

**DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS INTEGRITY AGENCY
PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 7.14 OF THE 2023 TENNIS ANTI-DOPING PROGRAMME**

I. Introduction

1. The International Tennis Integrity Agency (**ITIA**) is the delegated third party, under the World Anti-Doping Code (**Code**), of the International Tennis Federation (**ITF**), the international governing body for the sport of tennis and signatory of the Code. Under the delegation, the ITIA is responsible for the management and administration of anti-doping across professional tennis in accordance with the Tennis Anti-Doping Programme (the **TADP** or the **Programme**), which sets out Code-compliant anti-doping rules applicable to players competing in Covered Events.¹
2. Gilbert Klier Junior (the **Player**) is a 22-year-old tennis player from Brazil. He has achieved a career-high ATP singles ranking of 354. By virtue of (among other things) his ATP ranking and participation in Covered Events in 2022, the Player was bound by and required to comply with the TADP.
3. The ITIA charged the Player with the commission of anti-doping rule violations under Article 2.1 and/or Article 2.2 of the TADP (copied below), and proposed certain Consequences based on its analysis of the degree of fault that the Player bears for those violations:
 - “2.1 *The presence of a Prohibited Substance or any of its Metabolites or Markers in a Player’s Sample, unless the Player establishes that such presence is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.4.*”
 - “2.2 *Use or Attempted Use by a Player of a Prohibited Substance or a Prohibited Method, unless the Player establishes that such Use or Attempted Use is consistent with a TUE granted in accordance with Article 4.4.*”
4. The Player has admitted the anti-doping rule violations charged and acceded to the Consequences proposed by the ITIA.
5. In such circumstances, Article 7.14 of the 2023 TADP provides that:
 - “7.14.1 *At any time prior to a final decision by the Independent Tribunal, the ITIA may invite the Player or other Person to admit the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accede to specified Consequences [...]*

¹ Unless specified otherwise, references in this decision to the TADP are to the 2022 edition. In accordance with Article 1.5 of the 2023 TADP (which came into effect on 1 January 2023), any case brought after 1 January 2023 based on conduct that took place prior to 1 January 2023 will be governed by the substantive rules in force at the time of the conduct (i.e., the 2022 TADP) and the procedural rules of the 2023 TADP.

Any defined term denoted by an initial capital letter that is not otherwise defined in this decision has the meaning given to it in the TADP.

7.14.2 *In the event that the Player or other Person admits the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) asserted and accedes to Consequences specified by the ITIA [...], the ITIA will promptly issue a reasoned decision confirming the commission of the Anti-Doping Rule Violation(s) and the imposition of the specified Consequences [...], will send notice of the decision to the Player or other Person and to each Interested Party, and will Publicly Disclose the decision in accordance with Article 8.6. [...]*

7.14.3 *Any decision issued by the ITIA in accordance with Article 7.14.2 that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation has been committed [...] will address and determine (without limitation): (1) the factual basis of the decision that an Anti-Doping Rule Violation was committed; and (2) all of the Consequences to be imposed for such Anti-Doping Rule Violation, including the reasons for imposing the Consequences specified, and in particular the reasons for exercising any discretion not to impose the full Consequences available under this Programme.”*

