



DECISION of the FEI TRIBUNAL

dated 26 September 2018

Positive Anti-Doping Case No.: 2018/BS04 and 2018/BS05

Horse 1: JC CAHUEL **FEI Passport No:** 105U002

Horse 2: HLP GADAFI **FEI Passport No:** 105AP09

Person Responsible/NF/ID: Daiana Chopita/ARG/10107027

Event/ID (Horse 1): CEI1* 100 – Abu Dhabi (UAE)/ 2017_CI_1827_E_S_01_01

Date: 9 December 2017

Event/ID (Horse 1): CEI2* 120 – Abu Dhabi (UAE)/ 2017_CI_1830_E_S_01_01

Date: 23 December 2017

Prohibited Substance (for both Horses): Trometamol

I. COMPOSITION OF PANEL

Ms. Harveen Thauli (CAN), chair
Mr. Chris Hodson QC (NZL), member
Ms. Constance Popineau (FRA), member

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE CASE FROM THE LEGAL VIEWPOINT

1. Articles of the Statutes/Regulations which are applicable:

Statutes 23rd edition, effective 29 April 2015 ("**Statutes**"), Arts. 1.4, 38 and 39.

General Regulations, 23rd edition, 1 January 2009, updates effective 1 January 2017, Arts. 118, 143.1, 161, 168 and 169 ("**GRs**").

Internal Regulations of the FEI Tribunal, 2nd edition, 1 January 2012, and Internal Regulations of the FEI Tribunal, 3rd Edition, 2 March 2018 (Part I – 3.) ("**IRs**").



FEI Equine Anti-Doping and Controlled Medication Regulations ("**EADCMRs**"), 2nd edition, effective 1 January 2016.

FEI Equine Anti-Doping Rules ("**EAD Rules**"), 2nd edition, effective 1 January 2016.

Veterinary Regulations ("**VRs**"), 13th edition 2015, effective 1 January 2017, Art. 1055 and seq.

FEI Code of Conduct for the Welfare of the Horse.

2. Person Responsible: Ms. Daiana Chopita.

3. 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. 2.1.1: "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. 7.6.1: "At any time during the results management process the *Person Responsible* and/or member of the *Support Personnel* and/or *Owner* against whom an EAD Rule violation is asserted may admit that violation at any time, waive a hearing and may agree with the FEI on the Consequences that are mandated by these EAD Rules or (where some discretion as to Consequences exists under these EAD Rules) that have been offered by the FEI. The agreement shall be submitted to the FEI Tribunal for approval and, where approved by the *FEI Tribunal*, the final agreement shall state the full reasons for any period of *Ineligibility* agreed, including (if applicable), a justification for



why the flexibility in *Sanction* was applied. Such agreement shall be considered as a decision for the case and will be reported to the parties with a right to appeal under Article 12.2.2 and published as provided in Article 13.3.”

EADCMRs APPENDIX 1 – Definitions:

“Fault. Fault is any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing an Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel’s degree of Fault include, for example, the Person Responsible’s and/or member of the Support Personnel’s experience, whether the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel is a Minor, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel and the level of care and investigation exercised by the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. In assessing the Person Responsible’s and/or member of the Support Personnel’s degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Person Responsible’s and/or member of the Support Personnel’s departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example, the fact that the Person Responsible would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility, or the fact that the Person Responsible only has a short time left in his or her career, or the timing of the sporting calendar, would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.5.1 or 10.5.2.”

“No Fault or Negligence. The Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel establishing that he or she did not know or suspect, and could not reasonably have known or suspected even with the exercise of utmost caution, that he or she had administered to the Horse, or the Horse’s system otherwise contained, a Banned or Controlled Medication Substance or he or she had Used on the Horse, a Banned or Controlled Medication Method or otherwise violated an EAD or ECM Rule. Except in the case of a Minor, for any violation of Article 2.1, the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system.”

