules.
8. The adverse analytical finding ("**AAF**") of Strychnine, Phenylbutazone and Oxyphenbutazone gives rise to anti-doping rule violations (the "**ADR violations**") under the EADCM Rules.
9. Given the rule violations, the FEI provisionally suspended the APR on 2 December 2019 and granted him the opportunity to request a Preliminary Hearing. The PR was a Minor at the time of the ADR violations. The FEI offered him the "Special Procedure for Minors" and did not provisionally suspend him. The PR did not respond to the FEI's offer nor did he provide any submissions.
10. The APR submitted a short statement on 21 December 2019, which is summarised under Section III below.

III. Procedural background before the FEI Tribunal

11. By email dated 25 March 2021, the FEI submitted the case files to the Tribunal for adjudication. The United Arab Emirates Equestrian Federation (the "UAE-NF") was copied on the FEI's correspondence.

12. On 13 April 2021, the Tribunal Chair informed the Parties of the appointment of a one-person hearing panel to decide this case. The Parties were asked to provide any objections to constitution of the hearing panel by 16 April 2021. Furthermore, the Tribunal Chair granted the PR and the APR, through the UAE-NF, with the opportunity to respond to the FEI's allegations about the Prohibited Substances discovered in the Horse's system, by providing a statement of defence and any supporting evidence by 3 May 2021. The Tribunal Chair further informed the PR and the APR that should they fail to respond within the deadline, the Tribunal hearing panel would decide this case using the file material in its possession. The Tribunal Chair also requested the UAE-NF to provide the personal contact details of the PR and the APR by 16 April 2021. Finally, the Tribunal Chair informed the Parties of their right to request an oral hearing.
13. On 14 April 2021, the FEI informed the Tribunal that it did not have any objections to the constitution of the Tribunal hearing panel.
14. On 17 May 2021, the Tribunal requested the UAE-NF to confirm by 21 May 2021 whether the PR and the APR had received the case files. The Tribunal further informed the UAE-NF that if the Tribunal did not hear from them by this revised deadline, it would proceed on the basis that the PR and the APR received the case files and chose not to respond to the Tribunal.
15. On 20 May 2021, the UAE-NF informed the Tribunal that the case files were sent "*to the PRs*", and that the APR replied he did not have any further comments to add to his previously submitted statement of 21 December 2019.
16. On 26 May 2021, the Tribunal acknowledged receipt of the UAE-NF's correspondence dated 20 May 2021, noted that the case files had been duly provided to the PR and the APR, and that the APR did not wish to provide any further comments on this case.
17. Neither Party requested an oral hearing.

A. Written submission by the PR & the APR

18. The PR did not provide any submissions on the allegations brought against him by the FEI after the Tribunal Chair's request.
19. The APR submitted his position to the FEI on 21 December 2019.

20. Upon receipt of the FEI's notification letter on the ADR violations, the APR apparently conducted an investigation to have a better understanding of the AAF. The APR then responded as follows:

"I am writing you to set out the results of my investigation into the case. In my long life with horses I never had any equestrian cases also I can confirm that all my participation in all rides is to educate and qualify the kids for that noble sport as you already know our target in Boudhieb Academy, I do follow all FEI rules, and keep my self up to date, also attending all the workshops and training conducting by my National federation.

About the anti-inflammatory (Phenylbutazone), I would like to inform you that there is an error in calculating treatment schedule between the stable staff, which lead to that positive, which I was not aware of as I was a way at the time of the event. Regarding the Band substance, I did all investigation including, questioning all the staff, back to our records, treatment records, medicine stores, I found nothing related to this substance, I only can confirm to you I have no idea about it.

I admit the mistake even though I have no interference with it from near or far, but according to the law, I'm considered the first and last official in this incident, knowing that I'm preparing a master's degree in the endurance regimentation and its impact on developing this sport.

Accordingly, I go to your Honorable side, taking consideration this aspect in applying the sanction, and ask you kindly to apply the maximum degree of mercy, and I assure you that in the future I will be more careful, and work closely with my staff, to avoid such cases to happen again".