II. The Player's commission of anti-doping rule violations

6. On 5 April 2022, while competing at the ATP Challenger event held in Mexico City, Mexico (the **Event**), the Player was required to provide a urine sample for drug testing pursuant to the TADP. The sample he provided was given reference number 3174911 and was split into an A sample and a B sample, which were sealed in tamper-evident bottles and transported to the WADA-accredited laboratory in Montreal (the **Laboratory**) for analysis.
7. The Laboratory detected the presence in sample A3174911 of SARM S-22. SARM S-22 is an anabolic agent banned at all times under Section S1.2 (Other Anabolic Agents) of the 2022 WADA Prohibited List. SARM S-22 is not a Specified Substance.
8. The Adverse Analytical Finding reported by the Laboratory in respect of the A sample was considered by an independent Review Board in accordance with TADP Article 7.4. The Review Board did not identify any apparent departures from the applicable sample collection and sample analysis procedures that could have caused these Adverse Analytical Findings. It therefore decided that the Player had a case to answer for breach of TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
9. Accordingly, on 9 June 2022 the ITIA sent the Player a formal pre-charge Notice, asserting that the Player had a case to answer for breach of TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
10. Given that SARM S-22 is not classified as a Specified Substance under the TADP, the Player was subject to a mandatory provisional suspension under TADP Article 7.12.1, which came into effect on 9 June 2022.
11. The Laboratory subsequently analysed sample B3174911 and reported, on 18 June 2022, that it had detected the presence of SARM S-22, i.e., the B sample analysis confirmed the Adverse Analytical Finding made in respect of the A sample.
12. TADP Article 2.1 is a strict liability offence that is established simply by proof that a prohibited substance was present in the Player's sample, i.e., the ITIA does not have to prove how the substance got into the Player's system or that the Player took the substance intentionally (or even knowingly).

13. On 4 July 2022, the ITIA sent the Player a formal Charge Letter, asserting that the presence of SARM S-22 in his sample collected on 5 April 2022 constitutes anti-doping rule violations under TADP Articles 2.1 and/or 2.2.
14. In his preliminary response to the Charge Letter, the Player accepted that SARM S-22 was present in his sample collected on 5 April 2022, and therefore admitted that he had committed the anti-doping rule violations with which he was charged.

III. Consequences

A. Period of Ineligibility

(i) How SARM S-22 got into the Player's system

15. The Player has asserted that he did not intend to cheat and did not knowingly ingest SARM S-22. He asserts that his nutritionist, an expert in clinical nutrition, prescribed him two bespoke supplements (each containing different combinations of vitamins, minerals, and other compounds) that were specifically created to order by a compound pharmacy in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (the **Bespoke Supplements**), and that (unknown to him) those Bespoke Supplements were contaminated with SARM S-22.
16. In support of his explanation, the Player provided (among other things): (i) a detailed explanation of how, in around January 2022, the Player was first introduced by his physiotherapist to the prescribing nutritionist (based in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) and how they worked together thereafter; (ii) a copy of a prescription dated 27 January 2022 from the Player's nutritionist to the Player for the Bespoke Supplements; (iii) detailed explanations, supported by contemporaneous correspondence and other documents, regarding the prescription of the Bespoke Supplements and of how the prescription was filed by the compound pharmacy in São Paulo, Brazil, first on 27 January and then a second time on 22 March 2022 and the circumstances in which he collected the Bespoke Supplements; (iv) photographs of bottles of each of the two Bespoke Supplements he was prescribed; and (v) an explanation of when in the weeks prior to sample collection the Player ingested capsules of the Bespoke Supplements and the doses he took in that period.
17. When the Player's urine sample was collected on 5 April 2022, he was asked to declare on the Doping Control Form (the **DCF**) *"any prescription/non-prescription medications or supplements, including vitamins and minerals, taken over the past 7 days"*. The Player wrote on the DCF *"I don't know the name of the medicine. But this is the substances [sic]: vit A, vit D3, vit E, vit C, tiamina, riboflavina, niacinamina, pantotenato de calcio, piridoxina, metifolato, metilcobanolamina, zinco quelato, cobre quelato, cromo picolinato, manganes quelado"*. The substances declared on the DCF corresponded to the substances listed on the bottles of the Bespoke Supplements that the Player was prescribed and that were prepared in the compound pharmacy.
18. When the Player received the ITIA's pre-charge Notice on 9 June 2022, he still had in his possession the two bottles of the Bespoke Supplements made on 22 March 2022 from which he had been ingesting capsules since 2 April 2022. The Player immediately stopped taking capsules from those bottles and sent them to a laboratory for testing. That laboratory found SARM S-22 in the Bespoke Supplements at a roughly estimated concentration of 2.5 ng/capsule.
19. At the ITIA's request, the two bottles of the Bespoke Supplements were sent to the Laboratory for testing. The Laboratory initially tested the pooled contents of four capsules from each of the