“No Significant Fault or Negligence. The Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel establishing that his fault or negligence, when viewed in the totality of the circumstances and taking into account the criteria for No Fault or Negligence, was not



significant in relationship to the EADCM Regulation violation. Except in the case of a Minor, for any violation of Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules, the Athlete must also establish how the Prohibited Substance entered his or her system.”

III. DECISION

1. Parties

- 1.1 The Person Responsible (“**PR**”), Ms. Daiana Chopita, is an endurance rider competing for Argentina.
- 1.2 The Fédération Equestre Internationale (the “**FEI**” and 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).

2. Factual background

- 2.1 The PR participated with the horses JC CAHUEL and HLP GADAFI (the “**Horses**”) at the CEI1*100 on 9 December 2017, and at the CEI2* 120 on 23 December 2017 respectively, both in Abu Dhabi, UAE (the “**Events**”). The PR and Horse combinations finished third at both events.
- 2.2 On 9 December 2017 urine and blood samples were taken from the horse JC CAHUEL, and on 23 December 2017 a blood sample was taken from the horse HLP GADAFI. Analysis of the Horses’ samples revealed the presence of the substance Trometamol.
- 2.3 Trometamol is a Prohibited Substance under the 2017 FEI Equine Prohibited Substances List (the “**2017 FEI List**”).

3. Further proceedings

On 11 September 2018, the FEI informed the Tribunal that the Parties had reached an agreement in the context of the case 2018/BS04 JC CAHUEL and 2018/BS05 HLP GADAFI and submitted the Agreement (together with the Case Summary and the Full Reasoning for the Agreement, as well as the Annexes outlined throughout this Decision) to the Tribunal for approval and incorporation into a Decision of the Tribunal in accordance with Article 7.6.1 of the EAD Rules.



Case Summary and Full Reasoning (as provided to the Tribunal by the Parties as part of the Agreement referred to Article 4 below):

- 1.1 JC CAHUEL and HLP GADAFI (the "**Horses**"), respectively, participated at the CEI1* 100 on 9 December 2017 and the CEI2* 120 on 23 December 2017, both in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (the "**Events**"), in the discipline of Endurance. The Horses were ridden by Ms Daiana Chopita ("Ms Chopita") who is the Person Responsible (the "**PR**") in accordance with Article 118.3 of the FEI General Regulations.
- 1.2 On 9 December 2017 urine and blood samples were taken from JC CAHUEL and on 23 December 2017 a blood sample was taken from HLP GADAFI. Analysis of the Horses' samples revealed the presence of the substance, Trometamol. Trometamol is a Prohibited Substance under the 2017 FEI Equine Prohibited Substances List (the "2017 EPSL").
- 1.3 On 9 and 10 January 2018, the FEI charged Ms Chopita — as the PR for the Horses — with committing an anti-doping rule violation under Article 2.1 of the FEI Anti-Doping Rules (the "EAD Rules") (namely, presence of a Banned Substance in a Horses' samples). Ms Chopita was provisionally suspended pending determination of the charge.
- 1.4 Both Adverse Analytical Findings occurred before any notification was received in respect of either charge. Article 10.8.4.1 of the Equine Anti-Doping Rules proves that:

10.8.4.1 For purposes of imposing sanctions under Article 10.8, an EAD violation will only be considered a second violation if FEI can establish that the Athlete or other Person committed the second EAD Rule violation after the Athlete or other Person received notice pursuant to Article 7, or after FEI made reasonable efforts to give notice of the first anti-doping rule violation. If FEI cannot establish this, the violations shall be considered together as one single first violation, and the sanction imposed shall be based on the violation that carries the more severe sanction.

(Emphasis added)

- 1.5 Accordingly, the two charges against Ms Chopita must be considered together as one single first violation.
- 1.6 On 16 March 2018, Morgan Sports Law submitted a request to the FEI List Group that the classification of Trometamol be revised.
- 1.7 The FEI Bureau has approved the FEI List Group's recommendation that, as of 1 January 2019, Trometamol will be reclassified as a Controlled



Medication under the 2019 FEI Equine Prohibited Substances List (the “**2019 EPSL**”).