B. Written Response by the FEI

21. On 29 March 2021, the FEI provided its Response in this case.

22. The FEI submitted that:

- a) According to the Article 118.3 of the GRs, *the Person Responsible (PR) 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.
- b) Article 118.3 of the GRs further states: *"In Endurance, the Trainer shall be the additional Person Responsible."* The FEI also highlighted the definition of Trainer in the Endurance Rules, which states: *"for the purpose of this Code, the "Trainer"*

is defined as the person who is in charge of the preparation of the Horse both physically and mentally for Competition. Prior to the Event, the Trainer is responsible for the conditioning of the Horse for the Competition which involves the exercise programme, nutrition of the Horse, seeking appropriate Veterinary care and the administration of therapeutic substances under Veterinary advice.¹

- c) It has also been confirmed in previous Tribunal decisions² that given the specific nature of Endurance racing, trainers indeed make relevant and concrete decisions about their horses, including: feed and supplements (if any); shoeing type and cycle, choice of veterinarian and veterinarian treatments such as the administration of medications; training regime and exercise program; and the horse's competition schedule.
- d) In addition to Article 118.3 of the GRs and the previous decisions of the FEI Tribunal, the APR was also registered as the Horse's Trainer for the Event in the FEI Database. Once someone is registered as a Trainer in the FEI database, he is irrefutably presumed to be the person responsible for making relevant and concrete decisions about the horse's training and welfare, as described in the previous paragraph. Furthermore, the FEI as a prosecutor relies on the FEI database where Athletes and Trainers are registered with the FEI. The registration system allows the FEI to hold registered individuals accountable when they violate FEI Rules and Regulations.
- e) Article 3.1 of the EAD Rules makes it the FEI's burden to establish all the elements of the EAD Rule violation, to the comfortable satisfaction of the Tribunal.
- f) The elements of an Article 2.1 of an EAD Rule violation are straightforward. *"It is not necessary that intent, fault, negligence or knowing Use be demonstrated in order to establish an EAD Rule violation under Article 2.1"*. Instead, it is a "strict liability" offence, established simply by proof that a Banned Substance was present in the Horse's sample. The results of the A sample analysis confirmed the presence of Strychnine (the Banned Substance) as well as Phenylbutazone and Oxyphenbutazone (Controlled Medication Substances), and constituted "sufficient proof" of the violation of Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules. In any event, the PR and the APR did not dispute the presence of the Prohibited Substances in the A sample. Therefore, the FEI submitted that it had discharged its burden of establishing that the PR and the APR violated Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules.

¹ FEI Endurance Rules, Article 800, para. 3 & 4.

² Cf. Decisions dated 25 June 2020 (cases 2019/FT07 and 2019/CM08); Decision 2019/CM06

- g) When a Prohibited Substance is found in a horse's sample, there is a clear and unequivocal presumption of fault under the EAD Rules that it was administered to a horse in a deliberate attempt to enhance its performance. As a result of this presumption, Article 10.2 of the EAD Rules provides that a Person Responsible / Additional Person Responsible with no previous doping offence, but who violates Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules, is subject to a period of "**Ineligibility**" of two (2) years, unless he can rebut the presumption of fault on a balance of probability (Article 3.1 of the EAD Rules). If the PR / APR fail to do so, the two (2) year period of Ineligibility applies.
- h) To rebut the presumption of fault, the EAD Rules stipulate, and the jurisprudence of the FEI Tribunal and CAS is very clear: it is a strict threshold requirement that the PR / APR proves how the Prohibited Substances entered into the Horse's system before making any plea of No (or No Significant) Fault or Negligence. Indeed, this threshold requirement is strictly applied because without such proof, it would be impossible to assess the degree of Fault or Negligence (or No Significant Fault or Negligence) of the PR / APR for the presence of the Prohibited Substances in the Horse.
- i) A Minor does not have to establish the source of the Prohibited Substance in the horse, as can be inferred from the definition of "**Fault**" in the EAD Rules, which states: "*Except in the case of a Minor, for any violation of Article 2.1, the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered the Horse's system.*" However, if he fails to do so, it is impossible to evaluate the Minor's degree of Fault or Negligence for the ADR violation.
- j) In this case, the PR did not submit any position, despite several reminders from the FEI.
- k) The APR provided a short statement where he alleges that the positive result of Phenylbutazone and Oxyphenbutazone in the A sample resulted from a miscalculation of the Horse's treatment schedule.
- l) The FEI submitted that the APR did not corroborate his statement with any reliable and convincing evidence, such as the Horse's veterinary records or medical logbook. Even if the APR's explanation could be plausible and caused the AAF in the Horse, neither the PR nor the APR proved this scenario, on a balance of probability.
- m) In addition, neither the PR nor the APR provided any explanation or evidence for the more serious offence of the positive finding of the Banned Substance, Strychnine.