two bottles of Bespoke Supplements and detected SARM S-22 in the capsules from both bottles (at a roughly estimated concentration of 2.5 ng/capsule and 0.3 ng/capsule). The Laboratory then tested individual capsules from the two bottles of the Bespoke Supplements and detected SARM S-22 in all of the capsules. In the first Bespoke Supplement, SARM S-22 was detected at a mean roughly estimated concentration of 1.2 ng/capsule, with a range between 0.4 ng and 3.5 ng. In the second Bespoke Supplement, SARM S-22 was detected at a mean roughly estimated concentration of 0.6 ng/capsule, with a range between 0.2 ng and 1.5 ng.

20. In light of these findings, the ITIA approached the compound pharmacy that had manufactured the Bespoke Supplements, explained the above facts, and asked whether the pharmacy had SARM S-22 on its premises. The pharmacy did not respond to any questions raised by the ITIA.
21. The ITIA consulted Professor Martial Saugy, Scientific Advisor of the Centre of Research and Expertise in Anti-Doping Sciences at the University of Lausanne in Switzerland and former Director of the WADA-accredited Swiss Laboratory for Doping Analyses. Prof. Saugy confirmed that the analysis results of the sample collected on 5 April 2022 were caused by a previous ingestion of SARM S-22 and acknowledged that the Bespoke Supplements contained SARM S-22, which could explain the Adverse Analytical Finding.
22. Given all of the circumstances of this case, the ITIA accepts the Player has established that it is more likely than not that the presence of the SARM S-22 found in his urine sample 3174911 was due to the presence of SARM S-22 (an undisclosed contaminant) in capsules of the Bespoke Supplements that he consumed in the days prior to collection of that sample.

(ii) TADP Article 10.2

23. This is the Player's first doping violation.
24. TADP Article 10.2.1 mandates a four-year ban for a TADP Article 2.1 and/or 2.2 violation that is "*intentional*" and is a first violation.² If the prohibited substance in question is not classified as a Specified Substance (as here), the Player has the burden of proving that the violation was not "*intentional*." If the Player can do so, then TADP Article 10.2.2 provides for a two-year period of ineligibility, subject to potential further mitigation. TADP Article 10.2.3 explains that in this context "*the term 'intentional' is meant to identify those Players or other Persons who engage in conduct that they knew constituted an Anti-Doping Rule Violation or knew that there was a significant risk that the conduct might constitute or result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation and manifestly disregarded that risk*". The jurisprudence is clear that what counts in this context is what the Player actually knew, not what he should have known.³
25. As set out above, the ITIA has accepted that undisclosed contamination of the Bespoke Supplements was more likely than not the source of the Player's positive test. The Player knew that other tennis players had tested positive for prohibited substances attributed to bespoke

² In accordance with TADP Article 10.9.4.1, for the purposes of imposing consequences under the TADP, the anti-doping rule violations will be "*considered together as one single first Anti-Doping Rule Violation, and the sanction imposed will be based on the Anti-Doping Rule Violation that carries the more severe sanction*" if (as here) the Player did not commit the second anti-doping rule violation after he received notice of the first.

³ ITF v Sharapova, Independent Tribunal decision dated 6 June 2016, para 68, not challenged on appeal, Sharapova v ITF, CAS 2016/A/4643.

supplements produced in compound pharmacies and was therefore aware of the significant risk of using them. However, the Player (i) did not know that the Bespoke Supplements contained contaminants; (ii) checked in advance that the compound pharmacy was reputable; (iii) requested that the pharmacy take special care in preparing the supplements in view of his anti-doping obligations (see paragraph 30, below); (iv) undertook searches using the “No Dop” app to check the permissibility of each of the substances listed in the prescription provided by his nutritionist and in the supplements that he purchased from the compound pharmacy; and (v) used the first batch of Bespoke Supplements without issue (having tested negative on 28 March 2022 while using the first batch). In such circumstances, the ITIA considers that the Player did not manifestly disregard the significant risk that the Bespoke Supplements contained a prohibited substance. Accordingly, the ITIA accepts that the Player has met his burden of demonstrating that his commission of the violation was not “*intentional*” within the meaning of TADP Articles 10.2.1 and 10.2.3, and so the two-year period of ineligibility set out in TADP Article 10.2.2 applies.