- 1.8 The proposed changes to the FEI Equine Prohibited List have been published¹ for consultation with the National Federations (“NFs”) (Annex I).
- 1.9 The NFs consultation process is ongoing, as part of which the NFs can comment on the proposed changes. Should the NFs accept the changes and confirm the proposed change regarding Trometamol, the 2019 ESPL shall enter into force on 1 January 2019. It will be published at least three months before it enters into force, by the end of September 2018, at the latest.
- 1.10 The relevance of the reclassification is that:
 - (a) The use/administration of Banned Substances in equine sports is regulated by the EAD Rules (i.e. anti-doping rules).
 - (b) The use/administration of Controlled Medications in equine sports is regulated by the Equine Controlled Medication Rules (the “**ECM Rules**”).
 - (c) The reclassification thus means that the use of Trometamol will no longer be considered an anti-doping rule violation.
 - (d) The sanctions for violations of the EAD Rules are significantly greater than the sanctions for violations of the ECM Rules. For instance, the maximum period of ineligibility that can be imposed for the presence of a Banned Substance in the sample of a horse – for a first time violation under the EAD Rules – is 2 years.² By contrast, the maximum period of ineligibility that can

¹ <https://inside.fei.org/content/anti-doping-rules>

² EAD Rules 2.1 and 10.2 provide as follows:

Where Banned Substances or Banned Methods are involved, the following constitute EAD Rule violations:

2.1 The Presence of a Banned Substance and/or its Metabolites or Markers in a Horse’s Sample.

[...]

10.2 Ineligibility and Fine for Presence, Use or Attempted Use or Possession of Banned Substances and Banned Methods.



be imposed for the presence of a Controlled Medication in the sample of a horse – for a first time violation under the ECM Rules – is 6 months.³

- (e) Thus, the maximum sanction applicable for the use of Trometamol under the ECM Rules will be 6 months and, in fact, could result in no period of ineligibility at all if the PR elects to proceed with an Administrative Procedure under Article 8.3.1.⁴

*10.2.1 The period of Ineligibility for a violation of Articles 2.1, 2.2 or 2.6 shall be as follows, subject to 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 CHF15,000 shall also be imposed and appropriate legal costs.

(Emphasis added)

³ ECM Rules 2.1 and 10.2 provide as follows:

Where Controlled Medication Substances or Controlled Medication Methods are involved, the following shall constitute ECM Rule violations:

2.1 The presence of a Controlled Medication Substance and/or its Metabolites or Markers in a Horse's Sample.

[...]

10.2 Ineligibility and Fine for Presence, Use or Attempted Use of Controlled Medication Substances or Controlled Medication Methods.

*The period of Ineligibility for a violation of Articles 2.1, 2.2 or 2.5 shall be **six months**, subject to potential reduction or suspension pursuant to Articles 10.4, 10.5 or 10.6.*

(Emphasis added)

⁴ ECM Rule 8.3 provide as follows:

8.3.1 For Adverse Analytical Findings involving Controlled Medication Substances, the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel (where applicable) may elect to have their case processed under the "Administrative Procedure" provided that:

- a. No more than one (1) Controlled Medication Substance (including its metabolites or markers) is detected in the Sample;*
- b. The Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel (where applicable) and the Horse are first-time offenders (namely, no record of any EAD or ECM Rule violations, or violations of any predecessor rules) without any pending or concluded cases within the last four (4) years preceding the Sample which caused the Adverse Analytical Finding; and*
- c. The Event during which the Sample was taken from the Horse is not part of the Olympic Games, Paralympic Games or World Equestrian Games.*

8.3.2 If the Person Responsible requests a hearing before the FEI Tribunal, Article 10 below shall apply at the discretion of the Hearing Panel.