- n) The FEI highlighted that Banned Substances, in particular, are never to be found in a competition horse because they are substances with no legitimate use and have a high potential for abuse.³ Furthermore, it was the PR's and APR's personal duty under Article 2.1.1 of the EAD Rules to ensure that no Banned Substance was present in the Horse's body.
- o) The FEI submitted that both the PR and the APR failed to establish, on a balance of probability, the "threshold requirement" of how the Prohibited Substances entered the Horse's body. Since it was not possible to evaluate the PR's and the APR's degree of Fault or Negligence, the FEI further submitted that Article 10.2 of the EAD Rules, which imposes a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years and a fine of up to CHF 15,000, applies.
- p) In view of the above, the FEI recommended a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years be imposed on both the PR and the APR.
- q) On the disqualification of results, the FEI submitted that Article 9 of the EAD Rules, in conjunction with Article 10.1.2 EAD Rules, should apply, *i.e.*, that all individual results obtained in connection with an Event, should be forfeited.
- r) On the fine to be imposed, the FEI submitted that Article 10.2. of the EAD Rules provides that, for a violation of Article 2.1 EAD Rules, a fine of up to CHF 15 000 and appropriate legal costs shall also be imposed. The FEI submits that a fine of CHF 7 500 should be imposed on both the PR and the APR.
- s) On t the costs of the proceedings, the FEI submitted that the PR and the APR should be ordered to pay appropriate legal costs, which the FEI recommended should be CHF 2 000 for both the PR and the APR.
- t) The FEI requested the following prayers for relief:

The PR:

- (i) *upholding the charge that the PR has violated Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules;*
- (ii) *disqualifying the result of the PR and Horse combination obtained in the Competition and the Event, and the consequent forfeiture of all medals, points, prize money, etc. won, pursuant to Article 9 and 10.1.2 of the EAD Rules;*
- (iii) *imposing a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years on the PR, commencing on the date of the decision (since no provisional suspension to be credited has been imposed on the Minor yet);*

³ Article 1055 of the Veterinary Regulations.

- (iv) *fining the PR a fine of 7 500 CHF; and*
- (v) *ordering the PR to pay the legal costs of 2 000 CHF that the FEI has incurred in these proceedings.*

The APR - Trainer:

- (i) *upholding the charge that the APR (Trainer) has violated Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules;*
- (ii) *imposing a period of Ineligibility of two (2) years on the APR, commencing on the date of the decision, and crediting the Provisional Suspension already served as of 2 December 2019 (the date upon which the Provisional Suspension was imposed);*
- (iii) *fining the APR a fine of 7 500 CHF; and*
- (iv) *ordering the APR to pay the legal costs of 2 000 CHF that the FEI has incurred in these proceedings.*

IV. Jurisdiction

23. The Tribunal has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Article 38 of the Statutes, Article 161 of the GRs, the EAD Rules and Article 18 of the IRs. The PR and the APR are members of the UAE-NF, which is a member of the FEI; therefore, the PR and the APR are bound by the EAD Rules.