(iii) TADP Articles 10.5 and 10.6

26. TADP Article 10.5 provides that if a player establishes that he bears No Fault or Negligence for the anti-doping rule violation in question, the otherwise applicable period of ineligibility will be eliminated. No Fault or Negligence is defined in the TADP as follows: “*The Player or other Person establishing that they did not know or suspect, and could not reasonably have known or suspected even with the exercise of utmost caution, that they had Used or been administered the Prohibited Substance or Prohibited Method or otherwise violated an anti-doping rule.*”
27. TADP Article 10.6.1.2 provides that where the player can establish that he bears No Significant Fault or Negligence and that the prohibited substance came from a Contaminated Product, then the otherwise applicable two-year period of ineligibility may be reduced by up to 100% (in which case there would be a reprimand only). A ‘Contaminated Product’ is defined in the TADP as a “*product that contains a Prohibited Substance that is not disclosed on the product label or in information available in a reasonable Internet search*”. The definition of No Significant Fault or Negligence is: “*The Player or other Person establishing that their 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 relation to the Anti-Doping Rule Violation*”. Where No Significant Fault or Negligence is found, the amount of reduction to be applied depends upon the degree of the player’s Fault.
28. A plea of No Fault or Negligence or No Significant Fault or Negligence is assessed by considering how far the player departed from their duty under the TADP to use “*utmost caution*” to ensure that they would not ingest any prohibited substances or otherwise do anything that might constitute or result in the commission of an anti-doping rule violation.⁴ “*The difference between the two [...] is one of degree: to establish No Fault or Negligence, the athlete must show that he took every step available to him to avoid the violation, and could not have done any more; whereas to establish No Significant Fault or Negligence, he must show that, to the extent he failed*

⁴ See, e.g., *Kutrovsky v ITF*, CAS 2012/A/2804, para 9.49 (“*the athlete’s fault is measured against the fundamental duty that he or she owes under the Programme and the WADC to do everything in his or her power to avoid ingesting any prohibited substance*”); *FIFA & WADA*, CAS 2005/C/976 & 986, paras 73-75 (“*The WADC imposes on the athlete a duty of utmost caution to avoid that a prohibited substance enters his or her body. [...] It is this standard of utmost care against which the behaviour of an athlete is measured if an anti-doping violation has been identified*”).

to take certain steps that were available to him to avoid the violation, the circumstances were exceptional and therefore that failure was not significant".⁵ The TADP definition of Fault⁶ makes clear that the first question is how far the player departed from the duty of utmost caution (objective fault) and the second question is whether there is any acceptable explanation for that failure (subjective fault).

29. The standard of "utmost caution" is very onerous and requires a player to show that he "made every conceivable effort to avoid taking a prohibited substance".⁷ It follows that "even in cases of inadvertent use of a Prohibited Substance, the principle of the Athlete's personal responsibility will usually result in a conclusion that there has been some degree of fault or negligence".⁸
30. The Player does not assert that he bears No Fault or Negligence for his violation. He asserts however that he bears No Significant Fault or Negligence, so that a period of ineligibility of less than two years should be imposed, because: (i) he consulted a nutritionist, and only took the products that she prescribed; (ii) he told the nutritionist that he was a professional tennis player and specifically checked with the nutritionist that the ingredients of the Bespoke Supplements were not prohibited under anti-doping rules, and the nutritionist confirmed that they were not; (iii) he undertook searches using the "No Dop" app to check the permissibility of each of the substances listed in the prescription provided by his nutritionist and in the supplements that he purchased from the compound pharmacy; (iv) he had checked in advance that the compound pharmacy that he asked to manufacture the Bespoke Supplements was reputable; and (v) when making the order he informed the compound pharmacy that he was a professional athlete and requested that the compound pharmacy therefore be especially careful when manufacturing the Bespoke Supplements.⁹
31. The ITIA accepts that these factors weigh in the Player's favour. However:

⁵ IBAF v Luque, IBAF Anti-Doping Tribunal decision dated 13 December 2010, para 6.10.

⁶ "Fault is any breach of duty or any lack of care appropriate to a particular situation. Factors to be taken into consideration in assessing a Player's or other Person's degree of Fault include, for example, the Player's or other Person's experience, whether the Player or other Person is a Protected Person, special considerations such as impairment, the degree of risk that should have been perceived by the Player and the level of care and investigation exercised by the Player in relation to what should have been the perceived level of risk. In assessing the Player's or other Person's degree of Fault, the circumstances considered must be specific and relevant to explain the Player's or other Person's departure from the expected standard of behaviour. Thus, for example, the fact that a Player would lose the opportunity to earn large sums of money during a period of Ineligibility, or the fact that the Player only has a short time left in their career, or the timing of the sporting calendar, would not be relevant factors to be considered in reducing the period of Ineligibility under Article 10.6.1 or 10.6.2".

⁷ Knauss v FIS, CAS 2005/A/847, para 7.3.1; WADA v NSAM et al, CAS 2007/A/1395, para 80 ("The burden is therefore shifted to the athlete to establish that he/she has done all that is possible to avoid a positive testing result").

⁸ Adams v CCES, CAS 2007/A/131, para 155.

⁹ Specifically, the Player informed the pharmacy: "As I am a professional athlete, I ask you to clean the place where you do the manipulations, so that there is no risk of contamination and me being caught in doping" and also asked "Please, take as much care as you can". The pharmacy representative replied: "I'll put this observation in your order" and "I'll reinforce for sure".

- 31.1 Article 1.3.1 of the TADP states that it is the “*personal responsibility*” of each player bound by the TADP to “*be knowledgeable of and comply with this Programme at all times*”, “*take responsibility for what they use*”, “*carry out research regarding any products or substance that they intend to Use to ensure that Using them will not constitute or result in an Anti-Doping Rule Violation*”, and “*ensure that any medical treatment they receive does not violate this Programme*”.
- 31.2 Article 4.2.1.5 of the TADP specifically reminds players that “[*m*]any Prohibited Substances may appear (either as listed ingredients or otherwise, e.g., as unlisted contaminants) within supplements and/or medications that may be available with or without a physician's prescription. Since Players are strictly liable for any Prohibited Substances present in Samples collected from them (see Article 2.1.1), they are responsible for ensuring that Prohibited Substances do not enter or come to be present in their bodies by any means and that Prohibited Methods are not Used”.
- 31.3 In any event, it has long been known that supplements may contain substances that are not listed as a named ingredient. The comment to Code Article 10.5 is clear that a plea of No Fault or Negligence cannot succeed in the case of “*a positive test resulting from a mislabelled or contaminated vitamin or nutritional supplement (Athletes are responsible for what they ingest (Article 2.1.1) and have been warned against the possibility of supplement contamination*”. This is the case whether the supplement is an off-the-shelf product produced in bulk by a manufacturer or a bespoke compound mixed at a local pharmacy.
- 31.4 In the latter case, however, there have been several cases in Brazil of bespoke supplements mixed by a pharmacy turning out to contain not only the listed ingredient from the prescription but also prohibited substances. For example, in FINA v Cielo Filho and CBDA, the athletes (Brazilian swimmers) had caffeine pills (prescribed by their doctor) made by what they thought was a reputable pharmacy, but it was later determined that those pills had been contaminated with furosemide during the production process. This was a very high-profile case, in Brazil and elsewhere.
- 31.5 In 2016, Marcelo Demoliner was suspended following a positive test that was accepted to have resulted from contaminated supplements produced in a compound pharmacy in Brazil. The Player stated that he had consulted the same doctor as Mr Demoliner had in 2016, and ingested vitamins prescribed by that doctor and prepared in a compound pharmacy, but that he stopped doing so as soon as another player informed him about Mr Demoliner's positive test.
- 31.6 Several other tennis players: (i) Thomaz Bellucci, (ii) Igor Marcondes, (iii) Franco Agamenone, (iv) Camilla Bossi, (v) Beatriz Haddad Maia, and (vi) Nicholas Jarry, have tested positive for prohibited substances in the last five years. In each case, the positive test was found to be due to the contamination of bespoke supplements produced in compound pharmacies in Brazil. Those players received bans of up to eleven months. Each of those cases were reported on the ITF website at the time and, more widely, in the media. Similar cases have arisen in other sports, including in athletics. In particular, Brazilian discus