8.3.3 Where the Administrative Procedure is applied by the FEI, the following consequences shall be imposed and no other consequences, including those set forth in Article 10 below or elsewhere in these ECM Rules, shall be applicable to any Person who has elected this Administrative Procedure:

- a. Disqualification of the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel (where applicable) and the Horse from the whole Event and forfeiture of all prizes and prize money won at the Event;*



(f) Further to the application of the principle of *lex mitior*,⁵ Ms Chopita would be entitled to the benefits of the reclassification since the use of Trometamol is:

- i. no longer to be considered an anti-doping rule violation; and
- ii. is to be regulated by far less severe sanctions under the ECM Rules.

1.11 Article 7.6.1 of the EAD Rules permits a dispute to be settled by an agreement between the parties, subject to FEI Tribunal approval.

1.12 A product called Endurance (**Annex II**), which contained Trometamol as an unlisted ingredient, was administered to the Horse by Sohail Saeed, who is the assistant to Dr Alejandro Echezarreta, a veterinarian employed by Al Wathba Stables. The administration of Endurance took place under the supervision of Dr Echezarreta during the veterinary check prior to the Horses being transported to the Events.

1.13 Mr Ray Vaughan Thomas, who owns the manufacturer of Endurance, Equimed USA LLC ("**Equimed**"), has confirmed, by his witness statement

b. A Fine of CHF 1,500; and

c. Costs of CHF 1,000. However, if a B Sample analysis is requested and the Administrative Sanction accepted after the B Sample Analysis, the costs shall be increased to CHF 2,000.

(Emphasis added)

⁵ The principle of *lex mitior* is expressly recognised in both the EAD Rules and ECM Rules:

(1) Articles 16.1.2. of the EAD Rules provides as follows:

16.1.2 [...] with respect to any EAD Rule violation case which is pending as of the Effective Date and any anti-doping rule violation case brought after the Effective Date based on an anti-doping rule violation which occurred prior to the Effective Date, the case shall be governed by the substantive anti-doping rules in effect at the time the alleged anti-doping rule violation occurred unless the FEI Tribunal or national arbitral panel deciding the case determines the principle of "lex mitior" appropriately applies under the circumstances of the case.

(Emphasis added)

(2) Articles 16.1.2. of the ECM Rules provides as follows:

16.1.2 [...] with respect to any ECM Rule violation case which is pending as of the Effective Date and any controlled medication rule violation case brought after the Effective Date based on controlled medication rule violation which occurred prior to the Effective Date, the case shall be governed by the substantive rules in effect at the time the alleged controlled medication rule violation occurred unless the FEI Tribunal or national arbitral panel deciding the case determines the principle of "lex mitior" appropriately applies under the circumstances of the case.

(Emphasis added)



dated 15 March 2018 (**Annex III**) that Trometamol has historically been included in Endurance, to act as a “buffer” and that it was not included on the ingredients label of the product because it was an inactive ingredient (being used merely as a buffer).

- 1.14 There was no way that Ms Chopita, Sohail Saeed, or Dr Echezaretta could have known that Trometamol was an ingredient in Endurance. Accordingly, Ms Chopita did not intend to administer Trometamol to the Horse and bears a minimal level of fault, if any, for the anti-doping rule violation.”

4. Agreement between Parties

On 10 September 2018, the Parties reached the following Agreement, based on the facts as detailed above:

Quote

2.1 Ms Chopita:

- (a) admits the violation of Article 2.1 of the EAD Rules;
- (b) waives her right to a hearing;
- (c) cooperates with the FEI fully with respect to her case.

2.2 The FEI is satisfied that Ms Chopita has established:

- (a) how the Trometamol entered the Horses’ systems;
- (b) that this was her first violation of the Equine Anti-Doping and Controlled Medication Rules.