V. The Decision

24. Although the Tribunal has fully considered all the facts, allegations, legal arguments and evidence in the present proceedings, it only refers to the submissions and evidence it considers necessary to explain its reasoning in this decision.

1. The Person(s) Responsible

25. The PR is the Person Responsible for the Horse pursuant to Article 118.3 of the GRs as he was the Horse's rider at the Event. The PR did not accept the "Special Procedures for Minors" that the FEI offered to him. Therefore, the Tribunal will decide the PR's case in the normal course pursuant to Article 8.3.5 of the EAD Rules.

26. The Trainer is the Additional Person Responsible for the Horse pursuant to Article 118.3 of the GRs and previous decisions of the FEI Tribunal.

2. Considering

27. The Horse's sample confirmed the presence of a Banned Substance and two Controlled Medication Substances. Article 10.8.6 of the EAD Rules specifically governs the situation where the PR / APR committed violations involving both a Banned Substance and Controlled Medication Substances when based on the same factual circumstances, that is, the same samples taken from the Horse at the same Event. Article 10.8.6 states, in part, that the PR *"shall be considered to have committed one EAD Rule violation and the Sanction imposed shall be based on the Banned Substance [...]"* Given this wording, the FEI charged each of the PR and the APR with a single charge of violating Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules based on the AAF of all the Prohibited Substances found in the A sample.
28. As set forth in Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules, sufficient proof of an EAD Rule violation is established by the presence of a Banned Substance in the Horse's sample. The Tribunal is satisfied that the reports relating to the A-sample reflect that the analytical tests were performed in an acceptable manner and that the findings of the Laboratory are accurate. The Tribunal is further satisfied that the test results evidence the presence of Strychnine, Phenylbutazone and Oxyphenbutazone in the A sample taken from the Horse at the Event. Neither the PR nor the APR challenged the accuracy of the test results and the AAF. Strychnine is a Banned Substance and the presence of this substance in a Horse's body is prohibited at all times under Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules.
29. As a result, the FEI has established an AAF and sufficiently proven the objective elements of the offence in accordance with Article 3.1 of the EAD Rules.
30. Pursuant to Article 10.2.1 of the EAD Rules, the period of Ineligibility for an Article 2.1 violation, *i.e.*, the Presence of a Banned Substance in a Horse's sample, as in this case, is two (2) years, subject to a potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Articles 10.4 or 10.5 of the EAD Rules.
31. In cases brought under the EAD Rules, a strict liability principle applies as described in Article 2.1.1 of the EAD Rules. Once an EAD Rule violation has been established by the FEI, a PR / APR has the burden of proving that he bears *"No Fault or Negligence"* for the rule violation as set forth in Article 10.4 of the EAD Rules, or *"No Significant Fault or Negligence,"* as set forth in Article 10.5 of the EAD Rules.
32. In order for Articles 10.4 and 10.5 of the EAD Rules to be applicable, the PR / APR must establish as a threshold requirement how the Prohibited Substance entered the Horse's system.

33. As confirmed by various CAS panels as well as FEI Tribunals, the PR / APR have to present facts substantiated with concrete evidence. Speculation or theoretical possibilities are not sufficient. Furthermore, it was suggested by various CAS panels that the 51% threshold was understood as meaning that panels should separately compare each alternative scenario with the scenario invoked by the PR / APR. The PR's / APR's scenario has to reach a 51% threshold for it to be successful.⁴
34. The PR did not submit any position, which in itself does not need any further explanations.
35. The APR submitted a short statement without any corroborating evidence. The APR's theory that the Prohibited Substances in the Horse's system resulted from a miscalculation of the Horse's treatment schedule is mere speculation without any supporting evidence. Furthermore, and even more importantly, the APR admitted having no explanation for the presence of the Banned Substance of Strychnine in the Horse's sample, which ultimately led to the single charge of violating Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules.
36. The Tribunal also notes that the APR admitted in his statement of 19 December 2019 that he is ultimately responsible for what happened. He stated, in part: *"I admit the mistake even though I have no interference with it from near or far, but according to the law, I'm considered the first and last official in this incident..."*. As a result, the Tribunal finds that the PR / APR did not establish – on a balance of probability – how the Banned Substance entered the Horse's system.
37. Where the first hurdle has not been met, i.e., establishing the source of the Banned Substance, the Tribunal cannot continue with the second step and evaluate the PR's and the APR's degree of Fault or Negligence. Therefore, the Tribunal finds that the PR and the APR are not entitled to any reduction of the otherwise applicable period of Ineligibility under Articles 10.4 and 10.5 of the EAD Rules.
38. The Tribunal finds that the applicable period of Ineligibility is two (2) years pursuant to Article 10.2 of the EAD Rules for both the PR and the APR.
39. The Tribunal notes that the PR, being a Minor at the time of the infringement, did not accept resolution under the "Special Procedure for Minor" and was not provisionally suspended by the FEI. Therefore, the PR's suspension will begin on receipt of the present decision.