thrower Andressa de Morais was suspended for 16 months after a bespoke supplement she used was found to have caused her positive test for SARM S-22.¹⁰

- 31.7 On 12 September 2019, the ITF issued a warning on its website (which was also communicated to Players and other stakeholders via the ATP PlayerZone website on 12 September 2019 in English and 18 September 2019 in Spanish). The warning reminded Players and Player Support Personnel that *“the risk of violating the [TADP] due to supplement use remains high,”* and while *“[s]upplements from all regions may pose an elevated risk of an anti-doping violation [...] [p]layers in South America should be on particularly high alert to the use of supplements, including those prepared in pharmacies, as several violations arising from supplements prepared by similar sources have occurred in that region.”*¹¹
- 31.8 It is apparent that the consumption of bespoke supplements, in particular those made in compound pharmacies in South America, carries a significant degree of risk for athletes who are subject to anti-doping rules, and the escalating bans that have been imposed on tennis players for such violations have not been adequate to deter other players from taking those risks. The ITIA (i) urges all players to exercise extreme caution in considering whether to use supplements; and (ii) warns that any TADP violation that results from the ingestion of contaminated supplements will likely lead to a significant period of ineligibility.
32. As a result of the foregoing, the Player knew, and is deemed to have been on specific notice that, there is a significant risk that using bespoke supplements prepared by compound pharmacies in Brazil may contain prohibited substances that are not listed as ingredients. While the Player asserts that he did not see the ITF’s warning issued on 12 September 2019, he was aware that that Mr Belluci, Mr Demoliner, Ms Haddad Maia, and Mr Jarry had consumed supplements that resulted in an anti-doping rule violation (and, in two of those cases, that the supplements had been made in a compound pharmacy). Indeed, in 2016 – as a direct consequence of Mr Demoliner’s case – the Player stopped using bespoke supplements made in compound pharmacies. The Player could not assume that he was avoiding that risk in January 2022 in using what he thought was a reputable compound pharmacy based on cursory checks. To the contrary, he voluntarily assumed that risk.
33. In the circumstances, the Player was right not to pursue a plea of No Fault or Negligence, because it is not sustainable on these facts. However, the Code comment to Article 10.5 that is quoted above goes on to say: *“depending on the unique facts of a particular case, any of the referenced illustrations could result in a reduced sanction under Article 10.6 based on No Significant Fault or Negligence”*. The ITIA accepts that, in the specific circumstances of this case, the Player’s fault was not ‘significant’ within the meaning of TADP Article 10.6.1, justifying a reduction from the two-year starting point. The ITIA also accepts that the Player has shown that the prohibited substance in his sample came from a Contaminated Product, in that the prohibited substance was not disclosed on the product label, nor would it have been disclosed in information available in a reasonable internet search. Therefore, discretion arises to reduce the two-year ban applicable

¹⁰ [World Athletics v De Morais](#), AIU decision dated 4 December 2020.