2.3 Given that, since the proceedings were commenced against Ms Chopita, it is expected that the FEI Bureau will decide that:

- (a) based on the recommendation of the FEI List Group, Trometamol shall no longer be classified as a Banned Substance regulated by the EAD Rules;
- (b) Trometamol shall be reclassified as a Controlled Medication regulated by the ECM Rules, with effect from 1 January 2019;

and having regard to:

- (c) the fact that the use of Trometamol is expected to no longer be considered an anti-doping rule violation from 1 January 2019;

- (d) Ms Chopita shall, as a consequence, be entitled to the application of *lex mitior* in accordance with Article 16.1.2 of the EAD Rules, the FEI agrees that, as a matter of fairness and in accordance with the principle of proportionality, Ms Chopita's period of ineligibility shall be considered an ECM Rule Violation⁶ and that the period of ineligibility imposed on Ms Chopita shall be six (6) months.

2.4 In accordance with Article 10.10.4 of EAD Rules ("**Credit for Provisional Suspension or Period of Ineligibility Served**"),⁷ the period of ineligibility shall be deemed to have commenced on 10 January 2018 (i.e. the date on which the FEI imposed a provisional suspension on Ms Chopita) and ended on 9 July 2018.

2.5 In accordance with EAD Rules 9.1 and 10.1.2,⁸ the results achieved by Ms Chopita with the Horses at the Events are disqualified, with all

⁶ Noting that:

- (1) further to the WADA Code, anti-doping rules based on the WADA Code are "*intended to be applied in a manner which respects the principles of proportionality and human rights*" (see Introduction to the WADA Code);
- (2) Among the general principles of law applied by the CAS as part of the "*lex sportiva*" or "*lex ludica*", is the principle of proportionality. See:
 - a. CAS 1999/A/246 *McLain Ward v. FEI*
 - b. CAS 2005/A/830 *Squizzato v. FINA*
 - c. TAS 2007/A/1252 *FINA v. Mellouli*
 - d. CAS 2010/A/2268 *I v. Fédération Internationale de l'Automobile*
 - e. CAS 2005/C/976 & 986, *FIFA & WADA*
 - f. CAS A4/2016 *Sarah Klein v. Australian Sports Anti-Doping Authority and Athletics Australia*

⁷ EAD Rules 10.10.4 provides as follows:

10.10.4 Credit for Provisional Suspension or Period of Ineligibility Served.

If a Provisional Suspension is imposed and respected by the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel, or Horse, then a credit shall be received for such period of Provisional Suspension against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed as determined by the FEI Tribunal. If a period of Ineligibility is served pursuant to a decision that is subsequently appealed, then the Person Responsible and/or member of the Support Personnel and/or Horse shall receive a credit for such period of Ineligibility served against any period of Ineligibility which may ultimately be imposed on appeal.

⁸ EAD Rules 9.1 and 10.1.2 provide as follows:

9.1 *A violation of these EAD Rules in connection with a test in a given Competition automatically leads to the Disqualification of the result of the Person Responsible and Horse combination obtained in that Competition with all resulting Consequences, including forfeiture of any related medals, points and prizes. [...] Even if a Sanction is reduced or eliminated under Article 10 below, such reduction or elimination shall under no circumstances reverse the automatic Disqualification of Individual Results mandated by this Article 9.*

10.1.2 *At Events other than those listed above: an EAD Rule violation occurring during or in connection with an Event may lead to Disqualification of all of the Person Responsible's individual results obtained in that Event, with any and all Horses with which the Person Responsible competed, with all consequences, including forfeiture of all medals, points and prizes, except as provided in Article 10.1.4.*



resulting consequences, including forfeiture of any related medals, points and prizes.