⁴ See for example Viret, M., "Evidence in Anti-Doping at the Intersection of Science & Law", Asser International Sports Law Series, Springer 2016, (pp. 521-538), as well as CAS 2011/A/2234 & 2386, UCI v. Contador & RFEC, and CAS 2010/A/2230, IWBF v. UKAD & Gibbs. See for example also Case 2017/BS32 SAURA DE FONDCOMBE, Final Tribunal Decision dated 24 February 2020.

40. The Tribunal also notes that the APR has been provisionally suspended since 2 December 2019, Therefore, his two (2) year period of Ineligibility will be credited with the time he has already served under the provisional suspension.

VI. Disqualification of Results

41. 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.

VII. Fine & legal costs

42. The Tribunal agrees with the FEI's recommendations for fines.

43. The Tribunal notes the delay in the submission of the present case. The offence was detected in November 2019 and the APR responded in December 2019. The case was passed for adjudication to the FEI Tribunal in late March 2021. Due to this unjustified delay, the Tribunal holds that there will be no order on costs.

VIII. Operative part of the Decision

44. In summary, the Tribunal imposes the following sanctions in accordance with Article 169 of the GRs and Article 10 of the EAD Rules:

On the PR:

- a) The Tribunal upholds the charge that the PR violated Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules.
- b) The PR shall be suspended for a period of **two (2) years**, starting as of notification of the present decision. Therefore, the PR will be ineligible **until 23 August 2023**.
- c) The PR is fined **seven thousand five hundred Swiss Francs (CHF 7 500)**.
- d) The PR shall not bear any part of the costs of these proceedings.

On the APR:

- a) The Tribunal upholds the charge that the APR violated Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules.
 - b) The APR shall be suspended for a period of **two (2) years**. The period of Provisional Suspension, effective from 2 December 2019, shall be credited against the period of Ineligibility imposed in this decision. Therefore, the APR will be ineligible **until 1 December 2021**.
 - c) The APR is fined **seven thousand five hundred Swiss Francs (CHF 7 500)**.
 - d) The APR shall not bear any part of the costs of these proceedings.
45. No PR and/or APR 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 authorized or organized by the FEI or any National Federation, or participate in any capacity in competitions authorized or organized by any international or national-level event organisation (Article 10.11.1 of the EAD Rules).
46. Where a Person Responsible who has been declared Ineligible violates any of the conditions in the previous paragraph during Ineligibility, the results of any such participation will be disqualified and a new period of Ineligibility equal in length up to the original period of Ineligibility will be added to the end of the original period of Ineligibility. In addition, further sanctions may be imposed if appropriate (Article 10.11.3 of the EAD Rules).
47. According to Article 168 of the GRs, the present decision is effective from the day of written notification to the persons and bodies concerned.
48. 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.

- IX. DECISION TO BE FORWARDED TO:
- a. The Parties: Yes
 - b. The NF of the PR and the APR: Yes
 - c. Any other: No

FOR THE TRIBUNAL



Ms Harveen Thauli, One-Member panel