¹¹ See antidoping.itftennis.com/news/310566.aspx. Once responsibility for the TADP was delegated by the ITF to the ITIA, the ITIA also warned players and others of the risks of such supplements made in compound pharmacies in South America: see itia.tennis/tadp/supplements/.

under TADP Article 10.2.2 by up to 24 months, depending on the Player's level of objective and subjective fault.

34. In determining the appropriate period of ineligibility, the ITIA is mindful of the bans imposed in other recent tennis cases involving bespoke supplements: Mr Marcondes (9 months), Mr Agamenone (10 months), Ms Haddad Maia (10 months), and Mr Jarry (11 months). The Player is more at fault than each of those athletes because he was on greater notice particularly with respect to the dangers of bespoke supplements made in a compound pharmacy. In addition, it appears that the previous sanctions have not been sufficient to deter players from using utmost caution to avoid ingesting prohibited substances even inadvertently. Taking the foregoing and the specific facts of this case into account, the ITIA has proposed, and the Player has acceded to, a period of ineligibility of 12 months.
35. In accordance with TADP Article 10.13.2, the Player is entitled to credit for the period of provisional suspension served to date, such that his 12-month period of ineligibility will be deemed to have started running from 9 June 2022. Therefore, it will expire at midnight on 8 June 2023.
36. During his period of ineligibility, the Player's status will be as set out under TADP Article 10.14, i.e., he may not play, coach or otherwise participate in any capacity in (i) any Covered Event; (ii) any other Event or Competition, or activity (other than authorised anti-doping education or rehabilitation programmes) authorised, organised or sanctioned by the ITF, the ATP, the WTA, any National Association or member of a National Association, or any Signatory, Signatory's member organisation, or club or member organisation of that Signatory's member organisation; (iii) any Event or Competition authorised or organised by any professional league or any international or national-level Event or Competition organisation; or (iv) any elite or national-level sporting activity funded by a governmental agency. Nor will he be given accreditation for or otherwise granted access to any Event referred to at points (i) and (ii). In accordance with TADP Article 10.14.5.2, the Player may use the facilities of a club or other member organisation of a Signatory's member organisation for training purposes in the last two months of his period of ineligibility, i.e., from 9 April 2023 on.

B. Disqualification of results

37. The results obtained by the Player at the Event and in subsequent events are disqualified pursuant to TADP Articles 9.1 and 10.10, and the points and prize money that he won at those events are forfeited in accordance with the same provisions.

C. Costs

38. Each party shall bear its own costs of dealings with this matter.

D. Publication

39. In accordance with 2023 TADP Article 8.6, this decision will be publicly reported by being posted (in full and/or summary form) on the ITIA's website.

E. Acceptance by the Player

40. The Player has accepted the consequences proposed above by the ITIA for his anti-doping rule violations and has expressly waived his right to have those consequences determined by the Independent Tribunal at a hearing.


IV. Rights of appeal

41. This decision constitutes the final decision of the ITIA, resolving this matter pursuant to 2023 TADP Article 7.14.
42. Further to 2023 TADP Article 13.2.1, each of WADA and the Autoridade Brasileira de Controle de Dopagem (**ABCD**) has a right to appeal against this decision to the CAS in Lausanne, Switzerland, in accordance with the procedure set out at 2023 TADP Articles 13.8 and 13.9.
43. As part of this resolution of the matter, the Player has waived his right to appeal against or otherwise challenge any aspect of this decision (both as to the finding that the Player has committed anti-doping rule violations and as to the imposition of the consequences set out above), whether pursuant to 2023 TADP Article 13.2.1 or otherwise. However, if an appeal is filed with the CAS against this decision either by WADA or ABCD, the Player will be entitled (if so advised) to exercise his right of cross-appeal in accordance with 2023 TADP Article 13.9.4.

Issued Decision of the ITIA

London, 19 January 2023

Tennis you can **trust.**

The logo consists of two horizontal blue bars of equal length, positioned one above the other.