- 2.6 Ms Chopita did not contest the Provisional Suspension imposed on the Horses and therefore accepts that they remained in place until 8 March 2018, in the case of JC CAHUEL, and 9 March 2018, in the case of HLP GADAFI.
- 2.7 In addition, Ms Chopita shall:
 - (a) pay a fine of CHF 3,000;
 - (b) contribute CHF 1,000 towards the costs of the FEI judicial procedure.
- 2.8 Each party will bear its own legal and other costs incurred in connection with these proceedings.
- 2.9 The parties hereby request that the FEI Tribunal issue a Decision incorporating the terms of this agreement. The parties acknowledge and agree that, pursuant to Article 13.3 of the EAD Rules, that the Decision will be made public by the FEI. The terms set out in this agreement have been agreed as a full and final settlement of all claims relating to the subject-matter of these proceedings. Accordingly, any and all other claims for relief that any party might otherwise have made against another in relation to the subject-matter of these proceedings are released and discharged unconditionally, and they may not be pursued in any form hereafter.
- 2.10 This agreement is made in accordance with Article 7.6.1 of the EAD Rules and is subject to the approval of the FEI Tribunal. The Agreement will be included in a final decision of the FEI Tribunal.
- 2.11 This Agreement will constitute the decision for this case. Consequently, it will be communicated to the Parties with a right of appeal in accordance with Article 12.2 of the EAD Rules.

End Quote

5. Jurisdiction

- 5.1 The Tribunal has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the Statutes, the GRs and the EAD Rules.
- 5.2 As a member of the National Federation of Argentina, the latter being a member of the FEI, the PR was bound by the EAD Rules.
- 5.3 Further, Article 7.6.1 of the EADCMRs allows for agreements between parties.
- 5.4 As a result, the Tribunal finds that it has jurisdiction to issue this Decision.

6. Approval of Agreement

- 6.1 To start with, the Tribunal has taken note that the PR could not have known that Trometamol was an ingredient in the product called Endurance, did not intend to administer Trometamol to the Horse, and "*bears a minimal level of fault, if any, for the anti-doping rule violation.*" In this respect, the Tribunal finds that the agreement does not include what steps the PR took to prevent the Horses from ingesting the Prohibited Substance, and thus whether the PR had fulfilled the required duty of care. Therefore, the Tribunal is not in a position to decide on the level of fault of the PR for the rule violation. However, for reasons outlined below, the Tribunal does not have to decide on the level of fault of the PR in the case at hand.
- 6.2 In addition, the Tribunal has taken note that since the proceedings were opened against the PR, Trometamol is in the process of being reclassified as Controlled Medication Substance, with effect from 1 January 2019. In this regard, the Tribunal agrees with the Parties that the *lex mitior* principle, in accordance with Article 16.1.2 of the EAD Rules and Article 16.1.2 of the ECM Rules, concerning the applicable sanction for Controlled Medication Substances shall apply in the case at hand.
- 6.3 As a result, the period of Ineligibility foreseen for ECM Rule violations is six (6) months in accordance with Article 10.2 of the ECM Rules.
- 6.4 Having reviewed the Case Summary, the Full Reasoning for the Agreement and terms of the Agreement, and especially considering the *lex mitior* principle previously outlined, the Tribunal does not object to or



disapprove the terms of the Agreement and is satisfied the Agreement constitutes a *bona fide* settlement of the present case.

- 6.5 In accordance with the mutual consent of the Parties, the Tribunal hereby directs the Parties to fully comply with all the terms of the Agreement as set forth in Article 4 above. Further, this Decision shall terminate the present case 2018/BS04/JC CAHUEL & 2018/BS05 HLP GADAFI.

7. Decision

- 1) The Tribunal rules that the Agreement executed by the FEI and the PR, Ms. Daiana Chopita, concerning the case 2018/BS04/JC CAHUEL & 2018/BS05 HLP GADAFI is hereby ratified by the Tribunal with the consent of the Parties and its terms are incorporated into this Decision.
- 2) This Decision is subject to appeal in accordance with Article 12.2 of the EAD Rules. An appeal against this Decision may be brought by lodging an appeal with the Court of Arbitration for Sport (CAS) within twenty-one (21) days of receipt hereof.
- 3) This Decision shall be published in accordance with Article 13.3 of the EAD Rules.

IV. DECISION TO BE FORWARDED TO:

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

FOR THE PANEL

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'H. Thauli', written in a cursive style.

THE CHAIR, Ms. Harveen Thauli